

Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2008

The Historical Development, Philosophical Foundation, and Mission of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University

Jorge E. Rico

Andrews University, rico@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rico, Jorge E., "The Historical Development, Philosophical Foundation, and Mission of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University" (2008). *Dissertations*. 658.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/658>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/658/>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

ABSTRACT

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION,
AND MISSION OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
PROGRAM AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

by

Jorge E. Rico

Co-Chairs: John V.G. Matthews
Brian E. Strayer

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION,
AND MISSION OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM
AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

Name of researcher: Jorge E. Rico

Name and degree of faculty co-chairs: John V.G. Matthews, Ph.D.
Brian E. Strayer, Ph.D.

Date completed: June 2008

Topic

This study focuses on the evaluation of the historical development and philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. The program has been instrumental in training individuals as Bible instructors, church and educational leaders, and overseas missionaries. Its challenges and advantages have led leaders to define the program and implement a biblical philosophy of religious education.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the development, challenges, and attempts

to define the Religious Education program from its inception to the present. The investigation also analyzes the biblical basis, philosophical framework, mission, and contribution of the Religious Education program to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Sources

Historical-documentary research for this study focused on published and unpublished sources. The majority of primary sources used in this study were school bulletins, board minutes, letters, and numerous documents in archives and files located in the Center for Adventist Research, School of Education, and Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University. Secondary sources were consulted for the biblical and historical background, context, and philosophical framework.

Conclusions

The Religious Education program was founded in 1960 as an M.A. concentration in the Department of Education at Andrews University. Its history can be arranged into four distinct periods: foundation, growth, crisis, and redefinition. From the beginning, the mission and philosophy of the program were shaped by the Adventist philosophy of education which views the home, church, and school as pivotal agencies for religious instruction and the Bible as the primary source for religious learning. These four sources for religious training comprised a scriptural model employed by believers in biblical times to transmit the covenant relationship to future generations.

As the Religious Education faculty faced structural and administrative challenges, the implementation of this biblical model in the program became problematic and the

integrity and mission of Religious Education eroded. Starting in 1996, a series of events spared the program from complete elimination, and the process of redefining Religious Education at Andrews University began. Although this process is not fully complete, the program philosophy is once again centered in the biblical model, preparing candidates for service in the home, church, and school settings through the roles of a religious educator.

Andrews University

School of Education

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION,
AND MISSION OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
PROGRAM AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Jorge E. Rico

June 2008

© Copyright by Jorge E. Rico 2008
All Rights Reserved

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION,
AND MISSION OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
PROGRAM AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Jorge E. Rico

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Co-Chair: John V. G. Matthews

Dean, School of Education

Co-Chair: Brian E. Strayer

Member: O. Jane Thayer

External Examiner: Raymond J. Ostrander

Date approved

To my beloved wife, Elizabeth, whose selfless support and comprehension allowed me to engage in this research

To my lovely children, Michelle E. and Jorge E. III, for filling my life with joy and satisfaction

To my dear parents, Jorge E. Rico and María Nelly Muñoz, whose earnest prayers during this process reminded me of my dependence on God

To my late grandparents, Rafael Antonio and Julia María Muñoz, whose unsophisticated example and instructions taught me the rudiments of education and service

All of you add a fresh meaning to my life, ministry, and relationship with the Lord.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
PREFACE.....	xi
Background of the Problem.....	xi
Statement of the Problem.....	xv
Purpose of the Study.....	xvi
Research Questions.....	xvi
General Methodology.....	xvii
Delimitations of the Study.....	xviii
Definition of Terms.....	xviii
Ecclesiastical Terms.....	xviii
Educational Terms.....	xix
Theological Terms.....	xxi
Survey of Literature.....	xx
Review of Published Sources.....	xxi
Review of Unpublished Sources.....	xxvi
 Chapter	
I. THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION MOVEMENT.....	1
Philosophical Foundations of Religious Education.....	2
History of Religious Education.....	15
Religious Education in Biblical Times.....	16
Historical Survey of Religious Education.....	20
The Sunday School Movement.....	44
The Sunday School Movement in Great Britain.....	45
The Sunday School Movement in Europe and Other Parts of the World.....	52
The Sunday School Movement in America.....	55
The Religious Education Association.....	64
Seventh-day Adventist Foundations of Religious Education.....	83
Conclusions.....	98

II. THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY: THE EARLY YEARS.	100
History of the Program: Initial Master’s Degree.	101
History of the Program: Doctoral Degree.	111
Collaboration with the Seminary.	125
Program Evaluation.	141
Conclusions.	148
III. THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY: THE CHALLENGING YEARS.....	151
Governance and Cross-Campus Strains.....	152
The Identity of Religious Education in the SED.	164
Conclusions.	181
IV. THE RELOCATION OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM TO THE SEMINARY.....	183
Redefining Religious Education at Andrews University.....	184
Moving the Program to the Seminary.	203
The Preliminary Meetings.	203
The Involvement of the Deans.....	210
Rationale for the Location of Religious Education.	217
The Contributions of Religious Education.	235
The Presentation of the Proposal.	239
The Process of Moving the Program.	244
The Contribution of the Program to the Mission of the Church.	255
Conclusions.	259
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	261
Summary.	261
Conclusions.	271
Recommendations for Further Study.....	273
Appendix	
A. MAJOR CURRICULAR EMPHASES OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION DEGREES.....	278

B. COMPARISON OF REQUIREMENTS BETWEEN DOCTORAL PROGRAMS.	289
C. COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE GROWTH OF THE ADVENTIST CHURCH..	292
D. LIST OF ROLES AND COMPETENCIES.	296
E. BENEFITS OF HAVING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE SED.	299
F. BENEFITS OF HAVING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AS AN INTERSCHOOL PROGRAM.	304
G. BENEFITS OF HAVING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE SEMINARY.	307
H. RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATORS.	314
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	326
VITA.	371

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APRRE	Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education
ASSU	American Sunday School Union
ATS	Association of Theological Schools
AUC	Atlantic Union College
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
CAR	Center for Adventist Research
CARE	Department of Graduate Studies in Curriculum, Administration and Religious Education
<i>CEJ</i>	<i>Christian Education Journal</i>
C&I	Curriculum and Instruction
<i>EDCE</i>	<i>Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education</i>
<i>EDT</i>	<i>Evangelical Dictionary of Theology</i>
<i>HERE</i>	<i>Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education</i>
ICRE	International Council of Religious Education
ISSA	International Sunday School Association
LSSU	The London Sunday School Union
NAD	North American Division
NADBHE	North American Division Board of Higher Education

NAPCE	North American Professors of Christian Education
NCACS	North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
NCATE	National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
NCFR	National Council on Family Relations
<i>NIDCC</i>	<i>The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church</i>
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i>
NSSA	National Sunday School Association
<i>RCT</i>	<i>Readings in Christian Theology</i>
RE	Religious Education
REA	Religious Education Association
REDF	Religious Education Department Files
SDATS	Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
SED	Andrews University School of Education
SSCED	Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations
SSS	Sunday School Society
SWAU	Southwestern Adventist University
<i>TMC</i>	<i>The Teaching Ministry of the Church</i>
UNAC	Universidad Adventista de Colombia
<i>WDCE</i>	<i>The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Education</i>
WCC	World Council of Churches
WCCE	The World Council of Christian Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the time that I have been working on this dissertation, I was serving the Seventh-day Adventist Church in two areas. First, I was the pastor of the North Valley and Valencia Seventh-day Adventist churches in Albuquerque, NM, and Ministerial Secretary of the Texico Conference. Second, I have been Associate Professor of Religion at Southwestern Adventist University in Keene, TX. Engagement in a research project of this magnitude inevitably meant that my parishioners, pastors, and students were neglected. Therefore, I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to all of them who have patiently accepted the limitations that this study placed upon the attention and energy that should have been devoted to serving and caring for their spiritual, pastoral, and educational needs. I also want to express my deepest appreciation to my wife, Elizabeth, and my two children, Michelle and Jorge E. III. Many a time I was not able to give them the undivided attention that they rightfully deserve, yet I still felt their love and understanding toward me.

Many others helped me with this study, and to all of them I express my gratitude. Although most names cannot be mentioned here, there are some whose assistance is particularly appreciated. James Stevens, president of the Texico Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and the Conference Executive Committee showed their confidence in me by supporting my ministry in the conference during my doctoral work. Lyndon G. Furst,

dean of the School of Graduate Studies, and James Jeffery, dean of the School of Education, were very gracious in granting me permission to research the Religious Education archives in their respective departments. Special mention needs to be made of John Youngberg and George Akers, former Religious Education faculty and administrators as well as to John McVay and Karen Graham, former deans of the Adventist Theological Seminary and School of Education respectively, for taking time to provide the necessary information for understanding various aspects of the history of the Religious Education program. I also wish to mention Sue Schwab, Andrews University Banner Support and Student Systems, for her willingness to research and provide the requested statistical data. I am very grateful to friends and colleagues from Southwestern Adventist University—Cristina Thomsen, Library Director; Robert Gardner, Adult Degree Program Director; and Susan Gardner, Professor of English—for their kindness in taking the time to help me with the editorial work and to provide valuable comments. Finally, I want to thank the members of my dissertation committee for their willingness to work with me in this project, their excellent feedback, and their concern for me, even when the process proved difficult at times. In particular, I am extremely appreciative of Jane Thayer and John Matthews for believing in me, for showing patience when the writing was rough, and for their willingness and extra effort to help ensure that my final product would be good. Words cannot express how thankful I am to all of you for the assistance received throughout this research.

PREFACE

Background of the Problem

From biblical times, many individuals have functioned as religious educators. Most of them were trained either as clergy or as educators, but, until the twentieth century, few were prepared as religious educators. Studies have been done on the life and work of many of these individuals who made a contribution to religious education and on the ideals and values that motivated their educational initiatives. Scholars have also investigated the history of religious education from the biblical period to modern times.

In the Bible, God provided a system to facilitate the transmission of the covenant relationship with His people to future generations. This system was founded on three institutions: the home, the temple/church, and the school (Deut 4:9, 10; Exod 25:8, 9; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7; 1 Tim 3:1-5; Acts 2:42-46).¹ Old and New Testament writers used God's word, spoken and written, as the main source for religious instruction. A number of scholars have acknowledged the importance of the home, the church, and the school as primary agencies for the communication of God's plan of redemption. Many of these scholars have also accepted the scriptures as divine revelation.² But few have viewed

¹The New International Version is used unless otherwise indicated.

²See, for example, J. M. Price, L. L. Carpenter, and J. H. Chapman, eds., *Introduction to Religious Education* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1932), 259; and Randolph Crump Miller, *The Theory of Christian Education Practice: How Theology*

these elements as an integrated whole; as a biblical model that encompasses the past, present, and future strategies of God’s redemptive activity; or as an educational plan that incorporates the teaching ministry of the church within the gospel commission so that it becomes possible to say “to educate is to redeem.”³

Although the field of religious education grew in the twentieth century to become an academic program and a profession distinct from theology or education, there is still confusion among scholars and church leaders regarding the nature and definition of religious education.⁴ The problem has arisen largely because the main organizations that work to provide an identity to the field differ in their understanding of religious education. While the membership of the North American Professors of Christian Education (NAPCE) is primarily comprised of evangelical Christians, the Religious

Affects Christian Education (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1980), 155, 156.

³“To educate is to redeem” is the cornerstone of the conceptual framework of the Andrews University School of Education. The ideas are encapsulated in Ellen G. White, *Education* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1952), 30. Ellen Gould White was a co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and a prolific writer on various topics, including religion, family, education, and health.

⁴Norma Hoyt Thompson, “The Role of Theology in Religious Education: An Introduction,” in *Religious Education and Theology*, ed. Norma Hoyt Thompson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1982), 11; Harold W. Burgess, “An Analysis of Selected Theoretical Approaches to Religious Education in the Twentieth Century” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1974), 1; Gabriel Moran, “Where Now, What Next,” in *Foundations of Religious Education*, ed. Padraic O’Hare (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 98; Iris V. Cully and Kendig Brubaker Cully, eds., *Harper’s Encyclopedia of Religious Education* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1990), 304; and Dennis E. Williams, “Christian Education,” *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001), 132.

Education Association (REA) and the Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education (APRRE) include members from both Christian and non-Christian religious groups. The composition of these three entities is not conducive to formulating a clear definition of religious education because they are established on different ideological presuppositions.⁵

In 1960, in the midst of national confusion regarding the nature of religious education, the administration of Andrews University founded the Religious Education program in the Department of Education.⁶ The program was introduced as an added concentration to the existing Master of Arts degree.⁷ The purpose of the concentration was to train students in various areas of church and educational leadership for the Seventh-day Adventist Church around the world.⁸ The philosophical foundation of the concentration reflected the Adventist philosophy of education, drawn largely from Ellen White's exposition of scripture and her views on education. These views were molded into a distinctive educational framework based on the Bible and focused on the home,

⁵The ideological presuppositions of these three organizations are discussed in chapter 1, pp. 64-82.

⁶Andrews University is a Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher learning located in Berrien Springs, Michigan. It was founded in 1874 as Battle Creek College in Battle Creek, Michigan. Battle Creek College was the first Adventist educational establishment. When the Religious Education program was created in 1960, the Department of Education was part of the Andrews University School of Graduate Studies.

⁷Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, vol. 23, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1960), 60.

⁸Ibid. See also John B. Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program at AU for Jorge Rico, October 28, 2002," typed manuscript, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, in my possession.

church, and school as agencies of redemptive education. Religious Education at Andrews evolved to become a department in its own right, offering three graduate degrees: M.A., Ed.D., and Ph.D.

Difficult circumstances emerged during the 1980s and 1990s that militated against an implementation of the components of the educational framework established for the program. The result was diminished enrollment and a weakened philosophical foundation and mission. In spite of concerted efforts made by the leadership of the Religious Education program, challenges in terms of personnel, finances, educational purposes, and institutional politics took a heavy toll.

In the late 1990s, two new faculty members joined the program: Jane Thayer (1996) and John Matthews (1999).⁹ They started the work of redefining Religious Education at Andrews. As a result of research and meetings, the philosophical foundation and mission of the Religious Education program was modified. But the task of rebuilding and refocusing the philosophy and identity of the program continues. This ongoing revision will enable the faculty to adapt the mission of Religious Education to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church around the world and to the needs of the clientele that the program serves.

Although some research has been done on the history and philosophical foundation of Religious Education at Andrews University, a formal and comprehensive

⁹Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 2, 12; Jane Thayer, "Questionnaire on the Religious Education Program: Questions Posed by Jorge Rico—Answers Provided by Jane Thayer, December 2002 to January 2003," TM, Berrien Springs, MI, 2, in my possession; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1998-1999*, vol. 87, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1998), 181.

investigation has not yet been conducted. The research initiatives conducted to date have generally been sketchy and limited, and even that based on more solid research is incomplete. Ongoing assessment is valuable in defining and developing a clear mission and philosophy. This dissertation seeks to make a contribution to the process of documenting the history and analyzing the philosophy and mission of Religious Education at Andrews University. As George Knight, an Adventist educator and writer, stated: “A healthy educational program is one that is in as close harmony with its philosophic beliefs as external circumstances permit.”¹⁰ Jeffery S. Forrey added that this type of program provides “a greater sense of direction in educational practice.”¹¹

Statement of the Problem

No systematic documentation and analysis have been made of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. There have been significant challenges to the program from its inception as a master’s degree, through its development as a doctoral degree, and during its transition from the Graduate School, to the School of Education, to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University. These challenges, along with some notable opportunities, have resulted in genuine attempts to define and implement a biblical philosophy of religious education. An examination of this ideological and practical journey is a necessary excursion into the past in order to

¹⁰George R. Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, 4th ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2006), 186.

¹¹Jeffery S. Forrey, “Building a Christian Philosophy of Education,” in *Christian Education Journal*, n.s., 4, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 112.

explain the present and attempt to craft the future.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the development, challenges, and attempts to define the Religious Education program from its inception to the present. The investigation also analyzes the biblical basis, philosophical framework, mission, and contribution of the Religious Education program to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How has the biblical and the philosophical basis of religious education been understood throughout history, and how has this understanding influenced the field of religious education and ultimately Religious Education at Andrews University?
2. What was the historical development of religious education, and how did it provide a context for the evolution of the Religious Education program at Andrews University?
3. What led to the establishment of the Religious Education program at Andrews, and what modifications were made to meet the challenges that developed?
4. What were the reasons for redefining the philosophical foundation and mission of the Religious Education program at Andrews University, and how are these changes contributing to fulfilling the mission of the worldwide Adventist Church?

General Methodology

The general methodology for this research is qualitative and documentary. The selective historical overview of the history of religious education provided a background for understanding the evolution of the religious education movement. The main body of the study focused on understanding and analyzing the historical development and philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews University and its contribution to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

The investigation followed two main approaches. The first approach is the documentary approach. This approach was employed to gather data from two principal sources. First, pertinent information about the general field of religious education was mainly researched from books and journals. Second, data were obtained from primary sources such as files and documents relating to the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews. The second procedure was the oral history approach. Through this approach, information was collected using questionnaires. These instruments were prepared and administered to those persons who played significant roles in establishing the Religious Education program at Andrews University or who have participated in a meaningful way to its ongoing development.

The findings from these approaches helped the investigation in three ways. First, they provided insights into the writings of scriptural authors. According to a conservative traditional interpretation of these authors, God established a model or strategy to impart religious education to successive generations of believers. If the model is accepted as a valid, biblical construct, it becomes possible to use the model to evaluate religious

education after the biblical era. Second, the research offered a scholarly description of the deviation of the Christian Church from the proposed biblical pattern, and insights into how this departure affected the historical development of religious education. Third, the outcome of investigations based on these approaches enhanced the understanding of the historical development and philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews. This information may help the Religious Education faculty to continue the process of redesigning the identity and mission of the program.

Delimitations of the Study

This research had two delimitations. First, the study was focused on the historical development and philosophical foundation of religious education within the Christian faith. The investigation did not include an analysis of how non-Christian religious groups view and practice religious education. Second, particular attention was given to the field of religious education in North America and the development of an Adventist approach to education because it offered the context in which the Religious Education program at Andrews University was founded.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as used in this study.

Ecclesiastical Terms

Conference: An administrative unit of the Seventh-day Adventist Church composed of local churches within a defined geographical area.

Division: The second highest structural level of the Adventist Church that embraces all the unions and local conferences/missions/fields and institutions (other than General Conference institutions) in its assigned area of the world (e.g., North America).

General Conference: The largest unit of organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and embraces all church organizational structure in all parts of the world, currently located in Silver Spring, Maryland.

Local Church: A specific group of Seventh-day Adventist members within a determined area. The role of a local congregation is significant because it supports the conference financially, shares the vision of the conference, and participates in the nomination of conference leaders.

Union: A specific group of Seventh-day Adventist local conferences/missions/fields within a defined geographical area.

Sabbath School: The local Sabbath school is a department within a local Seventh-day Adventist Church that supports the mission program of the congregation and promotes the study of the Bible using specific Bible study guides.

Educational Terms

Battle Creek College: The first Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher learning founded in 1874 in Battle Creek, Michigan. It was established to prepare ministers and teachers, hallmarks of Seventh-day Adventist theology and education, and developed over time in accordance with Ellen White's principles discussed in chapter 1. In 1901, the church leaders moved the college to Berrien Springs, Michigan, and renamed

it Emmanuel Missionary College to emphasize the missionary aspect of all the training programs. In 1960, when Emmanuel Missionary College, the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, and the School of Graduate Studies united under one charter, the name of the school was changed to Andrews University.

Christian Education in North America: The evangelical Bible-based ministry that seeks to bring people to a knowledge of Christ, train them for discipleship, and equip them for service in the world.

Christian Education in the Adventist Church: The Seventh-day Adventist educational program which includes schools at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels.

Full-time Equivalent (FTE): Specifies the basis on which an instructor has been hired.

Religious Education at Andrews University: The Religious Education program founded in 1960.

Religious Education in North America: A ministry that seeks to promote religious and moral instruction, explore religious scholarly research, and advance teaching and leadership in Christian and non-Christian religious communities.

Religious Education in the Adventist Church: The Bible-based ministry employed to transmit the Seventh-day Adventist faith, train members for a life of discipleship, and equip them for worldwide service.

Religious Educator: An individual who is a life-changing agent encouraging pupils to aim higher cognitively as well as spiritually. While an educator is mainly concerned with academics, a Christian educator integrates faith with learning.

Theological Terms

Covenant Relationship: An agreement that describes the relationship between God and humanity after sin affected the original condition of the world. This agreement is based on Christ's sacrifice and promises forgiveness and eternal life to the believer.

Liberal: The term denotes a theological movement within the Christian Church that peaked in the first quarter of the twentieth century.

Survey of Literature

The literature consulted in this research was classified into two different groups. The first group includes the published sources used to explore the overall history and philosophy of religious education. References mainly cited from this group are books and journals. The second classification involves the unpublished sources employed in the analysis of the main topic. Files, documents, and school bulletins pertaining to the history of Religious Education at Andrews University are included among the unpublished sources.

Review of Published Sources

Books and the journal *Religious Education* comprise the main body of literature under review in this section. These documents are located in the collections of the James White Library at Andrews University. They serve as a substantive resource for understanding the historical unfolding and philosophical analysis of the field of religious education. The literature covers an extensive period of time, ranging from early biblical history until the beginning of the twenty-first century. In addition, the information

discusses, as described in the scriptures, possible biblical models for religious education and their impact on the growth of the Sunday school movement in Great Britain, Europe, and America. There is also an analysis of the development and present condition of such organizations as, for example, the REA and NAPCE, which are pertinent to an understanding of religious education in the latter half of the twentieth century.

The content of the journal *Religious Education* was particularly meaningful for this study because it provided information about religious education in the twentieth century. It offered crucial data concerning the founding and philosophical development of the REA and of religious education as an academic program in various seminaries in North America. Three articles are particularly important for their descriptions of the reasons and process followed to establish the REA—"Introductory," "The Religious Education Movement—A Retrospect," and "Originating Visions and Visionaries of the REA."¹² The authors of the first two articles, Cope and Coe, played significant roles in the creation and development of the new association. Therefore, the content of these articles has primary information about the foundation of the REA. The third wrote a more comprehensive history of the institution as part of its centennial celebration.

It was interesting to note the number of articles published in this journal on the three biblical settings for religious education, especially in the first half of the twentieth century. Various writers gave special emphasis to the home, church, and school as

¹²Henry Frederick Cope, "Introductory," *Religious Education* 1, no. 1 (April 1906): 1, 2; George A. Coe, "The Religious Education Movement—A Retrospect," *RE* 39, no. 4 (July–August 1944): 220-28; and Helen Allan Archibald, "Originating Visions and Visionaries of the REA," *RE* 98, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 414-25.

critical institutions established to provide religious instruction to the youth. The following are some examples of such articles: “Religious Education in the Home,”¹³ “The Church as an Educator: Is Education a New Function of the Church?,”¹⁴ and “The Task of Religious Education.”¹⁵

Books consulted for this dissertation also offered a significant amount of information about events, issues faced and changes made by distinct movements, and characteristics of key leaders related to religious education. Edersheim’s *Sketches of Jewish Social Life* and the editorial work of Eldridge in *The Teaching Ministry of the Church* provided excellent information about religious education in biblical times.¹⁶ The authors elaborated on the roles of the home, church, and school as agencies established by God to instruct believers on His redemptive covenant relationship.

¹³Lincoln Hulley, “Religious Education in the Home,” *RE* 2 (April 1907–February 1908): 13-16.

¹⁴Franklin C. Southworth, “The Church as an Educator: Is Education a New Function of the Church?,” *RE* 11 (February 1916–December 1916): 477-82.

¹⁵Benjamin S. Winchester, “The Task of Religious Education,” *RE* 5, no. 3 (August 1910): 227-31. In his article, Winchester discussed the importance of training teachers for both Sunday school and Christian grade schools.

¹⁶Alfred Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, updated ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994); and Daryl Eldridge, ed., *The Teaching Ministry of the Church* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1995). Other notable sources that provided insights into the history of religious education in biblical times include William Barclay, *The Educational Ideals in the Ancient World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1974); Michael J. Anthony, ed., *EDCE* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001); and Robert W. Pazmino, *Foundational Issues in Christian Education*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1997).

In *A History of Christian Education*,¹⁷ Reed and Prevost succinctly describe the history of religious education in the Christian Church after the biblical period. Although this work is somewhat superficial, it does lay out the major issues in broad perspective. In addition, it provides some interesting details and analysis of changes in different movements and their respective leaders. An analysis of these changes helps the reader see how some leaders and movements departed from the biblical foundations for religious education.

A more in-depth history and examination of the various movements in religious education are provided by Elias's *A History of Christian Education: Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox Perspectives*¹⁸ and Walker's *A History of the Christian Church*.¹⁹ Elias closely examines the development of religious training in the Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox traditions. He also gives attention to religious education during the 1950s and 1960s. Walker offers a thorough treatment of the different movements and their leaders from the early church to the present. His investigation was helpful to understanding the rationale behind changes made by religious educators through the Christian era. In addition, Walker's work contributed to an understanding of how those modifications affected religious instruction in the teaching ministry of the church.

¹⁷James E. Reed and Ronnie Prevost, *A History of Christian Education* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1993).

¹⁸John L. Elias, *A History of Christian Education: Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox Perspectives* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company, 2002).

¹⁹Willinston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970).

Literature about the history of Andrews University such as that by Edward Miles Cadwallader²⁰ and George R. Knight²¹ give foundational information about Seventh-day Adventist education and good insights into the history of the institution. Two important sources concerning the history of Battle Creek College are Jones-Gray's *As We Set Forth: Battle Creek College and Emmanuel Missionary College*²² and Vande Vere's *The Wisdom Seekers*.²³ Jones-Gray's book covers the history of the institution during two different periods (Battle Creek College and Emmanuel Missionary College). In her book, the author discussed the leaders and issues that affected the school in a significant way. Vande Vere's book provides a general history of the college based on biographical data regarding the main leaders who served as administrators of the educational institution. The original typescript of Vande Vere's book, located in the Center for Adventist Research (CAR) of the James White Library at Andrews University, is more useful than the published book because it includes additional material and footnote references.

Two books were particularly helpful in understanding Ellen White's views on

²⁰Edward Miles Cadwallader, *A History of Seventh-day Education* (Lincoln, NE: n.p., 1958).

²¹George R. Knight, ed., *Early Adventist Educators* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983).

²²Meredith Jones-Gray, *As We Set Forth: Battle Creek College and Emmanuel Missionary College* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2002).

²³Emmett K. Vande Vere, *The Wisdom Seekers* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1972).

education: *Fundamentals of Christian Education* and *Education*.²⁴ The former volume is a compilation published after White's death. It contains some of her initial views on education and presents the principles that subsequently became the foundation of the Adventist philosophy of education. The latter work clearly stated what she thought was the aim of education, which is the restoration of the image of God in humankind. This restoration is described as a lifelong process in which education and redemption are essentially one.

The literature discussed in the review of published sources explored segments of the history of religious education that were relevant for the current research because they offered a context for understanding the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Some books are more general in content than others. Although they offer good historical information, these works do not provide a philosophical analysis that enables the reader to see a connecting theme in religious education through the biblical and Christian eras.

Review of Unpublished Sources

The unpublished sources include school bulletins, board minutes, letters, numerous documents in archives and files, doctoral dissertations, and transcripts of questionnaires to which former and current professors and administrators of the program responded. Information gleaned from minutes, letters, and filed and archived documents

²⁴Ellen G. White, *Education*; idem, *Fundamentals of Christian Education* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1923). *Education* was originally published in 1903.

was important in providing details regarding the philosophical foundation, historical development, and mission of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. The information acquired from the questionnaires is very significant for the main purpose of the present research. Of all questionnaires, three sets of answers are particularly meaningful: “The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University” by Akers,²⁵ the “Information on the Religious Education Program at AU for Jorge Rico, October 28, 2002” by Youngberg,²⁶ and Thayer’s “Questionnaire on the Religious Education Program: Questions Posed by Jorge Rico—Answers Provided by Jane Thayer, December 2002 to January 2003.”²⁷ The responses of these professors and administrators gave detailed information regarding the creation of the first doctoral degree, the challenges, and the changes in the Religious Education program at Andrews. The questionnaires were administered between 2002-2004, and the transcripts are in the researcher’s possession.

One doctoral dissertation was particularly beneficial in comprehending the history and development of Andrews University: “The Historical Development of the Religion Curriculum at Battle Creek College 1874-1901.”²⁸ This research studied the historical

²⁵George H. Akers, “The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University,” answers given by the author, cassette 1, Berrien Springs, MI, 2002. In my possession.

²⁶Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 1-12.

²⁷Thayer, “Questionnaire on Religious Education,” 1-7.

²⁸Medardo Esaú Marroquin, “The Historical Development of the Religion Curriculum at Battle Creek College 1874-1901” (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2001).

development of the religion curriculum in relation to the purposes and goal statements of the institution and in relation to the educational implications of Ellen White's counsels. This dissertation evaluated the history of the school from its founding in 1874 to its transfer to Berrien Springs in 1901. The study also provided valuable insights regarding the early history of Andrews University.

Archives were located in the CAR, School of Education (SED), Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary (SDATS), and School of Graduate Studies. Permission to access all documents was granted by Niels-Erik A. Andreasen, president of Andrews University; James R. Jeffery, dean of the SED; and Lyndon G. Furst, dean of the School of Graduate Studies.²⁹ The CAR furnished background information regarding persons who played an important role in the program. These included denominational leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, former and current faculty and administrators of the Religious Education program, and some SED and Seminary professors who taught specific courses or served as advisors to the program from 1960 until the present. This background supplied the individuals' academic training and professional experience.

The information gathered from minutes and documents examined in the School of Graduate Studies about the Religious Education program was sketchy. These sources recorded voted actions without supplying much background beyond some general facts about the Religious Education program since 1969. Prior to 1987, the documents were filed under the records of the Graduate School Faculty. After the restructuring that took

²⁹Permission was granted verbally and in writing. Niels-Erik A. Andreasen, e-mail message to author, 14 June 2005; James R. Jeffery, e-mail message to author, 12 June 2005; and Lyndon G. Furst, e-mail message to author, 10 March 2004.

place in 1987, most administrative-level actions and documents relating to Religious Education were filed under the records of the Graduate Council.

In the SDATS, Thayer has kept important files pertaining to the recent history of Religious Education at Andrews. These files include minutes and documents from the Religious Education faculty initiatives and meetings dating from January 2000 to the present, which allow for considerable insight into the challenges faced by the Religious Education program at Andrews University over the last decade. These challenges included attempts at cross-campus collaboration with the Seminary when Religious Education was housed in the SED; attempts at revisioning and redefining Religious Education; and, most significantly, discussions and decisions that led to a change in location for Religious Education at Andrews.

The documents discuss the rationale and benefits for moving the Religious Education program from the SED to the Seminary and the steps needed to accomplish the transition. The most instructive of these documents include “Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary” (Document #58) and “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary: A Presentation to the SED Faculty” (Document #62).³⁰ These

³⁰“Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary,” Document #58, 13 November 2000, Religious Education Department files, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-12; and “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” Document #62, 10 January 2001, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-8. Documents were numbered for organizational purposes.

were computer presentations discussing statistical information, a brief history of the program, benchmarking studies from similar programs in North America, and options for governance of Religious Education in the Seminary.

In another document, “Proposal to Move Religious Education to the Seminary” (Document #43),³¹ Thayer and Matthews outlined their understanding of how Religious Education would be able to fulfill its mission more fully in the Seminary. They also observed how Religious Education might enhance and strengthen the role of the Seminary in meeting the needs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

The most extensive collection of materials pertaining to Religious Education at Andrews University is located in the SED. Included are faculty meeting minutes and general files pertaining to the history and philosophy of the Religious Education program. The general files include letters, memos, statistical information, lists of Religious Education graduates, and hand-written notes dating from 1973 to 1999. These collections provide insights into proposals, plans, and policies relating to the program. Two letters were particularly significant in elucidating some of the greatest challenges of the program: George Akers’s letter to Roy Naden, 20 November 1978, debriefing on the visit by Marvin Taylor to evaluate the program; and Akers’s letter to W. Richard Leshar, 11 June 1985, a candid appraisal of the perceived efforts by Gerhard Hasel to eliminate the doctoral degrees in Religious Education.³²

³¹Jane Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education to the Seminary,” revised document, Document #43, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³²George H. Akers, letter to Roy Naden, 20 November 1978, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; idem, letter to Richard Leshar, 11

Documents stored in the SED are both dated and undated. Documents in the period from 1974 to 2003 are generally dated. Prior to the establishment of the doctoral degree in 1974, most documents were undated. Three major presentations are important in understanding the development of the philosophy and mission of Religious Education. These span the last three decades of the twentieth century. In the “Program for a Major in Religious Education” (Document #23),³³ the rationale for establishing the Ed.D. in Religious Education and the nature and content of the Religious Education program are clearly delineated. The “Regular Review: Programs in Religious Education and Educational Foundations Self-Study Document” (Document #34)³⁴ outlines the components of the philosophical foundation, the unique characteristics, the purposes and goals, and the mission of Religious Education at Andrews. The “Mission and Future of the Religious Education Program” (Document #9)³⁵ discusses the competencies of religious educators, visions for the future of the program, and the proposed implementation of a two-track curriculum in the mid-1990s.

The minutes of the Religious Education faculty meetings filed in the SED date from 1974 to 1999. They record the decisions made regarding the development of the

June 1985, transcript in the SED files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³³“Program for a Major in Religious Education,” Document #23, 16 July 1973, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁴“Regular Review: Programs in Religious Education and Educational Foundations Self-Study Document,” Document #34, March 1990, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁵“Mission and Future of the Religious Education Program,” Document #9, 6 December 1994, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

image of the program and its philosophical platform. These documents also reveal details about the creation and development of the various Religious Education degrees, Taylor's visit as a consultant, the condition of the program after the departure of Akers and Naden, the rupture of relations between the Seminary and Religious Education, changes in the administrative structure of the program, the steps taken to maintain the program through Family Life Ministries, the establishment of a two-track curriculum, and information regarding the appointment of various faculty members over the years.

Andrews University bulletins, housed in the CAR in the James White Library, were an important source for understanding and analyzing the curriculum, mission, identity, and philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews. Three bulletins were especially pertinent for this study: *Bulletin 1960-1961*, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, and *Bulletin 2002-2003*.³⁶ They present three major transitions in the program, namely, the founding of a Religious Education program at Andrews University in 1960, the creation of the Ed.D. in Religious Education in 1974, and the relocation of the program to the Theological Seminary in 2002.

A number of the documents and archives reviewed above pertain to issues considered by the present study. However, some of these documents are sketchy and lack depth and analysis. Others have more depth and provide more historical detail, but none provide the broad context of the ongoing development of Religious Education at Andrews University. In fact, currently no comprehensive, in-depth analysis and contextual

³⁶Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*; idem, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, vol. 63, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1974); idem, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, vol. 89, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2002).

treatment of the historical development and philosophical foundation of the program exists. This dissertation is an attempt to fill the gap. Based on the literature available, interviews, and responses to questionnaires, this research pieces together the bigger picture of the development of Religious Education and its contribution to the mission of the worldwide Adventist Church.

CHAPTER I

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION MOVEMENT

From the biblical period to the present, numerous individuals have instructed believers regarding God's covenant relationship with humankind. As a result, throughout history, members of Hebrew and Christian communities have learned about God's plan to restore humans to their original condition. The transmission of this divine redemptive strategy lies at the heart of religious education. During the Christian era, several religious educational initiatives have been made, and a number of movements and organizations have been established to ensure the continuity of the faith among believers. A study of these efforts will provide a theoretical framework for understanding the Religious Education program at Andrews University and its contribution to the mission of the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Chapter 1 analyzes the philosophical foundations of religious education from a biblical perspective. It traces the history of religious instruction from biblical times to the present. It also discusses the initiatives, movements, and organizations as well as the instruments employed to transmit the redemptive covenant relationship to successive generations of believers. In addition, the chapter examines the Seventh-day Adventist foundations for religious education that influenced the philosophy, identity, and mission

of Religious Education at Andrews University. Chapter 1 ends with a condensation of the main points pertaining to this historical survey.

Philosophical Foundations of Religious Education

Christians believe that God has spoken to His children many times and in various ways (Heb 1:1). These adherents to the faith view the prophets (Hos 12:10; Amos 3:7; Heb 11:1), dreams and visions (Num 12:6), and Jesus Christ (Heb 1:1) as among the most important instruments God employed to communicate His messages to His people. The Lord's intervention in human affairs, according to these believers, makes Christianity a revealed religion and places the Bible as the main source of divine revelation to humankind. As a result, numerous Christian leaders have established religious education upon a Christian view of reality that is biblically rooted.¹ This theistic approach rests on the full corpus of scriptural revelation, not just one part of the Bible. Before considering the history and structure of religious education, it is important to explore the philosophical foundations of religious instruction. These foundations will be examined briefly in light of three main philosophical categories: metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology.²

¹Thomas H. Groome, *Christian Religious Education: Sharing Our Story and Vision* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1980), 24, 25; and William Bedford Williamson, *Language and Concepts in Christian Education* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 33-37.

²The field of philosophy has been concerned with issues about reality, knowledge, and value. According to scholars, these philosophical questions have been organized into three fundamental categories: metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. "While secular philosophers today have all but abandoned the idea of absolute philosophical presuppositions, they are the foundation of the Christian educator's philosophy of

Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy that deals with the nature of reality. “What is real?” is the basic question asked in the study of metaphysics. Metaphysical questions may be divided into five areas: theology, cosmology, ontology, anthropology, and teleology. Theology is that aspect of religious theory that has to do with conceptions about God. Christians accept the Bible as the self-revelation of God.³ According to these believers, the scriptures do not explain the existence of God; they only accept His being as a metaphysical reality (Gen 1:1; Rom 1:20).⁴ In the Bible, writers presented the Lord God as the beginning and the end of all things (Isa 41:4; 48:12; Rev 1:11; 22:13). They asserted that He is the true God and there are no other gods besides Him (Ps 86:10; Isa 43:10, 11; 44:6, 8; 45:5, 6, 18, 21; John 17:3). Although He is almighty, biblical authors described God’s character as being compassionate, long suffering, gracious, loving, and faithful (Exod 34:6, 7; Num 14:18; Pss 86:15; 103:8-10; Jonah 4:2; 1 John 4:8). For

education. Absolutes relating to metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology are at the core of the Christian educator’s belief.” Gary C. Newton, “Philosophy of Christian Education,” *EDCE*, 534; J. Donald Butler, *Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957), 14-38; and Knight, *Philosophy and Education*, 8, 9, 13-31.

³Raoul Dederen, “The Revelation-Inspiration Phenomenon According to the Bible Writers,” in *Issues in Revelation and Inspiration*, ed. Frank Holbrook and Leo Van Dolson (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1992), 12-29; Leon Morris, *I Believe in Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976), 42-44, 146; Kenneth S. Kantzer, “The Authority of the Bible,” in *Readings in Christian Theology*, vol. 1, ed. Millard J. Erickson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976), 161-72; and Clark H. Pinnock, *Biblical Revelation: The Foundation of Christian Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1985), 53, 54, 147-49.

⁴Christopher B. Kaiser, *The Doctrine of God* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1982), 1, 2.

them, the God of the Bible is both personal and infinite. Thus Christian writers claim that the universe owes its existence to a personal Being.⁵

Cosmology studies the origins, nature, and development of the universe as an orderly system. Christian scholars seem to concur that life and order find their origin in God (Gen 1:1-26; Ps 90:2; Jer 27:5; 51:15; John 1:1-3; Col 1:16, 17; Heb 11:3).⁶ Moses, an early biblical author, described this origin in the following words: “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (Gen 1:1). Based on his creation account, God’s creative work included both giving life to vegetation, animals, and human beings (Gen 1:11, 12, 20-27) and providing order and boundaries to the cosmos (Gen 1:6-10, 14-18). When the Creator completed His work, Moses wrote that God “saw all that he had made, and it was very good” (Gen 1:31). This statement seems to express the divine satisfaction that everything was perfect, harmonious, and in accordance with His plan.

In biblical revelation, God’s relationship with His creation is not depicted in pantheistic or deistic terms. Various biblical authors viewed the Lord as being physically separate from His creation (1 Kgs 8:27-30; Isa 57:15; Zech 2:13; Matt 5:33-35) yet closely connected to it (Pss 34:18; 138:6; Isa 57:15; John 1:14). This cosmological concept of God has led some scholars to assert that the Lord continually interacts with

⁵Gerhard F. Hasel, *Covenant in Blood* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1982), 7-11.

⁶Harold Kuhn, “Creation,” in *RCT*, 1:480-81; and Walter C. Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), 72-75.

His creation.⁷ God's relationship with humankind is pivotal for the study and understanding of religious education throughout history.

Ontology is the aspect of metaphysics concerned with the nature of existence and the meaning of being. It also includes the "being" of God and the distinctions of contingency and non-contingency regarding God and humans. Emphasis is placed on conceptions of the existence of God and man, the role of God in human affairs, and the nature and role of human beings as God's children.⁸ This ontological interest is related to the cosmology of creation. According to the Bible, in the beginning, God created Adam and Eve in His image and likeness. He gave them dominion over the earth and all the animals (Gen 1:26, 28). Communication between God and His two created human beings was perfect. The relationship between God and the first couple and between the two created beings was harmonious (Gen 1:31; 2:15, 23-25). This congenial relationship gave meaning to human life.

Anthropology focuses more specifically on the study of human beings. In this metaphysical category, humankind is both the subject and object of investigation. The *imago Dei* in humans points to the creation of the first couple in a perfect state (Gen 1:26,

⁷G. C. Berkouwer, "Providence as Government," in *RCT*, 1:488-90; Richard Rice, *God's Foreknowledge and Man's Free Will* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1985), 40-42; and Kaiser, 8-14.

⁸Robert W. Pazmiño, *Foundational Issues in Christian Education*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1997), 91; Butler, 25; and Knight, *Philosophy and Education*, 17.

27).⁹ In their perfection, the scriptural record implies that they had no difficulties in following the Creator's example. However, the intrusion of sin caused Adam and Eve to fall short of the glory of God (Rom 3:23). It affected the sinless human condition and fragmented relationships.¹⁰ As a result, individuals were no longer able to see God face to face (Gen 3:8; Isa 59:2). Their harmonious relationship with one another and with nature was also broken (Gen 3:16-18; 4:8). Paul, a New Testament writer, explained that sinful humankind was no longer able to follow God's example and properly reflect His image (Rom 3:10; 7:15-23).¹¹ Human beings were condemned to die and return to the dust from which the Bible purports God made them (Gen 2:16-17; 3:19), and their control over all of creation was lost (Gen 3:17-19). This sinful condition raises in humanity the necessity of restoration.

Teleology addresses questions regarding the design and purpose of the universe. According to scripture, God had a purpose in creating the earth and its inhabitants.¹² While the earth was created to be populated (Isa 45:18), individuals were made to glorify

⁹J. Oliver Buswell, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), 321-25; V. Norskov Olsen, *Man, the Image of God* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1988), 23, 27-30; H. D. McDonald, *The Christian View of Man* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1981), 32, 33; Hasel, 8-10; and Rice, 35-38.

¹⁰H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, 3d ed. (Edinburgh: T and T. Clark, 1926), 42-45; Hasel, 12, 13; and Olsen, 32-34.

¹¹Olsen, 71-73.

¹²Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, vol. 2, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), 109-12; and William Dyrness, *Themes in Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1979), 67, 68.

God in their lives (Isa 43:7, 21; Eph 2:10). The Christian faith is also teleological because it sees an end to the problem of sin through the plan of redemption and the second coming of Jesus (Gen 3:15; Matt 1:21; John 3:16; 14:1-3; 2 Pet 3:10; Rev 21:1-5; 22:12). Humanity will be restored once again to their Edenic state, and God's initial intention for His creation will be finally fulfilled (Isa 65:17-25; 66:22, 23; Rev 22:1-5).

These Christian concepts of metaphysics provide a foundation for religious education. God's self-revelation through the Bible allows religious educators to make observations regarding the nature of reality and provides the metaphysical framework in which religious instruction takes place. Institutions and organizations of religious education have been established because their leaders believed God exists and is working to redeem His creation. He is the central reality that gives significance and purpose to all systems of religious education. Hence, religious instruction is viewed in its relationship to the existence and purposes of God as understood from the perspective of Christian metaphysics.

Epistemology is the second philosophical branch, and this branch studies the nature, sources, and validity of knowledge. It seeks to answer such questions as "What is true?" and "How does one know?" The Bible is the main source of knowledge and the most important epistemological authority for the Christian Church. The scriptures also test and validate other sources of knowledge.¹³

¹³Millard J. Erickson, "How God Is Known: Editor's Introduction," in *RCT*, vol. 1, 115, 116; and Kenneth S. Kantzer, "The Authority of the Bible," in *RCT*, vol. 1, 172.

The authenticity of the biblical record is derived from God Himself.¹⁴ God instructed Moses and other biblical authors to record what He revealed (Exod 17:14; 24:2-4; Josh 24:26; Jer 30:1, 2; 36:1-4; Hab 2:2; Rev 2; 3). The disclosed messages were not only relevant and authoritative during the time of the writer but also for future generations of believers (Deut 31:9-13; Josh 1:1-7; 1 Kgs 2:1-3; 2 Kgs 14:1-6; 1 Chr 15:14, 15). Jesus and the apostles acknowledged the authority and validity of the Old Testament canon (Matt 19:1-9; Mark 7:5-8, 13; Luke 24:25-27, 44-48; John 5:39, 46, 47; Acts 13:32-41). The New Testament writers cited the Old Testament as a frame of reference for their writings (Rom 3:9-20; 4:3-25; Jas 2:25; 2 Pet 2:4-8).¹⁵ According to the biblical authors, the Lord commanded them to write His messages to lead the people “to learn to fear the Lord your God and follow carefully” His words (Deut 31:12, 13); to make individuals “wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus”; and to provide instruction, correction, and “training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work” (2 Tim 3:15-16).

Many Christians believe that this knowledge about God was available from the beginning of human history. Through their relationship with God, the first couple had a growing knowledge of the Creator. Their love and loyalty to God, according to the biblical record, was tested when He placed a ban on the tree of knowledge of good and

¹⁴Bernard Ramm, “The Principle and Pattern of Authority in Christianity,” in *RCT*, vol. 1, 260, 261; Samuel Koranteng-Pipim, *Receiving the Word: How New Approaches to the Bible Impact Our Biblical Faith and Lifestyle* (Berrien Springs, MI: Berean Books, 1996), 47-51; and Morris, 69-74.

¹⁵Dederen, 12-22; and Morris, 136-42.

evil (Gen 2:17).¹⁶ For the first time, God's human creation were confronted with the reality of having to make a choice whose consequences could be detrimental. Since death was a possibility, the introduction of this test implied that a plan to redeem the first couple was also available (Gen 3:21; 1 Pet 1:18-20; Rev 13:8). According to the Bible, the fall of Adam and Eve affected the entire creation (Rom 8:22; Eccl 7:29), resulting in a fragmented knowledge of God (Gen 3:1-7). No longer able to know and understand God as had been possible before the entry of sin, the human race also no longer reflected the *imago Dei*. As a consequence, a reintegration of the fragmented knowledge of God and a restoration of the image of God became important for salvation (John 17:3).

The transmission of God's revealed knowledge and His covenant relationship lies at the heart of religious education. Although the Bible was not intended to be an exhaustive source of knowledge, believers assert that it answers the most basic questions about humanity and how individuals may once again reflect God's image (Isa 11:9). An acceptance of the Bible as normative and authoritative provides the cognitive framework to evaluate all religious education systems.

Axiology introduces the third major question in philosophy. This question explores the implications of ethical and aesthetic values for religious instruction. It seeks to answer the question, "What is of value?" Christian axiological principles are derived from the revelation of the character and values of God. The question of values includes two main areas: ethics and aesthetics. Ethics studies moral values and conduct. It strives to answer such questions as "What should I do?" and "What is good?" In the Bible,

¹⁶Hasel, 11, 12.

goodness is inherent in God (Exod 34:6, 7; Pss 34:8; 86:5; Matt 19:16, 17; 1 Pet 2:3). God's image in man included the reflection of this aspect of the divine character.¹⁷ But sin distorted human ethics. Though human beings are no longer always naturally inclined to do good (Jer 17:9; Rom 7:14-23; Gal 5:17),¹⁸ believers are encouraged to represent God's character by demonstrating goodness in their decisions and actions (Mic 6:8; Zech 7:9; Matt 5:21-48; 1 Cor 15:33).¹⁹ When individuals show goodness in their lives, they demonstrate spiritual growth and character development (Gal 5:22).

Before removing the first couple from the garden, God implemented His redemptive covenant with them (Gen 3:15, 21). The basis of the covenant, according to scriptural sources, is the sacrifice of the Son of God as illustrated by the sacrifice of the lamb (John 3:16; Isa 9:6; Matt 1:21).²⁰ This covenant included the restoration of everything lost with the entrance of sin. Through the covenant, New Testament writers assert that people have an opportunity by God's grace to change their mentality and restore their ethics (Rom 12:1, 2; 2 Cor 5:17; Gal 5:22-25; Phil 2:5-8; 4:8). In this process, the person's desire to rebel against God is transformed into a life of surrender to

¹⁷Dyrness, 171-80.

¹⁸The natural tendency for people is to call evil good and good evil (Isa 5:20) because their values do not exhibit the divine principles (Isa 22:13; Rom 1:20-32; Amos 5:14, 15).

¹⁹Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981), 936, 937. In this book, Guthrie stated that the New Testament writers did not discuss ethics without taking account of the person's sinful nature.

²⁰Through the spoken and written word, the Lord taught His people regarding the covenant relationship with Him (Deut 4:5-9; 31:9-13; Rom 15:4; 1 Cor 10:11, 12).

His will through the power of the Holy Spirit (John 3:5; 1 Cor 15:31). These issues of human conduct are presented in the scriptures as an indication that a controversy between good and evil has been waging since the fall of man (Rev 12:7-9; Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6). In this cosmic conflict, biblical authors indicate that Christ has already obtained the victory over Satan (Dan 10:13, 21; Zech 3:1-5; Rev 3:21).

Aesthetics searches for principles governing the creation and appreciation of beauty and art. An inquiry into “What is beautiful?” is an element of the philosophic basis underlying religious education. From a biblical perspective, God is the creator of beauty and a lover of the beautiful. His creation was a work of art. Among other things, Moses describes how God included in His creation light, colors, the scent of flowers, the song of birds, and the beauty of precious stones (Gen 1-2). In the Bible, God’s beauty is connected to divine holiness (Exod 15:11; Pss 27:4; 29:2), and holiness is the reflection of God’s character (Lev 11:44, 45; 19:2; 1 Pet 1:15, 16). When the Creator made humans in His image and likeness, He imparted to humankind a sense of the aesthetic principles inherent in His own nature.²¹ As a result, human beings are also appreciative of beauty.

The Christian concept of reality includes the Lord’s response to the problems arising from the fall of man (Gen 3:1-19). God’s answer to the human need of restoration was the implementation of the plan of redemption (Gen 3:15, 21). During the biblical period, the transmission of this plan was to be accomplished through various educational agencies. The family was the foundation and the initial instrument for communicating

²¹Olsen, 54-57. Olsen’s understanding of the *imago Dei* in man led him to view man’s creation as embracing the ability to create something beautiful and the capacity to enjoy, delight, and be stimulated by it.

the covenant relationship from generation to generation.²² In the Bible, parents were commanded to instruct their children in the requirements of the covenant and to direct them in the way of the Lord (Gen 18:19; Deut 4:9, 10; 11:19-21; Ps 78:2-7; Prov 1:8; Eph 6:4; 2 Tim 1:5).²³ The first instructions were essentially provided by the mother while she was doing her household duties (Exod 2:7-9; 1 Sam 1:20-23; Prov 6:20).²⁴ Instruction was based on the absolutes of the law of God (Exod 20:1-17; Deut 5:6-21)²⁵ and the educational strategies presented in Deut 6:4-9.

A second agency was the gathering place for worship and learning. In Old Testament times, this place of meeting was the tabernacle and later the temple. There, Levites and priests educated the Children of Israel in the plan of salvation through the law of Moses, sacrifices, and ceremonies (Deut 31:9-13, 24-26; Lev 16; 23).²⁶ In the New Testament period, learning took place in the temple and synagogues (Acts 2:42, 46; 5:20). These two institutions functioned as schools during the week and as meeting places for weekly worship. In them, Jewish and Christian believers assembled together to praise

²²White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 95; idem, *Education*, 33; James Riley Estep, "Biblical Foundations of Christian Education," *EDCE*, 82; and James E. Reed and Ronnie Prevost, *A History of Christian Education* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1993), 46.

²³Eduard Lohse, *The New Testament Environment*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976), 148; Barclay, 16; and Pazmiño, 131.

²⁴Edersheim, 120-24.

²⁵Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology*, 114, 115; Lohse, 148; and Dyrness, 177-80.

²⁶Brevards S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 149-50; and Lohse, 160-64.

God until the church separated from Judaism following the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.²⁷ After this separation, church leaders provided new meeting places where Christian congregations learned about God's plan of redemption for humanity.

The school was a third agency established for training the youth in the covenant relationship with God. During the Old Testament, young Israelites were taught about God's salvific program in the school of the prophets (2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7).²⁸ Through the messages of the prophets, pupils learned, among other things, about God's character and His historical interventions on behalf of the people (2 Chr 20:14-17, 20).²⁹ In the New Testament, during the week, Christian youth came to the schools of the temple and synagogues to be trained in God's work of redemption (Acts 2:42, 46; 13:5; 20:20).³⁰ Instructional content included writings from Moses and the prophets as well as the teachings of Jesus and the apostles (Matt 28:20; Acts 24:14; 26:6, 21, 22; Titus 2:1; 1 Tim 4:12-16).³¹

²⁷Calvin J. Roetzel, *The World That Shaped the New Testament* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 66-68; Bruce M. Metzger, *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*, 2d ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983), 58, 59; and Guthrie, 752, 770.

²⁸R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 545; and Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1958), 593.

²⁹Dyrness, 184-86; Lohse, 166, 167; and White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 97.

³⁰Edersheim, 124-26; and Metzger, 59.

³¹Roetzel, 64-66.

According to many Christian scholars, the Old and New Testaments provide a biblical model for religious education. This model was given to ensure that the covenant relationship between the Lord and His people was transmitted to future generations of believers. Each agency—home, church, and school—constituted an integral part of the divine model for the restoration of humankind to the perfect original presented in Gen 1-2. In this system, the word of the Lord was essential to all instruction. During the biblical period, learning was not restricted only to natural phenomena (Deut 31:9-13; Neh 8:1-9; 1 Cor 2:10-14; 2 Tim 3:16, 17; 2 Pet 1:20, 21).

According to the Bible, God's plan to restore human beings to their original state would be accomplished by giving His people new hearts (Jer 31:31-34; Ezek 36:24-27; 2 Cor 3:2, 3; Heb 10:15-17) and renewing their minds (Rom 12:1, 2; Titus 3:5). These strategies were to effect positive changes in the individual's relationship with God and others. In his writings, Moses articulated the plan as follows: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one. Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, and with all your strength" (Deut 6:4, 5), and ". . . love your neighbor as yourself. I am the Lord" (Lev 19:18).

In the New Testament, Jesus upheld these principles as the two most important commandments given to human beings (Mark 12:29-31). Both Christ and Paul agreed that the law and the prophets depended on these two maxims (Matt 22:37-40; Rom 13:8-10). On the authority of Moses, Jesus, and Paul, God's redemptive plan envisioned a complete transformation of heart, soul, mind, body, and social interactions. This wholistic restoration of the image of God in humans was a process best achieved through

the agencies of the home, temple/church, and school. These agencies were intended to serve as channels through which the principles of God's biblical revelation and the plans of His redemptive covenant were to be transmitted to future generations.

This overview of religious education began with an analysis of the philosophical foundations for instruction. The investigation of these philosophical foundations was conducted using a biblical approach to the three main philosophical categories: metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. The exploration of these philosophical foundations provided a variety of historical and communal settings in both the Old and New Testaments to help the religious educator explore the nature of teaching and learning within the faith community. These foundations also established important guidelines for considering past and present educational efforts and for developing future ones. This philosophical analysis provides a context for evaluating the historical development of religious education to the present.

History of Religious Education

The history of religious education is the story of the transmission of the Old Testament Hebrew faith and the New Testament Christian faith to succeeding generations of believers. Throughout this history, according to believers, the Lord raised individuals who functioned as religious educators among His people. Many of these individuals were trained as clergy or educators, but few were specifically prepared as religious educators. It was not until the twentieth century that religious education was established as a discipline in colleges and universities to train professional religious educators.

The following survey presents a summary of the high points of religious education from a biblical and Christian perspective. It describes the instruments used during the biblical era to communicate the Hebrew and Christian faith to future generations of believers and how these instruments served as a model for religious educators after the biblical period. The survey then shows how the model was changed in the teaching ministry of the church and how the resulting modifications affected the historical development of the religious education movement.

Religious Education in Biblical Times

The Old Testament is a record of the relationship between God and His people as expressed in the covenant He made with them. This covenant relationship was bequeathed to succeeding generations employing the three components of the biblical model: home, temple/church, and school. The family remained the primary educational instrument for the transmission of the faith and covenant instructions during the patriarchal period. Such household leaders as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joshua transmitted the Lord's redemptive covenant through instruction, sacrifices, and patriarchal blessings (Gen 8:18-20; 18:19; 35:1-7; 48:14-16; 49:1-28; Josh 24:14, 15).³²

According to the Old Testament, after the Egyptian captivity, God instituted a second educational instrument. He set apart the tribe of Levi at Sinai to train the people of Israel concerning the law, worship, sacrifices, and festival celebrations (Lev 10:11; Deut 31:9-13; 2 Chr 17:7-9; Ezra 8:1-8; Hag 2:11; Mal 2:7). The educational work of the

³²John A. Maynard, *A Survey of Hebrew Education* (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company, 1924), 30-33.

Levites was conducted principally in the tabernacle and eventually in the temple.³³

However, the instruction provided in the temple did not replace the education received at home. Temple education served as an extension of family initiatives and as an important source of religious education for the nation.³⁴

The historical books of the Hebrew scriptures describe how, after the Children of Israel settled in Canaan, the Lord raised another group of teachers to be His prophets. During these early biblical times, God made further provision to instruct the young in Israel by establishing the schools of the prophets.³⁵ The main areas of study in these schools were the law of God (Exod 20; Deut 5), sacred history (Genesis; Exodus; Numbers; 1 & 2 Samuel; 1 & 2 Kings), sacred music and poetry (Psalms), and a practical trade (2 Kgs 2:19-22; 4:38-41; 6:1-7).³⁶ The education provided in the schools of the prophets did not replace the learning received at home and in the temple, but complemented it.

³³Estep, 82; and Reed and Prevost, 47.

³⁴Reed and Prevost, 47.

³⁵The work of the prophets was to bring reconciliation between the people and God (Mal 4:5, 6), and to be the guardians of the spiritual life of the chosen people of God (Jer 6:16, 17; Ezek 3:17; 33:7). Through their messages, the prophets instructed the children of Israel in such themes as God's justice, mercy, judgment, holiness, repentance, faith, and obedience. Instruction was given in the schools of the prophets and those who attended were called sons of the prophets (2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7). These schools were not only open to those who desired to search deeper into the truths of the word of God, but they also furnished the nation with men qualified to act in the fear of the Lord as leaders, counselors, and teachers. Harris, Archer, and Waltke, 545; White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 593; idem, *Education*, 46; Maynard, 33; and Estep, 82.

³⁶White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 97; and Reed and Prevost, 47.

Thus the educational system of God's people in the Old Testament was focused on the scriptures and based primarily on three institutions: the family, the temple, and the schools of the prophets.³⁷ When the Israelite leaders did not follow the biblical model, the result was deviation from the covenant relationship and separation from God (1 Kgs 11:1-8; 12:28-33; 16:30-33; 2 Kgs 22-23). The final consequence of the apostasy was exile and bondage (2 Kgs 24-25; 2 Chr 36). During the Babylonian captivity, the divine educational system was partially altered. Without the temple and the schools of the prophets, the religious leaders of Israel established synagogues and instruction was provided at the synagogue schools.³⁸ Despite the alteration of the biblical model, the scriptures indicate that God used these instructional agencies to provide Israel with the necessary means to educate the young in the fear of the Lord and to maintain a covenant relationship with Him.

The influence of the Old Testament educational system continued through the New Testament period and remained the pattern for religious education in the Christian

³⁷David Ng and Virginia Thomas, *Children of the Worshiping Community* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), 52; and Pazmiño, 131, 132.

³⁸The synagogues developed into centers for prayer, assembly, and education. They served as schools where children received instruction in the Law, the Prophets, the Mishnah, and the Talmud in addition to the instruction received at home. W. Schrage, "Synagōgē," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, abridged in 1 vol. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1985), 1109, 1110; Merrill C. Tenney, *New Testament Survey*, rev. Walter M. Dunnell (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1985), 96, 97; Michael J. Anthony, "Synagogue Schools," *EDCE*, 677; Edersheim, 126, 127; and Reed and Prevost, 49.

Church.³⁹ The role of the apostles as religious educators in the early Christian Church was important and formative.⁴⁰ Like its Old Testament model, the church's educational system was focused on the scriptures and primarily based on the family, church, temple, and synagogue settings. The apostles considered education in the family as foundational for the transmission of the faith (1 Tim 3:1, 2, 4, 5; 5:3, 4, 14; 2 Tim 1:5; 3:14, 15; Titus 2:3-5). They exhorted parents to raise their children in the discipline and instruction of the Lord (Eph 6:4).⁴¹ Thus the family was the primary foundation for religious education in the early Christian Church.

Family education was enhanced through the educational ministry of the church. According to the Gospels, before His ascension to heaven, Jesus instructed His disciples to teach new converts to obey all the things He had commanded them (Matt 28:20). Following Jesus' instruction to His disciples, Paul told Titus to "teach what is in accord with sound doctrine" (Titus 2:1; 2 Tim 2:2). The church was regarded as the pillar and

³⁹The continuity of the Old Testament educational system in the New Testament Church was due in part to the direction provided by Jewish leaders like Peter, Paul, Barnabas, and Silas; and Gentile converts like Titus who had come under the influence of Judaism (Gal 2:3; Titus 1:4, 5). Pazmiño, 135.

⁴⁰The book of Acts recorded that those who accepted Peter's message delivered at Pentecost "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2:42). The apostles taught about Jesus Christ every day in the temple and in the homes where they were welcomed (Acts 5:42). They viewed the position and function of the teacher as a gift of God (Rom 12:6, 7; 1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11). According to the apostles, the teacher's task was to explain the Christian faith to others and provide a Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. K. Wegenast, "Didaskalos," *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 3, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1971), 768.

⁴¹William A. Smith, "The Family's Role in Teaching," in *TMC*, 111.

foundation of truth (1 Tim 3:15). As a result, the mission of the church was carried out primarily through the process of instruction.⁴² Before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the apostles made new converts and instructed them in the faith in the temple (Acts 2:42, 46; 5:20, 21, 25, 42; 20:20) and synagogues (Acts 13:5; 14:1; 18:4).⁴³ Membership in the church was generally conferred without delay on these new converts through baptism (Acts 2:37-41; 8:12, 35-38; 9:17, 18; 10:44-48; 16:14, 15).

Sources from which information is drawn about the biblical period in the history of religious education imply that the focus remained primarily on the transmission of a scriptural message through the agencies of the home, temple, synagogue, church, and school. The implementation of this scriptural model was not limited to the biblical period. It was recorded in the scriptures for the benefit of succeeding generations of believers (Matt 28:19-20; Acts 1:8; 5:42; 20:20; Rom 12:7; 1 Cor 10:11; 2 Tim 3:16-17).

Historical Survey of Religious Education

As the number of converts from heathenism increased, some church leaders raised concerns about doctrinal purity and the content that was being taught to the new believers.⁴⁴ To counter these concerns, leaders implemented a period of preparation for

⁴²William A. Smith, "The Church's Role in Teaching," in *TMC*, 90.

⁴³In Acts, the author described the synagogue as an important factor in the missionary work of the church. The synagogue denoted a continuity between Israel and the church in salvation history. Schrage, 1111.

⁴⁴Justin, *Apology*, 150, in *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2d ed., ed. Henry Bettenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 5; and Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, 203, in *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2d ed., ed. Henry Bettenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 5, 6. Concerns about doctrinal purity were, to

new converts called the catechumenate,⁴⁵ a second century instructional term that preceded the administration of baptism. The local church overseer conducted this training phase, and the Bible was the main source of religious education. When the catechumen was ready for baptism, the local overseer also presided over the ceremony. But as the number of baptisms continued to increase, church leaders were overwhelmed by the demand to teach and ready the candidates for baptism. The need to train more clergy for the church stimulated the creation of a new institution: the catechetical school.

One of the most famous catechetical schools was founded toward the end of the second century, around A.D. 185, in Alexandria, by Pantaenus, a converted Stoic

some degree, already present during the apostolic period (Gal 1:6-9; 2 Tim 2:15; 3:13-17; Titus 1:9-11; 2 John 6-11; Rev 2:2; 22:18, 19).

⁴⁵The catechumenal practice, to some extent, has its roots in the apostolic era (Acts 8:29-35; 11:19-21). However, during the second century, the time of preparation was extended to last anywhere from one to three years. It generally ended with a rigorous examination and discipline during Lent. There were three basic groups of catechumens. The first group was the hearers. They were permitted to listen to the reading of scriptures and sermons, they received elementary instruction in doctrines, and had to display proper conduct to be promoted. The next group was the kneelers. This group was able to listen to the readings and remain for prayers, received more advanced instruction, and had to show by their lifestyle that they were ready for promotion. The last group was the chosen. The chosen were given intensive doctrinal, liturgical, and ascetical training in preparation for baptism. The Apostles' Creed was one of the sources used in the training process. Having professed to believe and live as Christians, the catechumens were ready to make a true commitment through baptism. John Laux, *Church History* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930), 83, 84; *The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ca. 100, in *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2d ed., ed. Henry Bettenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 64-66; P. Toon, "Catechumen," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984), 198; J. E. Harvey Martin, "Catechumenate," *EDCE*, 113, 114; and Walker, 85.

philosopher.⁴⁶ He was succeeded by his pupil Clement of Alexandria, also a convert to Christianity. The notable contributions of the school to the development of religious education included teaching new converts, training clergy, and clarifying positions taken in the theological controversies of the day.⁴⁷ Although the word of God was used for training new leaders in the school of Alexandria, it was interpreted allegorically.⁴⁸

The development of religious education in Alexandria differed from the patterns that had arisen in Asia Minor and the West. In the latter regions, conflicts with

⁴⁶Alexandria was a great center for commerce, a focus for Jewish and Greek learning, and an intellectual center for Christians. Its library was the largest and most famous in the Roman Empire. As an intellectual and cultural center, Alexandria fostered an association of Greek philosophy with Judaism and other oriental cults. It was in Alexandria that the Old Testament was translated into Greek, Philo reinterpreted Judaism in terms of Hellenistic philosophy, and Origen, a pupil of Clement of Alexandria and one of the first Christian theologians born and raised in a Christian home, emphasized the relationship between Christianity and philosophy. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 324 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1987), 249; D. A. C. Mulholland, "Catechetical School of Alexandria," *EDCE*, 111; Reed and Prevost, 85, 86; and Walker, 72-75.

⁴⁷The school took a stand in the controversies, against Sabellianism and Adoptionism. The most significant contributions of the institution occurred during the tenures of Clement and his successor Origen. Walker, 77; and Mulholland, 111.

⁴⁸Origen emphasized the importance of Greco-Roman learning for Christian education, interpreting Christian truths in terms of Hellenistic thinking. He held that the scriptures had a threefold meaning just as man consists of body, soul, and spirit. According to Origen, the first meaning was the obvious sense given by the simple man; the second meaning was obtained by the individual who has been edified by the soul; and the third meaning was provided by the perfect man who had received edification from the Spirit. Origen placed himself at the level of the perfect man who is instructed by the Spirit. By doing this, he claimed to be guided by the Spirit of the Lord in his understanding of the scriptures. As a result, he was able to use his philosophical views to interpret the Bible allegorically. This allegorical system gave Origen much latitude in scriptural interpretation. It was in this religious, academic, and cultural context that the catechetical school of Alexandria was established and became notable. The theological direction of the school was shaped mainly by the work and writings of Origen and Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius, 249; and Walker, 72-75.

Gnosticism generated a distrust of philosophy. While church leaders in Asia Minor and the West were disinclined to establish strong connections between philosophy and the Christian faith, Alexandrian leaders regarded philosophy as consistent with Christianity.⁴⁹

In Alexandria, students were instructed in the doctrine and traditions of the church and introduced to the studies of the Greco-Roman classics, philosophers, and academic disciplines.⁵⁰ It was argued that the purpose for learning those classical subjects “was not to mix Christianity and philosophy but only to present Christianity as the highest truth.”⁵¹ Nevertheless, the instruction provided in the Alexandrian school influenced religious education and the Christian Church toward a much more philosophical perspective. Biblical doctrines and principles were reinterpreted using philosophical views. This allegorical interpretation of the Bible affected the content of the message transmitted to believers and the roles played by the agencies of the biblical model in the ministry of the church. As a result, church leaders emphasized the role of the school setting over the family and church elements of the biblical model. With the eventual decline of

⁴⁹Walker, 72.

⁵⁰Reed and Prevost, 82, 86.

⁵¹Bengt Häggglund, *History of Theology*, trans. Gene J. Lund (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 59. In a letter to one of his students, Origen explained the role that these classical studies played in religious instruction: “I wish to ask you to extract from the philosophy of the Greeks what may serve as a course of study or a preparation for Christianity, and from geometry and astronomy what will serve to explain the Scriptures, in order that all that the sons of the philosophers are wont to say about geometry and music, grammar, rhetoric, and astronomy, as fellow-helpers to philosophy, we may say about philosophy itself, in relation to Christianity.” Origen, “A Letter from Origen to Gregory,” 235, sec. 1 in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1950), 288. All the disciplines mentioned by Origen are studies in the trivium and quadrivium, that is, the classical curriculum.

Alexandria as a significant city in the Roman Empire toward the end of the fourth century, the influence of the catechetical school of Alexandria waned.⁵²

The data about this early period of Church history seem to suggest that as the church separated from Judaism during the first two centuries of the Christian era following the destruction of Jerusalem, the components of the Old and New Testament educational systems were distorted in the teaching ministry of the church.⁵³ By the second century, the scriptures were no longer the main focus of study and the essential source of religious education. Growing intellectual influences of this period emphasized the relationship between Christianity and philosophy. Thus church leaders interpreted the Bible in terms of Hellenistic thinking and deviated from the biblical model. Over the next several centuries, the religious education system that emerged gave rise to various institutions and movements, as well as to the universities of the Middle Ages.

The Edict of Milan in A.D. 313 granted Christianity absolute freedom of conscience, placed the Christian faith on full equality with other religions in the Roman world, and ordered the restitution of church property confiscated during persecution.⁵⁴ Although this decree granted the Christian Church some privileges, freedom of conscience brought increased secularism in the church at large. In response, the life of

⁵²Mulholland, 111.

⁵³During the first two centuries, early Christians viewed the synagogue as a place where Jews blasphemed Jesus and cursed Christians. This situation developed tensions between Christians and Jews which prompted Christians to abandon the use of synagogues as places of worship and religious instruction. L. Coenen, "Church, Synagogue," *NIDNTT*, vol. 1, 297; and Schrage, 1112.

⁵⁴Walker, 101.

celibacy, poverty, and contemplative retirement from secular activities was adopted by some and became the Christian ideal during this early period of church history and throughout the Middle Ages.⁵⁵ Individuals renounced their main sources of attachment to society: property, personal freedom, and family. This new development prepared the way for the rise of monasticism, a movement in which, over an extended period, a large number of believers fled from the world into monasteries to lead a life of asceticism.⁵⁶

The practice of celibacy led the monastic movement to reject the importance of human relationships and affection found in families. Thus monasticism devalued the importance of the home in religious instruction, preferring instead to emphasize private

⁵⁵James Mulhern, *A History of Education: A Social Interpretation*, 2d ed. (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), 227-29; and Walker, 95.

⁵⁶The roots of monasticism can be traced to the life and practice of hermits like Anthony of Egypt about A.D. 270. Impressed by Jesus' words to the rich young ruler (Matt 19:21), Anthony gave up his inherited fortune and turned to the ascetic life. Anthony's example was soon followed by others who chose to live completely alone or in groups. Their ideal was that of the individual hero who had left all for Christ. Eventually, monasteries were built, and rules to structure the lives of the members were developed. In A.D. 529, Benedict of Nursia founded a monastery on the hill of Monte Cassino near Rome and established there the Benedictine Rule which dominated Western monasteries during the Middle Ages. This rule emphasized worship as the prime duty of a monk, while labor and reading were considered secondary. Upon entering the monastery, monks took three vows: poverty, chastity, and obedience. In addition to the vows, they were also required to learn to read, copy the scriptures, memorize large portions of the Bible, sing, meditate, and pray. With the copying of manuscripts, libraries were also developed, serving as a major educational facility in the monastery. Classes were taught in Latin, and students were instructed in classical philosophy, literature, and the seven liberal arts inherited from the Roman educational system: trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) and quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music). These subjects will be explained below. C. T. Marshall, "Monasticism," *EDT*, 728, 729; Anthony, "Monasticism," *EDCE*, 481, 482; Hägglund, 148; Laux, 168-70, 183-87; Reed and Prevost, 115; and Walker, 125-27.

spiritual practices like meditation, devotion, and worship.⁵⁷ It replaced the emphasis on marriage and family life that the early church inherited from the Old and New Testaments. Seclusion from the world also caused some people to separate themselves from their families and the community of believers in pursuit of higher levels of spirituality. Through the study of philosophy and the Greco-Roman classics, monastic schools also undermined the importance of the Bible in religious education.⁵⁸ As a result, monasticism continued the deviation from the biblical model which had begun in catechetical schools such as Alexandria. This separation inevitably affected the transmission of the covenant relationship to the community of faith. For a time, the main component of the biblical model that monasticism employed for religious instruction was the school, which was focused to a large degree on adult learners.

The independence and isolation of early monasticism was progressively eliminated during the Middle Ages through the discipline of rules and subjection to the church's hierarchy.⁵⁹ By the twelfth century, several monastic orders had been placed

⁵⁷Celibacy required that all monks should stay permanently unmarried and devoted to personal purity in thought and deed. The unmarried state was considered preferable, and its underlying theme was the rejection of materialism as evil in contrast to the goodness of the spiritual. Pazmiño, 139; Robert G. Clouse, "Celibacy, Clerical," *NIDCC*, 206; and O. G. Oliver, Jr., "Celibacy," *EDT*, 202.

⁵⁸D. F. Wright, "Monasticism," *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), 671; Anthony, 482; and Marshall, 728.

⁵⁹The rule of Benedict inaugurated at the beginning of the Middle Ages contributed significantly to bridging monasticism and the church. Walker, 127.

directly under the authority of the church's leadership.⁶⁰ Submission to the authority of the church gave its leaders the opportunity to be involved in monastic religious instruction. Thus monasticism also embraced the agency of the church as an element of the biblical model. Consequently, the church and the school became the main centers for religious education in the monastic setting. While the highly disciplined monastic education seems to have preserved ancient culture and continued the classical educational system through the study of the Greco-Roman classics, monasticism probably saved the church from complete secularization by stressing spiritual values over the material world.⁶¹

Cathedral schools, located in urban areas, evolved toward the middle of the eighth century as another source of religious education during the Middle Ages.⁶² They were established by local bishops, staffed by their own clergy, and intended primarily to train future priests for their local dioceses. The cathedral school reached its highest

⁶⁰Wright, "Monasticism," 671.

⁶¹Frank Pierrepont Graves, *A History of Education During the Middle Ages and the Transition to Modern Times* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1910), 21; and Mulhern, 227-29.

⁶²Cathedral schools were located in cathedrals and served as counterparts to the education provided by monastic centers in the rural areas. Among the first institutions founded was the school of York established by bishop Egbert ca. A.D. 740. While these schools were established primarily to train clergy, they also accepted children and adolescents generally from wealthy families. Cathedral schools were also places of worship and social gathering for young people. See Beverly Johnson-Miller, "Medieval Education," *EDCE*, 455; Henry R. Sefton, "Cathedral," *NIDCC*, 202; and Elias, 45.

development in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.⁶³

Learning in cathedral schools was similar to that at the monastic schools. It included instruction in religion as well as in the trivium and quadrivium.⁶⁴ The knowledge imparted in these studies, taught as the advanced instruction of the time, had a secular foundation. Though the Greco-Roman classical curriculum contained some useful elements for training religious leaders, its adoption diverted attention away from a thorough instruction in the covenant relationship with God. The inclusion of these

⁶³Lowrie J. Daly, *The Medieval University: 1200-1400* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), 5-7; and Mulhern, 229, 230.

⁶⁴The trivium and quadrivium comprised the subjects that became known as the "Seven Liberal Arts." The Liberal Arts reflected ancient learning under seven areas of study, following earlier Greco-Roman classifications. The trivium included the study of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic. Grammar was the basis and source of all liberal arts because it qualified people to speak and write correctly. Exposure to the study of analysis, word formations, figures of speech, and vocal expression was considered necessary to enable a person to read the Bible with understanding. In rhetoric, the preacher was trained to use secular discourse to present the biblical message in eloquent and impressive language. Dialectic aided scholars to unmask falsehood, expose error, formulate argument, and accurately draw conclusions. The quadrivium involved the study of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Arithmetic was used to determine the church calendar, for example, calculating the day for Easter. In addition, biblical passages involving measurements were studied. The study of geometry found practical application in surveying and settling boundary disputes. In astronomy, the chief purpose of the instruction was to explain the seasons and the motions of the planets and enable church leaders to fix the time of Easter and all other festivals and holy days. Learning music included a study of musical theory. Music was important in numerous activities of the church. Basically, the Seven Liberal Arts encompassed what was deemed necessary for the training of medieval clergy. The textbooks were few, chiefly the Latin grammars of Donatus and Priscian, the logical manuals of Boethius, as well as his arithmetic and music, a manual of rhetoric and the Venerable Bede's outline of practical astronomy. Ellwood P. Cubberley, *The History of Education* (Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948), 153-62; Charles Homer Haskins, *The Rise of the Universities* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957), 28; Daly, 8, 9; Mulhern, 251-54; Johnson-Miller, 455; and Eavey, 101-105.

classical subjects contributed to the decline of the role of the Bible as the foundation of the educational curriculum.⁶⁵ Through monastic and cathedral schools, the church gained control over education and learning during the Middle Ages.⁶⁶ Thus the church and the school represented the main settings for religious education during this time. The work of the monastic and cathedral schools prepared the way for the rise of the universities and scholasticism.⁶⁷

Universities were also a product of the Middle Ages.⁶⁸ Their rise was due in part

⁶⁵Norma Hedin, "The Bible as a Curriculum," in *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*, ed. Daryl Eldridge (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1995), 62.

⁶⁶Elias, 45.

⁶⁷Graves, 76, 77; Johnson-Miller, 456; and Walker, 238.

⁶⁸A university was initially neither a building nor a single center of learning, but a large gathering of teachers and students from monastic and cathedral schools under the authority of a chancellor. The term *university* implied the association of students and teachers into a collective body or guild. Guilds were corporations formed by groups of merchants or craftsmen, cathedral chapters, or communities of monks. At first, the main purposes of these associations were protection and legal recognition. But the influx of new knowledge into western Europe, partly through Italy, Sicily, and scholars from Spain, increased the need for learned professions. When completely developed, universities comprised four main faculties: Arts, Theology, Law, and Medicine. Some institutions of the time were well known for their emphasis on particular programs, e.g., the Universities of Paris and Oxford for their respective studies in theology; Bologna for its program in law; and Salerno for its emphasis in medicine. From these, the Universities of Paris and Bologna stood out as the two main centers of the time. In Bologna, the leaders of the university organized mutual protective associations of students and established it as a center where research could flourish freely and in autonomy. Leaders of the University of Paris viewed the arts as preparatory and as a means to arrive at a philosophical culture. They also arranged for a dean to preside over each faculty. Students were attracted to these and other centers by such great names as Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard, William of Champeaux, and Thomas Aquinas. The use of Latin as the only language of the classroom made possible the attendance of students from all over Europe. S. E. Frost, Jr., and Kenneth P. Bailey, *Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education*, 2d ed. (Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), 162; William Ragsdale Cannon,

to the great revival of learning that took place between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁶⁹ Instruction in these institutions included the Seven Liberal Arts taught in the cathedral schools and some new subjects like civil and canon law, medicine, and religion. The works of Aristotle emerged as central to university education, providing a foundation for the study of ethics, metaphysics, and natural science.⁷⁰ Lecture and debate were the two main methods of teaching. This form of instruction provided the impetus for modern scientific inquiry and inspired individuals to write documents about civil government and church polity.⁷¹ Universities also enjoyed more independence from local church authorities than did the monastery or cathedral school.⁷² Consequently, these educational institutions placed greater emphasis on the school over the family and church as the favored setting for religious education.

Another current of late medieval thought that needs to be considered in evaluating religious education is Scholasticism.⁷³ Scholastics questioned the teachings and authority

History of Christianity in the Middle Ages (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), 282-86; Julián Marías, *History of Philosophy*, trans. Stanley Appelbaum and Clarence C. Strowbridge (New York: Dover Publications, 1967), 159; Daly, 20; Haskins, 34, 35; Johnson-Miller, 456; Laux, 373; Reed and Prevost, 143-51; and Walker, 243.

⁶⁹Some of the writings that were introduced were the works of Aristotle, Euclid, Ptolemy, the Greek physicians, and various texts of Roman law like the *Corpus Juris Civilis* of Justinian. Haskins, 4, 5.

⁷⁰Ibid., 30, 31.

⁷¹Walker, 243; and Reed and Prevost, 150, 151.

⁷²Stewart, 317; and Reed and Prevost, 143.

⁷³Scholasticism was a movement that blended the study of theology with philosophy, applying Aristotelian categories. It attempted to reconcile reason with faith

of the church and insisted on the right of the philosopher to use his own reason. During the scholastic period, methods of logic (called dialectics) were applied to the discussion of theological problems.⁷⁴ As the movement developed, Scholasticism was divided into two general camps: those who espoused the *via antiqua* and those from the *via moderna*.⁷⁵ Those who followed the former way of realism found support in the ideas of the Thomists and Scotists while the modernists, also known as terminists or nominalists, adhered to the work of William of Occam.⁷⁶ Rivalries between the two groups motivated those who were moderate “moderns” to seek an escape from the scholastic web with its

and philosophy with revelation. As a result, a new theological method was developed with the assistance of philosophy. The role of reason in this new theological method was to present the content of faith in a way that could be logically comprehended. However, the recovery of the works of Aristotle, the rise of the universities, and the devotion of the mendicant orders to learning introduced a new period of Scholasticism in the thirteenth century known as High Scholasticism. Its greatest representative was Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) who completed the adaptation of Aristotle’s Greek philosophy to the Christian thought of Scholasticism through his book *Summa Theologiae*. Austen Kennedy De Blois and Donald R. Gorham, *Christian Religious Education: Principles and Practice* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1939), 26; Donald G. Stewart, “History of Christian Education,” *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Kendig Brubaker Cully (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), 316, 317; Hugh Wamble, *History of Christian Thought* (Nashville: Seminary Extension Department of Southern Baptist Seminaries, 1969), 160-75; Robert G. Clouse, “Scholasticism,” *NIDCC*, 885, 886; T. J. German, “Scholasticism,” *EDT*, 983, 984; Michael J. Anthony, “Scholasticism,” *EDCE*, 616; Hägglund, 167-70; Laux, 374; and Walker, 238-42, 244-52.

⁷⁴Mariás, 128; and Walker, 238.

⁷⁵Etienne Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1955), 487.

⁷⁶Gilson, 499; and Walker, 251, 252. Occam was radical in his divorce of philosophy from theology. Not only did he consider that faith was more important than reason, but also that theological doctrines should be accepted on the authority of the scripture.

endless disputations and tiresome intellectualism.

Impressed by the piety that was part of life in Northern Europe, the “moderns” sought a more practical and vital faith.⁷⁷ This spirit of piety was carried by them into the Renaissance period.⁷⁸ Scholastics, broadly speaking, maintained the centrality of the school setting in religious education, but the association of some scholastics with pious lay movements in Northern Europe opened the way to developments in religious education that were more community based. This branch of Scholasticism foreshadowed the Reformation and the importance attached to church and family education during the Reformation Era.

The Renaissance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was first manifested in Italy and then spread to the rest of Europe. During this time, a number of changes took place regarding how individuals viewed the universe, the world in which they lived, and their own existence in the world.⁷⁹ As the Northern Renaissance evolved, some

⁷⁷John V. G. Matthews, “Alexander Hegius (ca. 1433-98): His Life, Philosophy, and Pedagogy,” vol. 1 (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1988), 58; Ernest Addison Moody, *Truth and Consequence in Medieval Logic: Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1953), 6; and Jan Pinborg, “Speculative Grammar,” in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jon Pinborg (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 254-69.

⁷⁸Heiko Augustinus Oberman, *Masters of the Reformation: The Emergence of a New Intellectual Climate in Europe*, trans. Dennis Martin (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 46.

⁷⁹Lewis William Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1971); and Hermann Arend Enno van Gelder, *The Two Reformations in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of the Religious Aspects and Consequences of Humanism* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1961).

contrasting features distinguished it from its Italian antecedent.⁸⁰ Humanism was a manifestation of the Renaissance movement.⁸¹ Like the Renaissance itself, humanism was also expressed in two forms: northern and southern humanism. While Italian humanism was more secular and scientific in its methods and results, northern humanism was more Christian, connected with religious reform, and more biblical in nature.⁸² This Christian version of humanism is particularly meaningful for the analysis of the historical development of religious education. Therefore, this section focuses on humanism as it grew north of the Alps.

Northern humanists stressed right living and practical moral principles over the need for absolute theological orthodoxy or an unerring rationalism. The scholastics, on

⁸⁰Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements*, 274-99.

⁸¹Humanism was the literary manifestation of the Renaissance movement. Education was based upon a foundational study in Greek and Latin literature and the liberal arts which included history, literary criticism, grammar, poetry, philology, and rhetoric. It challenged the student to rediscover the person as a distinctly free being. Desiderius Erasmus, known as “the prince of humanists,” was convinced that the Christian Church was overlaid with superstition, corruption, and error. In his writings, he touched on the issues of his time with daring criticism of the clergy and civil rulers, and tried to return to the sources of Christian truth. John Colet, who influenced Erasmus to turn to biblical studies, rejected all allegorical interpretation of the Bible, criticized clerical celibacy, and desired to improve the education and morals of the clergy. Jacques LeFèvre proceeded to interpret the Bible using the grammatical method instead of the allegorical interpretation of the medieval period. The work and writings of these humanists had a common ground. They believed that sound learning, the study and preaching of the Bible, and the correction of ignorance, immorality, and administrative abuses of the church would make the church what it should be. Michael J. Anthony, “Christian Humanism,” *EDCE*, 347-49; Robert G. Clouse, “Christian Humanism,” *EDT*, 536; Laux, 410, 411; Mariás, 190; and Walker, 294, 295.

⁸²Graves, 140, 141, 174-76; and Cubberley, 288, 289.

the other hand, emphasized the preservation of what they perceived to be true doctrine.⁸³ Christian humanists were opposed to the metalogical methodologies and formal syllogistic approach to dialectic appropriated by the scholastics. As a result, they broke with the spiritual-allegorical method of Bible interpretation of the medieval schoolmen and introduced new methods of biblical exegesis.⁸⁴ Humanists stressed high standards of scholarship and were convinced that church reform would come about through education.⁸⁵ They published devotional works in the classical style and printed sacred literature from the early church period.⁸⁶

Humanism in Northern Europe was also willing to recognize that intellectual pursuits must be the servant of religion, to acknowledge that reason is subject to faith, and to exalt the “foolishness of the cross.” Thus humanists developed a critical attitude to the formalism of church life and manifested a desire to return to a more biblical Christianity.⁸⁷ Their renewed emphasis on the Bible and the publication of religious literature were both significant contributions to religious instruction in the

⁸³Steven Ozment, “Humanism, Scholasticism, and the Intellectual Origins of the Reformation,” in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History*, ed. F. Forrester Church and Timothy George, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, no. 19 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), 135-41; and Matthews, “Alexander Hegius,” 64, 65.

⁸⁴Walker, 294-96.

⁸⁵Ibid., 314.

⁸⁶Lewis William Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 5.

⁸⁷Matthews, “Alexander Hegius,” 70.

pre-Reformation era and laid the foundations for the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Influenced by humanism and the moral decay of the Roman Church, early Protestant leaders expressed a concern for reform in the church and in education.⁸⁸ Some of the issues they deemed oppressive were papal immorality, nepotism, taxation, and interference with ecclesiastical appointments. The peasantry in many parts of Europe were in a state of economic unrest.⁸⁹ Added to this restlessness was the growing religious awakening and the concern for salvation that found greater expression in the Protestant Reformation.⁹⁰ Through their profound religious faith, Protestant Reformers were led to

⁸⁸Hägglund, 215, 216; and Lamb, 586.

⁸⁹Laux, 421, 422; and Walker, 301.

⁹⁰The ideas that gave rise to the Protestant Reformation flourished in both the classroom and the pulpit. Reformers made the sermon central in their worship services and used it to teach the doctrines of the Bible and to give guidance for daily life. Emphasis was placed on the authority of the scriptures and the right of all people to have direct access to the study of the Bible. Martin Luther believed that Christians “should teach nothing outside of Scripture pertaining to divine matters . . . which means only that one should teach nothing that is at variance with Scripture.” Philip Melanchthon shared similar views when he wrote that Christian belief “should and must be grounded in the word of God.” John Calvin supported the position of the other two reformers regarding the Bible when he stated that the knowledge of God is “more intimately and also more vividly revealed in his Word.” Stress on the Bible led the Reformers to separate themselves from the papacy on three main principles: justification by faith, the supremacy of scripture, and the priesthood of all believers. Martin Luther, “On the Councils and the Church,” 1539, in *Luther's Works*, vol. 41, trans. Charles M. Jacobs, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 83; idem, “Luther to Peter Lupinus and Andrew Carlstadt,” 1519, in *Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters*, trans. and ed. Preserve Smith (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1913), 158, 159; Philip Melanchthon, *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*, trans. and ed. Clyde L. Manschreck (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 29; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1559, vol. 1, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 96; R. L. Harrison, “The

restore the authority and centrality of the word of God in religious education. The work and writings of such men as Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, and John Calvin also brought a renewed emphasis on the place of the home, the church, and the school as the primary foundational institutions for religious education.⁹¹ The emphasis given by Protestant Reformers to all the components of the biblical model is significant because it represents an important return to the biblical foundation.

The response of the Roman Catholic Church to the Protestant Reformation was manifested in the Roman Catholic Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth

Reformation,” *HERE*, 299, 300; Robert D. Linder, “The Reformation,” *NIDCC*, 830; Eavey, 145; Hedin, 62; Hägglund, 220-23; Reed and Prevost, 191; and Stewart, 318.

⁹¹Luther emphasized the importance of the home in religious education. He praised and honored it “as a divine, blessed, and well-pleasing ordinance of God’s creation” and as a place where children “must be nourished, trained, ruled, and provided for in a godly spirit.” He did not, however, believe that the instruction provided by parents was sufficient for the children. He felt that schools were also necessary because the church and society needed well-trained individuals: “I have written much about the schools, urging firmness and diligence in caring for them. . . . For if we fail to train pupils we will not have pastors and preachers very long—as we are finding out.” As a result, Luther encouraged and supported compulsory and universal education. Calvin’s ideas did not differ from Luther. For him, a man should not “rashly despise marriage as something unprofitable or superfluous to him.” He also viewed the church as the institution where “God is pleased to gather his sons, not only that they may be nourished . . . but also that they may be guided.” Melanchthon referred to the church as “a marvelous government, which proceeds from and must be maintained through God’s word.” He also wrote that “every Christian father should accustom his children to useful ceremonies, should teach them to pray, to read or speak a piece of Christian doctrine in the morning and evening, and as they go to and from the table.” Luther, “On the Councils and the Church,” in *Luther’s Works*, 176, 177, 197; Calvin, 407, 1012; Melanchthon, 257, 313. See also Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 72-85; Robert L. Lamb, “The Reformation,” *EDCE*, 586; D. F. Wright, “Protestant Reformation,” *EDT*, 920; De Blois and Gorham, 27; Harrison, 300; Hägglund, 244-46, 264; Pazmiño, 143, 144; Reed and Prevost, 192-94; Stewart, 318; and Walker, 322.

centuries. One of the chief instruments of this Catholic Reformation was the organization of the Society of Jesus in 1540 by Ignatius of Loyola.⁹² The Jesuits not only perceived the permanent value of education, but they also recognized the vital and mutual interdependence of church and school. In contrast to the biblical model, the importance of the home as foundational for religious education was shifted to the school, and the scriptures were not considered to be the sole foundation for religious education.⁹³ Instead, the Jesuits argued that Catholic tradition was a necessary guide for interpreting the scriptures.⁹⁴ The Jesuit emphasis on the church and school elements of the biblical model mirrors the old medieval educational system and its focus on the same two settings. Thus the Catholic Reformation could be seen as a step back from the work that Protestant Reformers had accomplished in restoring the biblical model for religious education.

In addition to the study of the two Reformation movements and their contrasting

⁹²The Society of Jesus [Jesuits] became a militant and zealous supporter of the Catholic Church. The Jesuits were missionaries, diplomats, confessors of the kings, and educators, the last being their most pronounced function. While they were not the first to distinguish themselves as teachers, they viewed pedagogy as a stated part of their mission. The Jesuits carried out educational reforms within Catholicism. Their curriculum was a formalized humanism that included religion, classical languages, and literature with Aristotelian philosophy for advanced students. Education was regarded as a discipline for service and it was designed to train workers, not dreamers. Students were taught what to think and how to defend the Catholic faith. The Jesuits worked to halt the Protestant Reformation. Former Catholic territories were reclaimed and new ones were conquered for the Catholic Church. Douglas A. Sweeney, "Jesuits and the Counter Reformation," *EDCE*, 378; F. S. Piggin, "Counter-Reformation," *EDT*, 276; De Blois and Gorham, 30-32; Harrison, 301, 302; Laux, 460; and Stewart, 318.

⁹³Warren S. Benson, "Roman Catholic Education," *EDCE*, 605.

⁹⁴Hägglund, 286; and Sweeney, 379.

roles in religious education, the work of John Amos Comenius⁹⁵ (1592-1671) deserves some consideration for its contribution to religious instruction and the restoration of the biblical model. Comenius was a pioneer whose educational aim was to conform the person to God's design.⁹⁶ He contended that the education of every individual was a necessity if humanity is to enter into its religious inheritance; piety, virtue, and learning were to be brought to their fruition.⁹⁷ For him, all instruction should be dedicated to

⁹⁵John Amos Comenius, a bishop of the Moravian Church, defined education as learning all that was necessary for this and the future life. He argued in favor of universal education for both sexes as a tool to bring universal peace and religious harmony. In his curriculum, learning included not only the scientific study of nature, but also the Bible. Teaching in the vernacular, grading according to ability, use of visual aids, preschool preparation, and a realistic relation of all learning to life formed part of this "universal" education. Comenius believed that educational theory and practice should be based on firm scientific principles and that the method, once proven right, should be made universal. Through his book, *The Great Didactic*, he introduced teaching methodologies that are still considered basic to modern instruction. For example, he devised a method of teaching Latin through the use of a picture book. The emphasis of this book was on concrete words illustrated with pictures. See William F. Falkner, "Johann Amos Comenius," *EDCE*, 160; T. F. Kinloch, *Pioneers of Religious Education* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1969), 49; Matthew Spinka, "Jan Amos Comenius (Komensky)," *NIDCC*, 242; Robert Ulich, *A History of Religious Education: Documents and Interpretations from the Judaeo-Christian Tradition* (New York: New York University Press, 1968), 165-67; and Stewart, 318.

⁹⁶Comenius's aim is shown in the following propositions from the *Didactica*: "(I) Man is the highest, the most absolute, and the most excellent of things created; (II) the ultimate end of man is beyond this life; (III) this life is but a preparation for eternity; (IV) there are three stages in that preparation for eternity: to know oneself (and with oneself all things), to rule oneself, and to direct oneself to God; (V) the seed of these three (learning, virtue, religion) are naturally implanted in us; (VI) if a man is to be produced, it is necessary that he be formed by education." John Amos Comenius, *The Great Didactic*, 1657, trans. M. W. Keatinge (London: A. & C. Black, 1910), 36. See also Kinloch, 49; and Spinka, 242.

⁹⁷Robert R. Rusk, *The Doctrines of the Great Educators*, 3d ed. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1967), 89-111; Cubberley, 408-11; and Mulhern, 363-66.

knowledge, morality, and piety.⁹⁸ Hence, Comenius's view of religious education went beyond instruction to include the development of the individual's personality.⁹⁹

Comenius organized his educational system into four institutions: schooling provided by the mother, vernacular schools, Latin schools, and the university.¹⁰⁰ Through the work of the mother, he acknowledged the importance of the home school in a child's education.¹⁰¹ The role of the church and school were equally essential in his educational program. He was particularly concerned that individuals learn to read the Bible aright.¹⁰² From his study of the nature of worship, Comenius came to realize the value of hymns for religious education, especially when songs were carefully selected and explained. Comenius held all the components of the biblical pattern to be crucial elements in his instructional system.

Following the Reformation, Protestantism became more and more concerned with defining orthodoxy. Although based on the Bible, "it assumed the form of a fixed

⁹⁸Stewart, 318; and Ulich, 165.

⁹⁹Kinloch, 58.

¹⁰⁰In the *Didactic*, Comenius described his educational structure as follows: "A mother school should exist in every house, a vernacular school in every hamlet and village, a Latin school in every city, and a university in every kingdom or in every province. The mother school and the vernacular school embrace all the young of both sexes. The Latin school gives a more thorough education to those who aspire higher than the workshop; while the university trains up the teachers and learned men of the future, that our churches, schools, and states may never lack suitable leaders." Comenius, 38.

¹⁰¹Comenius would have every mother teach her children the first elements of history, geography, astronomy, music, arithmetic, and religion. Cubberley, 408-11; Mulhern, 363-66; and Reed and Prevost, 232-34.

¹⁰²Kinloch, 53, 54.

dogmatic interpretation, rigid, exact, and demanding intellectual conformity.”¹⁰³ Pure doctrine and the sacraments were emphasized as the most necessary components of the Christian life. In reaction to this new form of scholastic Protestantism, some Christians emphasized the need for a more practical Christian pathway based on good works and a holy life.¹⁰⁴ The result was the emergence of the Pietist movement in the seventeenth century.

Pietism brought a fresh emphasis on the centrality of the scriptures and the place of the home in religious education.¹⁰⁵ A shift from theological speculation to devotional earnestness and from an intellectual to an experiential knowledge of God was

¹⁰³Walker, 444.

¹⁰⁴Robert G. Clouse, “Pietism,” *NIDCC*, 780; Hägglund, 326-28; and Reed and Prevost, 264.

¹⁰⁵Pietism originated in Germany shortly after the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), when the churches were becoming entangled with confessional rigidity. The leader of the Pietist movement was Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705). Stimulated by the experiential emphasis in Puritan writings, Spener wrote in the introduction to a new edition of the sermons of the Lutheran mystic Johann Arndt concerning the sources of spiritual decline of the Protestant churches in Germany. He also proposed that there should be a shift of emphasis from the creeds to the scriptures, a focus on good works, avoidance of controversy, and better spiritual training for ministers. Spener rejected the use of Aristotelian philosophy in the field of theology and acknowledged the canonical authority of the Old and New Testaments. Moreover, Spener believed that Christianity was more a way of life than an intellectual knowledge. However, it was through August Hermann Franke, one of Spener’s disciples, that the Pietist movement made its greatest contribution to religious education. Franke insisted that schools should be deeply religious, cultivating a devotion of the heart, not simply of the mind. He considered the home to be an integral component of a child’s education with the school complementary to it. Richard E. Allison, “August Hermann Franke,” *EDCE*, 301; Clouse, “Pietism,” *NIDCC*, 780; R. J. VanderMolen, “Philipp Jakob Spener,” *EDT*, 1040; Hägglund, 325-29; M. A. Noll, “Pietism,” *EDT*, 855-58; Reed and Prevost, 264-68; and Walker, 446-48.

emphasized.¹⁰⁶ The family was to function as a partner with the church to educate the children,¹⁰⁷ and school teachers were not perceived as replacements for the parents.¹⁰⁸

The Pietist commitment to the scriptures and the emphasis on practice more than theory have been characterized as “a significant effort to reform the Protestant heritage.”¹⁰⁹

Pietist leaders continued the emphasis on the biblical model for religious education restored by the Protestant Reformation and the work of Comenius. Eventually, this focus was embraced by Methodism as well. Contacts with Pietist Christians during the eighteenth century influenced the spiritual life of John Wesley (1703-1791) and contributed to the development of the Methodist movement.¹¹⁰ Concerned with the

¹⁰⁶Allison, 301; Noll, 857; and VanderMolen, 1040.

¹⁰⁷Reed and Prevost, 272.

¹⁰⁸Allison, 301.

¹⁰⁹Noll, 858.

¹¹⁰John Wesley, founder of Methodism, came into contact with Pietists for the first time during a journey to America. During this trip, he met a group of twenty-one Moravians whose faith and trust in the Lord made a considerable impression on him. Upon his return to London, Wesley was introduced to Peter Boehler, a Pietist leader, and after his conversion Wesley visited a Moravian settlement in Herrnhut where he met Count Nikolaus Von Zinzendorf. These contacts and Wesley’s conversion experience on Aldersgate Street in London prepared him for his life work. His message was designed to awaken people to lives of active faith and holiness. Wesley organized his listeners into small, highly disciplined groups called classes. Each class was headed by a lay leader charged with educational and pastoral duties. Believing that education and religion were to be united in a mutually beneficial relationship, Wesley founded schools that taught academics in light of the Bible. Despite his enthusiasm for the Sunday school, Wesley considered it only supplemental to the religious education a child was to receive at home. Wesley’s search for an effective method to lead Christians toward the goal of scriptural holiness earned his movement the Methodist name. Robert J. Choun, “John Wesley,” *EDCE*, 719, 720; P. A. Mickey, “Methodism,” *EDT*, 713, 714; R. G. Tuttle, Jr., “John Wesley,” *EDT*, 1163-65; A. Skevington Wood, “John Wesley,” *NIDCC*, 1034, 1035;

spiritual nurture of children, Wesley made their religious education a special priority in the Methodist society.¹¹¹ This religious instruction had its foundation in the home and was supplemented by instruction provided in the church and school.¹¹² The scriptures were central in the academic program of a Methodist school.

The historical survey studied in this section outlined major emphases in the biblical period and analyzed the foundational elements used in the transmission of the Hebrew and Christian faith to succeeding generations of believers. These foundational elements constitute the biblical model for religious education. This model is founded on the centrality of the scriptures as God's revealed source for religious instruction, and the home, church, and school as foundational institutions or agencies for providing religious education.

The biblical model offered an important guideline to future generations of Christian believers. Yet, as religious educators of the post-biblical period made contact with Hellenistic thinking, they strayed from the model presented in scripture. The result was the development of a quasi-biblical foundation which has affected religious education since the second century of the Christian era. The Bible, home, and church lost their centrality in religious instruction, and special emphasis was placed on the school as

Hägglund, 342, 343, 384-88; Reed and Prevost, 275, 276; and Walker, 454-64.

¹¹¹C. A. Bowen, *Child and Church: A History of Methodist Church-School Curriculum* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 27; David I. Naglee, *From Font to Faith: John Wesley on Infant Baptism and the Nurture of Children* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), 228-37; and Reed and Prevost, 276.

¹¹²Reed and Prevost, 276.

the main setting for religious education. However, some trends in Protestant education and certain elements of Catholic education made significant efforts to restore the biblical model of religious education and ensure the communication of God's redemptive covenant relationship to believers in their respective religious communities.¹¹³

Toward the latter part of the eighteenth century, the work and influence of Wesley contributed to the initial growth of the Sunday school movement in England.¹¹⁴ Wesley's support of the Sunday school movement started when he met Robert Raikes and became acquainted with his Sunday school program. Raikes was a citizen of Gloucester, England; his concern for the poor children there had motivated him to start a Sunday school. In contrast to the Methodist movement, Raikes's Sunday school program was not

¹¹³Jansenists also contributed to restoring the biblical model for religious education. Jansenism was an Augustinian movement in the Roman Catholic Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Founded by Cornelius Otto Jansen (1585-1638), this Roman Catholic movement had an innovative educational system. Jansenist instructional ideas made important contributions to education in France. According to Barnard, the educational views of Jansenists "were in many respects far in advance of those of any of their contemporaries." For them, the aim of education was moral and religious. They viewed education as the best means of rescuing humans from their weak sinful nature and attaining eternal life. Jansenists also acknowledged the vital relationship between the home and the school to help pupils show God's grace in their moral character. They believed in Bible reading and the experience of conversion. Of all of their educational reforms, the introduction of the vernacular into the schools produced the most immediate effect, "not only as a medium of instruction but also as a subject worthy of study in itself." For Jansenists, a correct understanding of the language was pivotal for the proper interpretation of the Bible. Howard Clive Barnard, *The Little Schools of Port-Royal* (Cambridge: University Press, 1913), 4, 60-62, 218. Other sources that provide insights into the history of Jansenism include Clyde L. Manschreck, *A History of Christianity: Readings in the History of the Church*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986), 118, 155, 298, 363-64; David C. Steinmetz, "Jansenism," *NIDCC*, 524, 525; Laux, 502-05; and Walker, 520.

¹¹⁴Gary C. Newton, "Sunday School, Early Origins," *EDCE*, 673; and Wesley R. Willis, "History of the Sunday School," *EDCE*, 338.

so much a religious enterprise as it was a social initiative.

The Sunday School Movement

The Sunday school movement started in the late eighteenth century as a response to the poor social and living conditions of the urban lower classes in England at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Housing, clothing, nutrition, and sanitation were grossly inadequate, and many children were forced to work in the mills and factories.¹¹⁵ Having Sunday as their only free day, children often ran wild in the streets and engaged in various activities many of which were crime-related.¹¹⁶

During this time, illiteracy was also common, and the opportunity for children to receive an adequate education was virtually nonexistent in the late 1700s and early 1800s except in the elite public schools which were open only to the rich and socially respectable.¹¹⁷ This lack of adequate education, however, was not confined to the lower classes because many of the local parish clergy were “poorly paid, unlettered, and seldom

¹¹⁵E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1963), 314-49; Derek Fraser, *The Evolution of the British Welfare State: A History of Social Policy Since the Industrial Revolution*, 3d ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 11-15, 38-40; Norman John Greville Ponds, *The Culture of the English People: Iron Age to the Industrial Revolution* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 336, 337, 243, 244; Andrew Ure, *The Philosophy of Manufactures*, 3d ed. (London: Bohn Publishers, 1961), 300-02; Reed and Prevost, 255; and Walker, 454.

¹¹⁶Children engaged in quarreling, cursing, and fighting, with very little supervision from their parents who used Sunday as a day for “relaxing or sleeping off a drunken stupor from Saturday night revelry.” Willis, 337.

¹¹⁷Edwin Wilbur Rice, *The Sunday-School Movement and the American Sunday-School Union: 1780-1927*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Union Press, 1927), 12; Fraser, 85; and Ure, 301.

taught more than catechism to the children.”¹¹⁸ As a result, ignorance abounded and the study of the Bible seemed to have been neglected at least among many of the poor. Unfortunately, the lack of adequate education and religious instruction helped to perpetuate “the poverty-crime-prison cycle into which these children were born.”¹¹⁹ This lack was one significant influence among many, broadly a result of the Industrial Revolution, that caused a breakdown in the burgeoning urban society.

The Sunday School Movement in Great Britain

Robert Raikes (1736-1811),¹²⁰ disturbed by the growing problem of children running wild in the streets of Gloucester on Sundays and watching the seemingly endless poverty-crime-prison cycle, felt the need to find a solution to the situation.¹²¹ He saw in education an effective tool to combat moral degeneration and solicited the assistance of Thomas Stork, rector of Saint John the Baptist Church.¹²² After securing Stork’s assistance, Raikes approached the local clergy to seek permission for the use of their

¹¹⁸Rice, 13.

¹¹⁹Reed and Prevost, 256.

¹²⁰Raikes was a Gloucester newspaper publisher and dedicated Anglican layman whose compassion and sympathies for the lower class children were aroused. Ken Garland, “Sunday School Movement,” *EDCE*, 674; and G. E. Knoff, “Sunday School Movement,” *HERE*, 625.

¹²¹Raikes’s initial efforts to combat crime and immorality in Gloucester were directed toward establishing a program to work with prisoners once their terms were completed. But after twenty-five years, he concluded that the program had accomplished nothing and a better starting point would be the children. Rice, 14; Knoff, 625; and Willis, 337.

¹²²Reed and Prevost, 257.

church facilities. The clergy rejected Raikes's request from fear that the children would destroy the facilities.¹²³ The refusal of the local clergy deprived the Sunday school of that initial connection with religious institutions that would have made the Sunday school an important instrument for religious education from the very beginning.

Without the support of the local clergy and church leaders, Raikes turned next to a certain Mrs. Meredith who finally agreed to rent the kitchen of her home and provide instruction to poor children.¹²⁴ Thus in 1780, Raikes and Stork began enlisting children from "the lowest rung of the socioeconomic ladder in Gloucester" for their first Sunday school.¹²⁵ Although Raikes's primary goal was literacy training, he also included instruction in morals, manners, and some religious education.¹²⁶ Believing that the Bible

¹²³The early beginnings of the Sunday school met with opposition and discouragement. Opposition came from many bishops and archbishops in the Church of England, the English nobility, and the British government. Raikes also had to endure the mocking of his friends who would call him "Bobby Wild Goose and His Ragged Regiment." Henry Frederick Cope, *The Evolution of the Sunday School* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1911), 68, 70; Garland, 674; Knoff, 625; Reed and Prevost, 258; Rice, 20; and Willis, 338.

¹²⁴Finding the behavior of the children too extreme, Mrs. Meredith felt unable to continue with the program and the children were transferred to the house of a certain Mrs. King. In this new locality, Raikes placed the children under the instruction of Mary Critchley who was assisted by the more advanced pupils. Rice, 15; Knoff, 625; and Willis, 337. Several searches were conducted to identify Meredith and King more fully, but without success.

¹²⁵Reed and Prevost, 257. Boys and girls were enlisted whose ages ranged from six to fourteen years. Newton, 672.

¹²⁶The children received training in the areas of reading, writing, spelling, grammar, and arithmetic. The religious instruction included memorization of portions of the church catechism and attending worship services. De Blois and Gorham, 46, 280; Garland, 674; Newton, 672; Reed and Prevost, 256, 258; and Willis, 338.

was the best source for instruction, he used it as the main textbook.¹²⁷ This combination of literacy training with some religious instruction would eventually yield positive results.

In an effort to create more awareness of the Sunday school program,¹²⁸ Raikes invited William Wilberforce, a member of Parliament, and John Wesley to his Sunday school to observe the religious progress made by the children.¹²⁹ Impressed with what they saw, Wilberforce and Wesley decided to support Raikes's program.¹³⁰ As a result, new Sunday schools were opened in other parts of Gloucester; enrollment soon grew to about 300,¹³¹ and by 1786 the clergy started giving Raikes some assistance.¹³²

Two important influences further supported Raikes's efforts, which brought the Sunday school into closer connection with the church and helped it remain an important institution for religious instruction in the Christian church for the next two centuries. The

¹²⁷Garland, 674.

¹²⁸In 1783, Raikes began creating an awareness of the Sunday school work by publishing a description of it in the *Gentleman's Magazine* and in his own newspaper the *Gloucester Journal*. J. Kenneth Meir, "Sunday School Movement," *A Dictionary of Religious Education*, ed. John M. Sutcliffe (London: SCM Press, 1984), 333; and Reed and Prevost, 258.

¹²⁹Rice, 17.

¹³⁰Wesley decided to promote the Sunday school program as part of the Methodist movement. Garland, 674; and Reed and Prevost, 275.

¹³¹Motivated by the increase in enrollment, Raikes wrote and published in 1784 the first textbook ever prepared for the Sunday school entitled *Reading Made Easy*. The book was popularly known by its short form "Redinmadesy." Merrill, 4.

¹³²George R. Merrill, *The Development of the Sunday-School: 1780-1905* (Boston: The Executive Committee of the International Sunday-School Association, 1905), 4; De Blois and Gorham, 46; Rice, 15; and Willis, 337.

first development occurred in 1785 when William Fox, a Baptist businessman raised in a town close to Gloucester, attended a monthly Baptist meeting held at the King's Head Tavern in the Poultry, London.¹³³ During this meeting, Fox proposed a collaborative effort in teaching the lower classes to read with the purpose of providing greater access to the Bible. Consequently, the Baptist leaders called a new meeting for August of that year. In this meeting, "it was decided that the best approach to teach the poor to read would be through Sunday Schools."¹³⁴ The Baptists' decision is significant for religious education. The use of church buildings to instruct the poor facilitated the religious training of the students and laid the foundation for the incorporation of the church component of the biblical model into the Sunday school movement.

The second factor that added momentum to the Sunday school movement was the support received from Queen Charlotte, wife of King George III.¹³⁵ While the decision of the Baptist leaders contributed to the creation of the first Sunday School Society (SSS) on 30 August 1785 with the purpose of promoting the Sunday school throughout the British

¹³³Garland, 674; and Reed and Prevost, 259. The Poultry was the early home of the London poulterers. It was located in London's Eastend.

¹³⁴Reed and Prevost, 259.

¹³⁵Willis, 338. As a result of royal support, persons like the converted slave trader John Newton, the poet William Cowper, the theologian Thomas Scott, the philanthropist John Howard, Bishop Porteus of Chester, the Bishops of Norwich and Salisbury, the religious writer and philanthropist Hannah More, and Llandaff, the Earl of Salisbury, and others from the upper class also became supporters of the Sunday school movement. Rice, 21.

Dominions,¹³⁶ the Queen's influence encouraged the preparation, publication, and distribution of curriculum materials by the new society.¹³⁷

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, Thomas Charles, a prominent leader of the Methodist movement in Wales and a resident of Bala, introduced the Sunday school movement into Wales. He encouraged a closer connection between the Sunday school and the church and exhorted adults to attend Sunday school.¹³⁸ This connection yielded positive results. Welsh Sunday schools were organized in churches, their attendance included both adults and children, and, significantly, the Bible became the center of study, not merely as a textbook, but as the inspired Word of God.¹³⁹ Charles's initiatives started a trend that spread through numerous congregations in Wales. The scriptures regained their centrality, and the church again became an important setting for religious instruction. The incorporation of some elements of the biblical model into the Sunday

¹³⁶Cope, 48; Garland, 674; and Reed and Prevost, 259. The official name of the SSS was The Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday-Schools in the Different Counties of England. As the Sunday school program extended to Wales, Ireland, and the British colonies, the name was changed to The Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday-Schools Throughout the British Dominions. The work of the SSS soon bore positive results. It added more popularity and a broader base to the Sunday school program so that by 1787, Raikes stated, Sunday school enrollment had reached 250,000 students. By Raikes's death in 1811 there were about 400,000 students enrolled in the Sunday school program; by 1831 there were about 1,250,000 students enrolled in England; and by 1880 it was estimated that about 12,000,000 people were enrolled in the Sunday schools of the nation. Cope, 48; Knoff, 625; Merrill, 4; Reed and Prevost, 259; Rice, 21, 22; and Willis, 338.

¹³⁷Rice, 25.

¹³⁸Cope, 72.

¹³⁹Ibid.

school facilitated, at least to some extent, the transmission of the covenant relationship to believers.

During the nineteenth century, Sunday schools in Great Britain became more religious in nature with the Bible holding the main place in the curriculum. This new focus received formal support with the founding of the London Sunday School Union (LSSU) on 13 July 1803. The objectives of the LSSU were threefold: “to stimulate and encourage the education and religious instruction of the young; to improve the methods of instruction; and to furnish literature suited for Sunday-school.”¹⁴⁰ Toward the end of the century, most of the schools were meeting in buildings attached to churches.¹⁴¹ The inclusion of the Bible in the curriculum and the support received from the LSSU suggests that British Sunday schools were making a significant impact in the area of religious education. Despite the improvement, the biblical model for religious education was not completely implemented. While the Bible and the church received special emphasis, the home and the school components were still neglected. The collapse of the agrarian social system and apprenticeship education that was a consequence of the Industrial Revolution had not yet been fully addressed by the church or parliament. Family life and the informal and formal systems of education that had sustained the agrarian society were casualties of the social collapse within the new urban working class.

Early in the twentieth century, Hamilton Archibald, an innovative Sunday school

¹⁴⁰Rice, 23. The LSSU became the first Sunday school organization to publish teaching books and a teacher’s magazine. Garland, 674.

¹⁴¹Cope, 75, 76.

leader, determined to make Sunday school teaching more effective. “Arguing that education begins with the child, not with a book nor lesson, Sunday schools were graded into departments to cater for various age-groups.”¹⁴² Archibald’s ideas found support in leaders of several denominations. In various Sunday schools, teachers prepared their lessons based on the age of the group they were instructing. In 1920, the British Lessons Council assumed the responsibility for planning lesson courses.¹⁴³

During the twentieth century, however, the Sunday school decreased in importance for religious education with the inclusion of the study of religion in the curriculum of the British educational system.¹⁴⁴ Although such instruction gave British education a religious foundation, it also became a constant source of difficulty and division.¹⁴⁵ A growing number of individuals in Great Britain insisted that all religious instruction must be left wholly to voluntary agencies like church schools and Sunday schools.¹⁴⁶ But the Education Acts of 1944 in England and 1945 in Scotland set the terms

¹⁴²Meir, 333.

¹⁴³Ibid.

¹⁴⁴Knoff, 626.

¹⁴⁵This educational conflict started in 1833 when the British government made its first grant of money to the National Schools. These schools were founded by the National Society after it was established in 1811. In their curriculum, religious instruction was to be provided by the Episcopal Church and the subject matter was to be in harmony with the teachings of the church. Hence, this action was perceived as a direct support to one particular religious belief system, and therefore it was opposed by many nonconformists. Cope, 45, 46.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., 46.

within which religious instruction has been offered until the present time.¹⁴⁷

The genesis of the Sunday school movement in Great Britain was social rather than religious in nature. It commenced as an effort to provide poor children an opportunity to receive literacy and some religious education. Even though the movement did not enjoy the initial support of the churches and religious leaders, it grew to become a significant tool for providing religious education in Great Britain. However, the success of the movement did not completely restore the biblical model for religious education. In the twentieth century, by the inclusion of religious instruction in the national curriculum, the role and significance of the Sunday school was diminished. Although the national school system offered religious instruction, the curriculum was controversial. There was a tendency for both home and church to depend on the national system for religious learning, but the system was just the purveyor of knowledge and did not promote an experiential connection with God. Through the twentieth century, church and home relinquished responsibility for religious education to the state. As a result, the biblical foundation of religious education in Great Britain was weakened.

The Sunday School Movement in Europe and Other Parts of the World

The Sunday school movement in Great Britain furnished the model for similar schools on the European continent. Moreover, its success and potential for good also

¹⁴⁷The Education Acts of 1944 and 1945 set some basic terms pertaining to religious education. First, religious education should be a tool to provide religious information, not to do evangelism. Second, it must develop respect and understanding. Third, it should not promote an established religion or denomination. Alex R. Rodger, *Education and Faith in an Open Society* (London: Handsel Press, 1982), 59, 60.

motivated some people to establish Sunday schools in other parts of the world. Among these was Albert Woodruff, an American, who strove to introduce the Sunday school to Germany and France.¹⁴⁸

Woodruff began his work in 1798 when the first Sunday school was established in Germany for the purpose of providing general and religious education.¹⁴⁹ In doing so, he followed a similar pattern to the one used in Great Britain. As Woodruff followed the British pattern, the German Sunday school program focused mainly on the Bible and church components of the biblical model for religious education. He did not emphasize the role of the home and the school.

The movement continued to spread to other parts of the world in a similar fashion, and a Sunday school was opened in India in 1803,¹⁵⁰ the same year that the LSSU was established. The LSSU was instrumental in establishing more Sunday schools in India and extending the Sunday school work to China and Japan.¹⁵¹ Eventually, the first world Sunday school convention was held in London in 1889.¹⁵²

During the 1907 world convention in Rome, the World Sunday School

¹⁴⁸Rice, 26.

¹⁴⁹De Blois and Gorham, 45.

¹⁵⁰Meir, 334.

¹⁵¹Rice, 26.

¹⁵²Harold Calton Mason, "The History of Christian Education," in *An Introduction to Evangelical Christian Education*, ed. J. Edwards Hakes (Chicago: Moody Press, 1964), 33. World conventions continued to be held in various cities around the world until 1958 when the last one was called in Tokyo. Cully and Cully, 625.

Association was inaugurated and given responsibility for organizing future meetings and fostering the international growth of the Sunday school movement.¹⁵³ The new body helped to promulgate the Sunday school work in Europe, Australia, South Africa, and India.¹⁵⁴ As the educational work expanded beyond the boundaries of the Sunday school work, the name of the Association was changed in 1947 to the World Council of Christian Education (WCCE).¹⁵⁵ After a period of negotiations, the WCCE merged in 1971 into the World Council of Churches (WCC) and became its newly organized unit on education.¹⁵⁶ This educational unit remains under the umbrella of the WCC as a consultative body called the Commission on Education.¹⁵⁷

The Sunday school movement on the European continent and in other parts of the world was an important source of religious education for the Christian church in those territories. It encouraged the creation of world councils and promoted the organization of international conventions to advance the educational work of the movement. Through the Commission on Education of the WCC, religious education continues to be an important component of the educational ministry of the church around the world. However, the

¹⁵³Mason, 33.

¹⁵⁴Cully and Cully, 625; and Meir, 334.

¹⁵⁵Marvin J. Taylor, "A Historical Introduction to Religious Education," in *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 21; and Cully and Cully, 625.

¹⁵⁶Cully and Cully, 625; and Meir, 334.

¹⁵⁷The World Council of Churches was constituted at its first general assembly in Amsterdam on 23 August 1948. World Council of Churches, "History," *Who Are We?*, 3 June 2004, www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/who/history.html (accessed 3 June 2004).

Bible and the church remain as the main components of the biblical model that are emphasized in the Commission on Education of the WCC.¹⁵⁸

The Sunday School Movement in America

The impact of the Sunday school in America can hardly be overstated. It was used to educate the masses in the early period of American national life, and today it continues to have an influence in the lives of millions of Christians each week. Many perceive it as an important teaching arm of the Protestant churches to communicate the Christian faith.¹⁵⁹ When Sunday schools were introduced in America, conditions differed from those in England. The poverty and neglect of children found in Gloucester were not present in American towns. Also, unlike the English situation, the Sunday school was introduced in America with the general support of the churches.¹⁶⁰ This support gave the American Sunday school a religious orientation from its inception.

The first recorded Sunday school was established in the home of William Elliot in Virginia in 1785.¹⁶¹ The following year, a second one was organized in the house of Thomas Crenshaw in Hanover County, Virginia, under the leadership of Bishop

¹⁵⁸Ibid.; idem, "WCC Programme Work," *What Do We Do?*, 29 January 2007, www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/index-e.html (accessed 29 January 2007).

¹⁵⁹D. C. Borchert, "Sunday School," *HERE*, 623.

¹⁶⁰Cope, 72; Reed and Prevost, 260; Taylor, 17; and Walker, 458.

¹⁶¹This Sunday school was later transferred to the Burton-Grove Methodist Church in Accomack County, Virginia. Mason, 29.

Asbury.¹⁶² Based on the positive results of these two early Sunday schools, the Methodist Conference in Charleston, S.C., voted in February 1790 to organize Sunday schools in its parishes.¹⁶³ The Conference's decision was the beginning of a trend which placed the Sunday school formally in the care of the church. Methodist Sunday school leaders emphasized the centrality of the scriptures for religious education. The Bible and the church elements of the biblical model remained significant for the transmission of the faith in Sunday schools in America for the next two centuries.

On 19 December 1790, Methodist leaders called for a convention to meet in Philadelphia.¹⁶⁴ The purpose of this meeting was threefold: to secure religious instruction for poor children on Sunday, to provide them with basic elementary education, and to promote the organization of other Sunday schools in Philadelphia and other areas.¹⁶⁵ The result was the formation of the First Day or Sunday School Society (SSS) in January

¹⁶²Merrill, 94; and L. G. McAllister, "History of Christian Education," *HERE*, 304.

¹⁶³Merill, 94, 95. Individuals were appointed to teach gratis those who attended and instruction was provided during hours that did not interfere with public worship. Cope, 73.

¹⁶⁴The convention was called by Benjamin Rush, a medical doctor, along with a group of twelve prominent Philadelphians. J. M. Price, ed., et al., *A Survey of Religious Education*, 2d ed. (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), 235; Knoff, 625; and Rice, 45.

¹⁶⁵Ronald H. Cram, "The Origins and Purpose of the Philadelphia Sunday School and Adult School Union," *CEJ* 10, no. 3 (Spring 1990): 47; Anne M. Boylan, *Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution 1790-1880* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 7; Knoff, 625; Merrill, 95; and Price, 235.

1791,¹⁶⁶ and the church became the natural setting for conducting its work.

During these early years of the American Sunday school, the curriculum included numerous catechisms prepared to guarantee biblical understanding and purity. This catechetical method prevailed until about 1810 when the Bible gradually replaced the catechisms in the curriculum.¹⁶⁷ Yet there was little systematic Bible study, and stress was placed on memorization.¹⁶⁸ Nonetheless, the contributions made by these early initiatives were very significant for the time. They made Sunday more interesting to children, introduced children to a knowledge of the Bible, emphasized the value of childhood and youth, and called attention to the value of community in religious training.¹⁶⁹

However, by 1817, the American SSS was experiencing declining enrollments. In 1819, the last Sunday school operated by the SSS closed its doors.¹⁷⁰ Meanwhile, two other Sunday school societies had been inaugurated. The first one was the Female Union

¹⁶⁶Merrill, 95. The meeting was attended by representatives of different Christian denominations which made it possible for the Sunday school to remain relatively free of denominational control for a number of years. In 1804, the first denominational Sunday school was organized by the Broadway Baptist Church in Baltimore, Maryland. Price, 235.

¹⁶⁷Taylor, 18.

¹⁶⁸Instructors encouraged pupils to memorize large amounts of biblical material, but little time was left for examining the meaning of the various passages learned. De Blois and Gorham, 281; and Taylor, 18.

¹⁶⁹De Blois and Gorham, 281, 282.

¹⁷⁰These declining enrollments were first attributed to the growth of free charity day schools in Philadelphia and later to the introduction of Sunday schools by other religious societies. Boylan, 8, 9.

Society for the Promotion of Sunday School, formed in the city of New York in 1816; the second was the Philadelphia Sunday and Adult Society founded in 1817.¹⁷¹ Eventually, both institutions combined their resources to establish the American Sunday School Union (ASSU) in Philadelphia on 25 August 1824.¹⁷²

The ASSU played an important role in expanding Sunday schools in America.¹⁷³ As a result, the Sunday school became a vital channel for the evangelization and education of the American Western frontier.¹⁷⁴ It has been argued that the ASSU tried to maintain the interior of the nation as primarily Protestant by planting Sunday schools in churches within the cities.¹⁷⁵ As well as influencing the expansion of Sunday schools in America, the American Sunday School Union contributed to the development of Sunday school curricula until 1864,¹⁷⁶ founded the first Sunday school for blacks in St. Louis in

¹⁷¹The Philadelphia Sunday and Adult Society was established to cultivate unity and Christian purity among the different Christian denominations, and to promote the establishment of more schools in the Philadelphia area. Boylan, 13; and De Blois and Gorham, 48, 49.

¹⁷²De Blois and Gorham, 50.

¹⁷³The ASSU penetrated the trans-Appalachian frontier and established Sunday schools in many settlements in the Mississippi Valley. Price, 235.

¹⁷⁴Bibles, song books, and readers were purchased for use in Sunday schools to evangelize and educate individuals on the American Western frontier. See De Blois and Gorham, 285; Knoff, 625; Mason, 30; and Reed and Prevost, 261.

¹⁷⁵Winthrop S. Hudson, *Religion in America*, 4th ed. (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1987), 273-79; and Reed and Prevost, 261.

¹⁷⁶The curricula included the preparation and introduction of the first International Lesson System. De Blois and Gorham, 52; Elias, 165; and Taylor, 18.

1818,¹⁷⁷ and served as a platform for ecumenical dialogue.¹⁷⁸

As the work of the Union was advancing, a need for reform in the Sunday school curricula became evident around the 1860s.¹⁷⁹ Consequently, a principle of complete uniformity for the Sunday school lesson was adopted in the fifth national convention of the ASSU held in Indianapolis in 1872.¹⁸⁰ Doctrinal, denominational, and logistic reasons, however, militated against this principle of uniformity. As a consequence, in 1930, the uniform lessons were replaced by others more attuned to the doctrinal positions of individual denominations.¹⁸¹

The increased attendance of delegates from outside the United States to the conventions of the Union led the leaders of the organization to change its name in 1906 to the International Sunday School Association (ISSA).¹⁸² The leaders of the association strengthened the local and national promotion of the Sunday school as a Bible-based educational entity under the leadership of interested, volunteer laity. Simultaneously,

¹⁷⁷Eventually, more Sunday schools were established by black denominations like the African Methodist Episcopal and the Methodist Episcopal Zion Churches. Cope, 74; and Reed and Prevost, 262.

¹⁷⁸Cram, 47.

¹⁷⁹The popularity of the International Lesson System set the stage for considerable competition in curriculum preparation. Some denominations decided to prepare and publish their own sets of lessons for use in their own churches. A number of private publishing companies also prepared and published different sets of lessons for use by various Christian denominations. Taylor, 18.

¹⁸⁰Knoff, 626; Mason, 30, 31; and Taylor, 19.

¹⁸¹Garland, 672.

¹⁸²Pope, 91.

boards of education from different denominations were establishing trained, professional staff for the purpose of doing similar publicity within their communions. However, the lay leadership of ISSA provided little opportunity for the participation of these denominational leaders. This lack of opportunities led leaders from various faiths to organize the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations (SSCED) in 1910.¹⁸³

The leadership of this new organization was largely composed of clergy. Some of these ministers adopted a liberal bent in their theological views.¹⁸⁴ Thus tensions regarding educational policy and control of the Sunday school program arose between the SSCED and ISSA.¹⁸⁵ These tensions were finally resolved by merging the two

¹⁸³Taylor, 20.

¹⁸⁴Protestant liberalism began to take shape during the 1870s in America when some leaders sought to restate the essential doctrines of the Protestant faith in terms they considered would be more intelligible and convincing. Leaders like Henry Ward Beecher, Charles Hodge, and Horace Bushnell recognized that the mere repetition of doctrines from their old theological system would no longer satisfy the intellectual and scientific climate of modern times. Thus a new theology was fashioned with an emphasis on Christian experience rather than upon external dogmatic authority. The stress on Christian experience permitted Protestant liberals to bridge the gap between the natural and the supernatural, and to give due recognition to the claims of science and the scientific method. The center for this new theology was Chicago where William Rainey Harper and John D. Rockefeller had established the University of Chicago in 1892. Through the stimulus of Harper's interests, the University of Chicago pioneered a new scientific approach to religious education. Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 63, 64; Van A. Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1964), 144-46; William Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology*, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1968), 73-110; Estep, "Liberal Theology," *EDCE*, 429, 430; R. K. Johnston, "Liberal Evangelicalism," *EDT*, 631; R. V. Pierard, "Theological Liberalism," *EDT*, 631-34; Hudson, 249-59; and Mason, 32.

¹⁸⁵Taylor, 20.

organizations in 1922 and forming the new International Sunday School Council of Religious Education, later shortened to the International Council of Religious Education (ICRE).¹⁸⁶

This new organization provided a more flexible structure to meet both existing and future needs of the different denominations. The governing body of the International Council was comprised of an equal number of denominational and lay representatives. The Bible and church components of the biblical model remained the main instruments for providing religious education. From the beginning, the dominant objective of the Council was “to convert educational ideals into the language of the leadership of the average church [Sunday] school and to make available to all the educational experiences, plans, and resources of the many cooperating religious bodies.”¹⁸⁷ The ICRE published the *International Journal of Religious Education*,¹⁸⁸ which focused on curricula, methods, administration, supervision, and other aspects of Christian education. The contribution of the ICRE continued until its merger in 1950 with other interdenominational agencies to establish the National Council of Christian Churches.¹⁸⁹

The merger was partially a response to the declining enrollment in Sunday schools

¹⁸⁶Ibid., 21.

¹⁸⁷Karl R. Stolz, “Historical Development of Religious Education in America,” in *Studies in Religious Education*, ed. Philip Henry Lotz and L. W. Crawford (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931), 48. See also Taylor 20, 21.

¹⁸⁸Ibid., 48, 49.

¹⁸⁹Taylor, 21; and Mason, 33.

of mainline Protestant denominations toward the middle of the twentieth century.¹⁹⁰ According to Newton, an evangelical scholar, this loss of enrollment was the consequence of a number of factors. These include the influence of Protestant liberal theology in the Sunday school curricula, the attitude that the world needed education more than Jesus for its salvation, and the movement away from the lay leadership of the Sunday school to denominational and professional leadership in an attempt to improve the educational standards of the Sunday school.¹⁹¹ Although the new Council of Churches maintained the church as the main setting for religious education, under the influence of the more liberal theology, the Bible was no longer the normative standard for the Sunday school curricula. This affected the transmission of the covenant relationship to believers.

In contrast to the reduced enrollment in mainline Protestant Sunday schools, a number of evangelical congregations maintained a steady increase in attendance at their Sunday schools. Tom Nettles argues that this growth was possibly the result of their strong theological heritage, devotion to the scriptures as the final arbiter in doctrinal matters, and dedication to the proclamation of the gospel.¹⁹²

¹⁹⁰Newton, 673.

¹⁹¹Ibid.

¹⁹²Ibid.; and Tom J. Nettles, "Evangelicalism," *EDCE*, 263. Evangelical Sunday schools maintained a strong evangelistic emphasis with the purpose of sharing the gospel with the world. This emphasis on the scriptures and evangelism received further support with the founding of two new entities. The first was the National Association of Evangelicals (1942), which provided an orthodox alternative to Protestant liberalism. The second was Fuller Theological Seminary (1947), which served as an evangelical center for continued academic and intellectual research. Nettles, 264, 265; and R. V.

Though the challenges faced in mainline Protestant Sunday schools did not change significantly through the latter half of the twentieth century, the Sunday school movement continued to make significant contributions to the life of many Christian congregations and to religious education in America. Sunday school teachers have provided biblical instruction to believers, deepened the faith of numerous congregations, helped to form the character of individuals, sensitized people to ethical questions, trained church leaders, and created awareness of the role of the church around the world.

Based on an analysis of the history of the Sunday School movement, it becomes apparent that, even though the Sunday school remains the primary teaching arm of the church to communicate the Christian faith, the biblical model for religious education has not generally been fully implemented in mainline Protestant congregations in North America. Contrary to mainline Protestants, Evangelicals have made important efforts to implement the biblical model. Evangelical church and Sunday school leaders have placed the Bible at the center of religious instruction. The home, church, and school components of the biblical model have also been emphasized in their religious education program.¹⁹³

Pierard, "Evangelicalism," *EDT*, 379-81.

¹⁹³Evangelical leaders like James C. Dobson, William Maier, and John Fuller are authors, speakers, and hosts of different programs on family matters. Through their work, they have stressed the centrality of the home for religious instruction. Dobson is founder and chairman of Focus on the Family, a non-profit organization that produces national and international radio programs. Fuller is the co-host of the daily "Focus on the Family" radio program. Maier is an author, a speaker, and a vice-president at Focus on the Family. He hosts the national "Weekend Magazine" radio program and the "Family Minute with Dr. Bill Maier." He also acts as a media spokesperson for Focus on a variety of family-related issues. Evangelical emphasis on the church setting has mainly come from the teaching ministry of the Sunday school. Evangelicals have also focused on the school agency through institutions like Fuller Theological Seminary, Asbury Theological

Imported from England, the Sunday school is one of the longest lasting religious movements in American history and still remains one of the largest and most robust ecclesiastical organizations in the United States.

The Religious Education Association

The religious education movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Great Britain, Europe, and America developed a more tangible identity in the twentieth century with the founding of the Religious Education Association [REA] in 1903. From the beginning, the new organization found wide acceptance and popularity among clergy and educators, and within the councils of various denominations and religious groups. Its work contributed significantly to making religious education a distinct profession.

At the turn of the twentieth century, widespread dissatisfaction existed among religious and educational leaders with the revivalistic approach of the Sunday school to religious education and the perceived inadequacies of the Sunday school to deal with modern intellectual and scientific issues.¹⁹⁴ These issues led a group of individuals known as the Council of the Seventy to meet on two separate occasions in 1902 to

Seminary, and Baylor University. Focus on the Family, "Press Biographies," *Press Room*, 27 December 2007, www.focusonthefamily.com/press/focusvoices (accessed 27 December 2007); and Nettles, 263.

¹⁹⁴Herman E. Wornom, "The Religious Education Association," in *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 359; and Elias, 167. ISSA had also decided in its Denver convention in the spring of 1902 not to develop any more advanced, graded lessons, which concerned some of the leading thinkers in the field of religious education. Boardman W. Kathan, ed., "Pioneers of Religious Education in the 20th Century," *RE* 73, no. 5-S (September-October 1978): S-7.

address the problem.¹⁹⁵ At their second meeting, the Council, led by William Rainey Harper, a Baptist scholar and linguist, decided to issue a formal call for a national convention to meet in Chicago sometime in February or March 1903.¹⁹⁶ The official rationale and call for the convention read as follows:

We, the undersigned, members and associates of the Council of the Seventy, and others, believing

1. That the religious and moral instruction of the young is at present inadequate, and imperfectly correlated with other instruction in history, literature, and the sciences; and
 2. That the Sunday-school, as the primary institution for the religious and moral education of the young, should be conformed to a higher ideal, and made efficient for its work by the gradation of pupils, and by the adoption of its material and method of instruction to the several stages of the mental, moral and spiritual growth of the individual; and
 3. That the home, the day school, and all other agencies should be developed to assist in the right education of the young in religion and morals; and
 4. That this improvement in religious and moral instruction can best be promoted by a national organization devoted exclusively to this purpose,
- Unite in calling a convention, under the auspices of the Council of the Seventy, to assemble in a city to be designated, in the month of February or March 1903, for the creation of such a national organization, the convention to consist of (a) members and associate members of the Council of the Seventy; (b) invited teachers, ministers, and editors; (c) invited pastors of churches and superintendents of Sunday-schools.¹⁹⁷

In addition to expressing the need for improving the current condition of religious and moral education, the above rationale makes some significant statements about the

¹⁹⁵The Council of the Seventy was responsible for directing the American Institute of Sacred Literature organized by William R. Harper, president of the University of Chicago at the time. The Council's first meeting took place on 20 August 1902 and the second on 13 October 1902. Cope, 201; and Stolz, 49.

¹⁹⁶Boardman W. Kathan, "Religious Education Association," *HERE*, 545; and Cope, 201, 202.

¹⁹⁷Cope, 202, 203.

nature of religious education during the nineteenth century. First, the Sunday school was the main purveyor of religious instruction, and the church was the primary center where the young came to learn. Second, the role of the home and school in religious education was minimized, and the incorporation of these two institutions to improve the educational program of the youth was acknowledged and requested. Third, the implementation of the elements of the biblical model should be promoted and supervised by a national organization. However, as the new organization was created and its purpose and constitution drafted, the school and church agencies became the main focus of its religious education program.

The proposed convention was held in Chicago on 10-12 February 1903.¹⁹⁸ At this meeting, the Religious Education Association was formally organized with 1,259 charter members from both the United States and Canada.¹⁹⁹ A threefold purpose for the new

¹⁹⁸The convention was attended by more than 3,000 individuals among whom were representatives from twenty-three states and the Dominion of Canada. These representatives included college and university presidents, deans and professors of theological seminaries, and Sunday school and other religious workers. All the business meetings were held in different churches in the Chicago area. Cope, 203, 204; Kathan, "Religious Education Association," 545; and Reed and Prevost, 306.

¹⁹⁹The REA was officially organized in the meeting held at the University Congregational Church in Hyde Park, Chicago. Reverend Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., then dean of the Yale Divinity School, was nominated as the first president; Nicholas Murray Butler, LL.D., president of Columbia University, was named the first vice-president; and William R. Harper, LL.D., was selected as chairman of the executive board. The incorporation papers for the new organization were filed and a constitution was drafted. The constitution was modeled after the National Education Association. Included among the charter members were distinguished academicians and clergymen like G. Stanley Hall, George Albert Coe, Francis G. Peabody, Booker T. Washington, and John Dewey. The work of the association was arranged into a small number of departments. Each department had an executive unit to conduct its activities. However, this departmental structure would eventually become impractical and disappear by 1927.

organization was adopted at the Boston convention in 1905.²⁰⁰ This threefold purpose served “to inspire the educational forces of our country with the religious ideal; to inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal; and to keep before the public mind the ideal of Religious Education, and the sense of its need and value.”²⁰¹ The particular focus of the educational ideal was to incorporate the insights of psychology, the practices of modern pedagogy, and the findings of critical and historical scholarship in teaching the Bible in the field of religious education. In addition, religious instruction should be integrated with education in history, literature, and the sciences.²⁰²

The focus on the educational ideal allowed the REA to develop better graded materials and curricula for Sunday school classes, to provide for more adequate training of teachers, and to promote unity among those who were working toward a higher ideal of religious and moral education.²⁰³ The educational ideal also motivated the leaders of the organization to introduce in April 1906 the journal *Religious Education* under the

Kendig Brubacker Cully, “Religious Education Association,” *WDCE*, 566; Stephen A. Schmidt, “Religious Education Association (REA),” *EDCE*, 590; Kathan, “Pioneers of Religious Education in the 20th Century,” S-14; and Wornom, 362.

²⁰⁰Merrill, 564.

²⁰¹Kathan, “Religious Education Association,” 545.

²⁰²Wornom, 359. The growing dissatisfaction with the Sunday school led the REA to professionalize the field of religious education. Georgia Harkness, “An Underlying Philosophy for Religious Education,” in *Studies in Religious Education*, ed. Philip Henry Lotz and L. W. Crawford (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931), 58-61; and Elias, 170.

²⁰³Kathan, “Pioneers of Religious Education in the 20th Century,” S-13; and Winchester, “The Task of Religious Education,” 227-31.

editorship of its first general secretary, Henry Frederick Cope.²⁰⁴ These initiatives show the concern of the REA with the effects of the intellectual and cultural climate at all levels of education and not just with course offerings in religion or with the religious activities of students.

In the beginning, the new association was almost entirely Protestant in its complement and interests. The bulk of its members came from churches, schools, and colleges in the United States with a small representation from Canada.²⁰⁵ A consensus soon developed among the leaders and members that a broader fellowship of scholars would benefit the REA. As a result, the administrators of the REA invited Catholic and Jewish religious and educational leaders to join the new organization and to participate in its programs.²⁰⁶

The theological direction of the new organization was liberal from its inception. Many of its leaders were disillusioned with “the staid biblicism of the American Sunday school movement” and, therefore, attempted to reconcile Christianity with the intellectual

²⁰⁴Henry Frederick Cope stated in the first issue of the journal that *Religious Education* was not going to be academic but practical and that its policy was to adopt “no educational panacea or religious philosophy.” Therefore, the new journal included articles and convention papers on various topics in the field of religious education. Cope, “Introductory,” 2; and William Rainey Harper, “The Scope and Purpose of the New Organization,” in *The Religious Education Association: Proceedings of the First Annual Convention* (Chicago: Executive Office of the Religious Education Association, 1903), 234.

²⁰⁵Laird T. Hites, “The Religious Education Association,” in *Studies in Religious Education*, ed. Philip Henry Lotz and L. W. Crawford (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931), 393. See also Reed and Prevost, 368; and Wornom, 361.

²⁰⁶Hites, 395.

world that emerged after the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859).²⁰⁷ These leaders considered the Bible as one of a number of resources available for religious education, and for some, it had no claim to preferential treatment.²⁰⁸ The concern of the REA to reconcile the Christian faith with the scientific ideas of the time gave the organization a different direction. The initial purpose for founding the new association was to promote religious instruction through the home, church, and school settings. However, as the REA developed, the scripture and home components of the biblical model received more theoretical than practical emphasis.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁷Schmidt, 589. The leading individual behind the attempt to reconcile Christianity with the intellectual world was the American theologian George Albert Coe, a professor at Union Theological Seminary. Coe tried to wed Protestant liberal theology to elements of the progressive educational theory. Some of these elements were the "utilization of the new disciplines of psychology and sociology, emphasis on the child's growth and learning through active experiences, stress on adapting education to the interests of learners, and forging a close connection between education and social change and reform." Elias, 168; see also Hordern, 79; Johnston, 631; and Pierard, "Theological Liberalism," *EDT*, 632.

²⁰⁸Protestant liberals believed that the importance of the Bible for religious education grew out of its valuable social narratives and not because it was the authoritative Word of God. J. Donald Butler, *Religious Education: The Foundations and Practice of Nurture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 116; Estep, "Liberal Theology," *EDCE*, 429; Hordern, 79; and Elias, 170.

²⁰⁹The literature of the time shows that members of the REA focused on the components of the biblical model. However, the actual emphasis of the association was on the church through the Sunday school program and the school. Robert J. Hutcheon, "The Family: What the Home Should Contribute to Religion," *RE* 16 (February 1921–December 1921): 250; Harry Levi, "Parents as Educators," *RE* 12 (February 1917–December 1917): 359; Charles Franklin Thwing, "The Family as an Agency for Religious Education," *RE* 10 (February 1915–December 1915): 280; G. Stanley Hall, "The Place of Formal Instruction in Religious and Moral Education," in *The Aims of Religious Education: The Proceedings of the Third Annual Convention of The Religious Education Association* (Chicago: Executive Office of the Association, 1905), 69, 71; Price, Carpenter, and Chapman, 259; George H. Betts, "What Does Religious Education

The influence of the REA was felt in the development of the new position of Director of Education in various denominations and the organization of departments of religious education in seminaries and major universities.²¹⁰ As a result, the field of religious education blossomed during the first two decades of the twentieth century. However, it was essentially concerned with social and cultural reconstruction and not with individual salvation.²¹¹ After those two decades of growth, the profession declined from the 1930s through 1945. Financial difficulties during the Great Depression and World War II forced church administrators to release staff and to combine various positions in order to meet their tight fiscal situation.²¹²

In addition to the financial conditions of the time, the liberal theology of the REA was challenged by Christian leaders of two theological ideologies: neo-orthodoxy and evangelicalism. Neo-orthodoxy derived its name from the leaders' attempt to return to

Mean to the Church?" *RE* 15 (February 1920–December 1920): 161, 165; Randolph Crump Miller, *The Clue to Christian Education* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), 12; idem, *The Theory of Christian Education Practice: How Theology Affects Christian Education*, 155, 156.

²¹⁰Some of these schools focused their religious education programs on lay ministers who would serve in the tradition of the Sunday school movement. Other educational institutions placed more emphasis on the clergy, who in the tradition of the pastor-teacher role, would train and equip lay persons for specific leadership in various church programs. By 1915, programs in religious education had been launched in institutions like Columbia University, Union Theological Seminary, the University of Chicago, Yale University, and Boston College. Eventually, these schools started offering master's and doctoral degrees in religious education. Bruce P. Powers, "History of the Christian Education Profession," *EDCE*, 335; Reed and Prevost, 367; and Williams, 132.

²¹¹Estep, "Liberal Theology," *EDCE*, 429.

²¹²The Director of Education, a full-time position dedicated to providing religious education in the church, was combined with the office work of the church. Powers, 335.

classical Christianity as found in the Protestant Reformation, the creeds of the church, and the Bible itself. Neo-orthodox leaders had been educated in the liberal theological tradition, yet their desire to engage with the Bible itself and rediscover the distinctive claims of Christianity led them to break all alliances with philosophy, the sciences, and culture.²¹³ These elements were perceived as responsible for distorting the Christian message in order that it might conform to the spirit of the time.²¹⁴ Despite the rejection of much theological liberalism, neo-orthodox theologians kept some liberal views which did not allow a complete return to classical orthodoxy.²¹⁵

Neo-orthodox scholars stressed such concepts as human sinfulness, revelation in Christ, the church as a fellowship of believers, and the need for a subjective, personal encounter with the Lord. Although this focus seemed to be a restatement of classical

²¹³Alasdair I. C. Heron, *A Century of Protestant Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980), 74-98; and Stanley J. Grenz and Roger E. Olson, *20th Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 63-77.

²¹⁴The neo-orthodox position regarding the Bible and Christian faith possibly motivated some religious educators to consider this theological current as an orthodox alternative to Protestant liberal theology. According to some scholars, the book *Faith and Nurture* (1941) by H. Shelton Smith, a professor of religious education, and a report entitled "The Church and Christian Education" (1947) were two attempts to reformulate religious education along neo-orthodox lines. The latter was the result of a study that was started in 1944 by the International Council of Religious Education regarding the theological and educational foundations of religious education. Thompson, "The Role of Theology in Religious Education: An Introduction," 6; Butler, 119; and Elias, 172, 173.

²¹⁵James C. Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Vatican II* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1971), 340; Estep, "Neoorthodoxy," *EDCE*, 503, 504; Pierard, "Theological Liberalism," *EDT*, 634, 635; R. V. Schnucker, "Neo-orthodoxy," *EDT*, 754-56; Harvey, 162-64; Hordern, 101-29, 150-69; Schmidt, 590; and Walker, 545.

orthodoxy, it failed to go back to belief in the Bible as propositionally revealed and recorded truth.²¹⁶ Neo-orthodoxy saw the true meaning of biblical narratives as lying outside the purview of scientific investigation. These narratives were a depiction of events that contain symbolic, mythic, and parabolic truth, but not literal or scientific fact.²¹⁷ These views affected the transmission of the covenant relationship to neo-orthodox followers. In the 1960s and beyond, neo-orthodoxy was overshadowed by the emergence of a pluralism of theologies that resulted in a multiplicity of approaches to the study of religious education.²¹⁸

A number of evangelical Christian educators were also concerned with the growing influence of liberalism in Sunday schools.²¹⁹ Unlike those who accepted

²¹⁶Although the Bible was viewed as authoritative, it was not regarded as the content of God's revelation, but as a witness to divine revelation. Similarly, the church was not considered the only repository of ultimate truth because truth can also be learned from secularism. See Estep, "Neoorthodox," *EDCE*, 503; Butler, 118-20; Hordern, 503; and Schnucker, 756.

²¹⁷Livingston, 339-41. Karl Barth, a well-known neo-orthodox theologian, provides an example of how biblical narratives were considered. "But inasmuch as the occurrence was conditioned by the resurrection, in so far, that is, as it was not the 'coming to pass,' or the discovery, or the recognition, which conditioned its necessity and appearance and revelation, the resurrection is not an event in history at all." Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 29.

²¹⁸Estep, "Neoorthodox," *EDCE*, 503; and Elias, 175. The 1960s was a period of social unrest. During this time questions were raised regarding the relevance of the church and religion to the problems of the world. But these questions did not receive satisfactory answers from neo-orthodox circles. Thompson, "The Role of Theology in Religious Education: An Introduction," 11.

²¹⁹Evangelicals were also uncomfortable with the strong influence of progressive education and liberalism in the REA. Nancy L. DeMott, "Minister of Christian Education," *EDCE*, 471, 472; Cully and Cully, 304; and Pazmiño, 55.

neo-orthodoxy, the evangelicals regarded the Bible as God’s absolute standard of truth in all that it affirms. Evangelicals espoused the metaphysical and epistemological reality that God’s revealed message to humankind is found in the Bible.²²⁰ Their strong theological stance enabled them to keep the Bible central in their religious instruction and ministry.²²¹

Uncomfortable with the inclusiveness of the different theological persuasions in the REA, evangelical ministers and educators preferred to use the term “Christian education” to refer to their Bible-based ministry. These leaders defined Christian education as a Bible-based teaching-learning process of the church that seeks to bring people to a saving knowledge of Christ, train them for a life of discipleship, and equip them for service in the world.²²² Unlike those who accepted the neo-orthodox position, evangelicals have emphasized the importance of the home, church, and school and have diligently worked to reach the aims of the biblical model.²²³

²²⁰Robert P. Lightner, *Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986), 9-32. Many evangelicals are in disagreement in regard to the extent of the Bible’s inspiration. While some accept that the Bible in its autographs is free from error and omission, others believe in an inspired but errant scripture.

²²¹Williams, 132.

²²²Werner C. Graendorf, ed., *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972), 16; Pazmiño, 56-60, 86-88; and Williams, 133.

²²³See Samuel N. Natale, “A Family Systems Approach to Religious Education and Development,” *RE* 74, no. 3 (May–June 1979): 246, 250; Wesner Fallaw, “The Role of the Home in Religious Nurture,” in *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, ed. by Marvin J. Taylor (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 147, 148; Reed and Prevost, 272, 273, 276, 352; Françoise Darcy-Bérubé, “The Challenge Ahead of Us,” in *Foundations of Religious Education*, ed. Padraic O’Hare (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 153; Williams, 133; and D. Campbell Wyckoff, “Religious Education as a

Starting in the mid-1940s, evangelical leaders conducted meetings that culminated in the formation of various organizations that have affected religious education through the second half of the twentieth century and the early part of the twenty-first century. Through these entities, they promoted the growth of evangelical Christian education. These organizations will be discussed later in this section.

The financial and theological challenges of the REA left the association weak and disillusioned. By the time Herman Wornom became general secretary in 1952,²²⁴ the REA had experienced a loss in influence and members. Wornom's ecumenical vision, however, helped him revive within the membership of the REA a strong interest in research and social science insights related to teaching and learning.²²⁵ Higher education became the object of special emphasis in religious education.²²⁶ The next eighteen years under Wornom's leadership brought growth and transformation to the REA as religious educators across the country took the association more seriously. Upon his retirement in 1970, Wornom was replaced by Boardman W. Kathan.²²⁷ Under Kathan, the REA started holding biennial conventions in American and Canadian cities.

Discipline," *RE* 62, no. 5 (September 1967–October 1967): 393. Some examples are provided on p. 62, fn. 2, to illustrate the evangelical focus on the biblical model.

²²⁴Herman E. Wornom, "The Religious Education Association," *RE* 58, no. 5 (September–October 1963): 450.

²²⁵Schmidt, 590.

²²⁶Wornom, "The Religious Education Association," *RE*, 449.

²²⁷In 1970, the executive office of the REA was moved to the campus of Yale Divinity School. Kathan, "Religious Education Association," 546.

In 2003, the REA celebrated its first centennial of service to the field of religious education. Its diverse membership now includes religious educators from the Baha'i, Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, Muslim, and Protestant traditions.²²⁸ From its inception, the REA was well accepted and supported by many religious and educational leaders in North America. The publication of the journal *Religious Education*, the creation of the position of director of education in different congregations, and the organization of departments of religious education in several institutions of higher learning are contributions that illustrate the influence of the association during the first decade of its existence. The initial goals of REA's leaders were also notable. Among those ideals were included the development of better curricula and materials for Sunday school classes; the implementation of the home, church, and school as agencies for religious instruction; and the promotion of unity among religious educators.

Despite these contributions, the REA in 2008 is less influential than it was in the past. The diminished influence of the REA may be noted in such areas as leadership aims and participation in conferences. Unlike the early leadership of the association, current leaders have less expansive goals.²²⁹ In fact, the leaders' main objective is to "create opportunities for exploring and advancing the interconnected practices of scholarship, research, teaching, and leadership in faith communities, academic institutions, and the

²²⁸The Religious Education Association, "History of the Religious Education Association," *REA History*, 2 January 2008, www.religiouseducation.net/org/rea/reahistory.htm (accessed 2 January 2008).

²²⁹Helen Allan Archibald, "Originating Visions and Visionaries of the REA," *RE* 98, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 224.

wider world community.”²³⁰ In addition, the regular national conferences of the REA are no longer widely attended. An average of 250 members participate in the national meetings of the association.²³¹

One of the REA’s important contributions that steadily continues is the publication of the journal *Religious Education*. Although the journal is edited and published by the REA, members of the Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education (APRRE) support the publication of *Religious Education* through financial donations and contribution of articles.²³² Although the contribution of the REA to the field of religious education has been significant, it has been suggested that its usefulness may be superceded by other organizations in coming years.²³³

One significant challenge that the REA faced toward the middle of the twentieth century was the formation of a new association of religious educators among evangelicals. In 1944, evangelical leaders initiated a series of meetings with the Church School Commission of the National Association of Evangelicals. The result of these discussions was the formation of the National Sunday School Association (NSSA) in

²³⁰The Religious Education Association, “About Us,” *About REA*, 30 December 2007, www.religiouseducation.net/org/AboutREA.htm (accessed 30 December 2007).

²³¹Archibald, 224; and Schmidt, 591.

²³²The Religious Education Association, “Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education,” *History of APRRE*, 30 December 2007, www.religiouseducation.net/oldwebsite/org/aprre/aprre_history_future.htm (accessed 30 December 2007). The content of the journal is now more academic, written largely for university and seminary professors and not for parish religious educators. Schmidt, 591. APRRE will be discussed later in this section.

²³³Schmidt, 591.

1945. Through the NSSA, the Sunday schools of many evangelical churches were revitalized in the mid-twentieth century. The Bible and the church were central to the program of the National Sunday School Association.

As members of the Research Commission of the NSSA concentrated more on the needs of higher education, the commission recommended in 1970 changing the name of the NSSA to the National Association of Professors of Christian Education (NAPCE).²³⁴ The function of this association was “to provide fellowship and dialogue for teachers of Christian education and related disciplines who serve in evangelical Bible colleges, liberal arts colleges, and theological seminaries.”²³⁵ Thus the educational component of the biblical model received special attention from NAPCE. In 1991, the name NAPCE was slightly changed to the North American Professors of Christian Education to include members from beyond the United States borders in North America.

At present (2008), NAPCE continues “to enhance the intentional teaching mission of the church through the cultivation of personal and professional growth of professors within the broad field of educational ministries.”²³⁶ Through its efforts, the leaders of NAPCE want to promote research, writing and discussion with the purpose of giving focus, direction, and theological integration to educational ministries. They also work to

²³⁴North American Professors of Christian Education, “An Historical Perspective on NACPE,” *NAPCE History*, 22 May 2003, www.napce.org/history.html (accessed 22 May 2003).

²³⁵*Ibid.*

²³⁶North American Professors of Christian Education, “Welcome Christian Educators!” *Home*, 2 January 2008, www.napce.org (accessed 2 January 2008).

advance educational ministries in multi-cultural and cross-cultural contexts.²³⁷ NAPCE seems to enjoy stability as its finances and membership continue to grow.

Concurrent with the work of the Research Commission of the NSEA on higher education, the Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education (APRRE) was also established in 1970.²³⁸ It was founded to provide an ongoing forum to enhance the quality of teaching and research in religious education through sharing and encouraging the publication of scholarly works, and through ecumenical and interreligious dialogue.²³⁹ Almost from its inception, APRRE worked in cooperation with the REA, and the publication of *Religious Education* became a joint venture.²⁴⁰

The affiliation of the REA with APRRE brought both positive and negative results to the REA. On the positive side, it helped the REA to strengthen ties with the academic community without losing concern for religious education in the local church and synagogue.²⁴¹ But on the negative side, it dealt a serious blow to the intellectual

²³⁷Ibid.

²³⁸During the 1950s, the National Council of Churches helped to organize an annual meeting of the Professors and Research Section under the leadership of their Division of Christian Education. This section was dissolved in 1969 and reorganized as APRRE in 1970. Charles F. Melchert and Randy G. Litchfield, "Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education," *APRRE History*, 2 January 2008, www.religiouseducation.net/oldwebsite/org/aprre/aprre_history_future.htm (accessed 2 January 2008), 1.

²³⁹Ibid., 2.

²⁴⁰Ibid.

²⁴¹Although APRRE has strengthened the REA's ties with the academic community, the REA is still "concerned for religious education in the local church or synagogue." Reed and Prevost, 368.

leadership of the REA, for the majority of professors and teachers of religious education decided to join the APRRE.²⁴² Consequently, the intellectual energy and focus of religious education was shifted to the APRRE. The new association met the academic and professional needs of seminary and university teachers in religious education and became an important major professional organization for the academic leadership in religious education in North America.²⁴³

At present (2008), the APRRE has more than 300 members representing forty-three different denominations and religious groups in seventeen countries.²⁴⁴ The membership includes Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. No one theory or theology dominates the APRRE's approach to religious direction. Instead, the association supports cooperative approaches, feminist interests, liberation theologies (Latin American and African American), evangelical theologies, the social sciences, historical interests, more philosophically sophisticated educational theories, and a renewed interest in practical theology.²⁴⁵

From this discussion of the work and mission of the REA, APRRE, and NAPCE emerges a general picture of the state of religious education in the twenty-first century in North America. All three organizations have a common goal: the enhancement and promotion of religious education. Despite this commonality, they have major

²⁴²Schmidt, 590.

²⁴³Ibid.

²⁴⁴Melchert and Litchfield, 2.

²⁴⁵Ibid., 1.

philosophical and methodological differences for achieving that goal. While NAPCE maintains a strong evangelical approach to religious education, the REA and APRRE have a more liberal bent. The focus of the REA and APRRE is considered liberal for two reasons. First, both organizations support multiple theologies and sources of knowledge. Second, the membership of both entities includes Christian and non-Christian religious educators. Therefore, their philosophical foundation cannot be established upon a Christian view of reality, and the communication of God's covenant relationship to future generations of believers cannot be a primary aim. Rather, this religious plurality demands of necessity that the leaders of the REA and APRRE define their metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological realities, and thereby their mission, in a way that is acceptable to all parties concerned.

The ideological differences between NAPCE and the other two entities have significantly affected religious education in the twenty-first century in North America. They have generated confusion regarding the nature and definition of religious instruction in North America. At the same time, each organization appears to have various views, opinions, and questions about religious education that have impeded a full implementation of all the components of the biblical model. The diverse cultural identities and inter-faith collegiality within the REA and APRRE make it impossible to have all elements of the biblical model incorporated into their philosophical foundation. NAPCE's Christian view of reality, on the other hand, seems to have particularly emphasized the Bible and church setting of the biblical model. Thus the non-incorporation of all the components of the biblical model and the use of various

theologies and approaches to religious education have not been conducive to formulating a coherent definition and philosophy of religious education in the twenty-first century. Instead, there is still uncertainty about what religious education is and where it is going.²⁴⁶

NAPCE's special emphasis on the church and the Bible can still be seen in 2008 in the Christian education programs of evangelical theological seminaries across the country. These programs are especially designed to meet the specific needs of the church and to prepare students to serve their congregations by providing nurture, spiritual formation, and discipleship.²⁴⁷ Some of the concentrations offered in these programs include Leadership and Administration, Youth Ministries, Ministry-Based Evangelism, Christian Spirituality, Christian Formation, Adult Ministries, Missions, Psychology and Counseling, and Church Recreation.²⁴⁸ Few concentrations are offered to prepare

²⁴⁶Burgess, 1; Moran, 98; and Williams, "Christian Education," *EDCE*, 132. This confusion regarding the nature and direction of religious education may be noticed in the theme of the NAPCE 2003 annual conference "Christian Education at the Crossroads: Guiding Educational Ministries."

²⁴⁷See Asbury Theological Seminary, "M.A. in Christian Education," *Master of Art in Christian Education*, 28 January 2008, www.asburyseminary.edu/programs/academic/mace.htm (accessed 28 January 2008); North Park Theological Seminary, "The Master of Arts in Christian Education Degree," *NPTS - Catalog - MACE*, 28 January 2008, www.northpark.edu/sem/academics/catalog_pdfs/mace.pdf (accessed 28 January 2008); and Talbot School of Theology, "Master of Arts in Christian Education," *Talbot Programs*, 28 January 2008, www.talbot.edu/programs/mace/index.cfm (accessed 28 January 2008).

²⁴⁸These concentrations are offered by such theological institutions as Andover Newton Theological School, Andrews University Theological Seminary, Asbury Theological Seminary, Ashland Theological Seminary, Bethel Seminary, Calvin Theological Seminary, Claremont School of Theology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Haggard Graduate School of Theology, North Park Theological Seminary, Reformed Theological Seminary, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Talbot School of

individuals in the family and school settings, such as Family Life, Children's Ministries, Cross-cultural Education Ministry, and General Christian Education.²⁴⁹ The attention given to the scriptures and the home, church, and school settings of the biblical model by several seminaries seems to provide a sense of direction to religious education in the twenty-first century within evangelicalism.

According to the preceding analysis, the ideals and initiatives of the Religious Education Association were welcomed by many North American ministers and educators as possible solutions to the perceived inadequacies of the Sunday school to deal with the intellectual matters of the time. Through its influence, the REA made significant contributions to the field of religious education such as the development of the position of director of education in several churches and the founding of departments of religious education in a number of institutions of higher learning. Thus religious education became a distinct academic program and profession. As financial conditions during the Great Depression became difficult and the theological orientation of the organization was challenged, REA's influence and membership decreased, and new religious education organizations emerged during the second half of the twentieth century. The ideals and ideologies of these institutions have offered essential background for understanding

Theology, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Trinity International University, and Wheaton College.

²⁴⁹Institutions that offered these concentrations include Andrews University Theological Seminary, Columbia International University, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Huntington College, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Talbot School of Theology, and Trinity International University.

religious education in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Seventh-day Adventist Foundations of Religious Education

The Seventh-day Adventist philosophy of religious education emerged from the writings and views of Ellen G. White (1827-1915) on education.²⁵⁰ In January 1872, she stated her initial position in an article entitled “Proper Education.”²⁵¹ This treatise embodied some fundamental principles that became the basis on which the Adventist educational philosophy was built. The essay contains three parts. The first part deals with the importance of education, the distinction between education and training, and an exposition of discipline as self-control. The second segment treats physical health and manual labor in relation to education.²⁵² The last section discusses the teaching of the Bible and the preparation for ministry. These educational perspectives were eventually expanded in later works.²⁵³

²⁵⁰Ellen G. White was a co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and a prolific writer on various topics, including religion, family, education, and health.

²⁵¹Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948), 3:131-60; idem, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 15-46.

²⁵²White envisioned an educational program where manual labor would offset the mental strain on the students. She also believed that schools should have industries, offering different kinds of outdoor jobs where students would be able to exercise, gain a practical knowledge of business, and pay for their tuition. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 3:135-58; and Marroquin, 48, 49.

²⁵³Edwin Carlton Walter, “A History of Seventh-day Adventist Higher Education in the United States” (Ed.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1966), 33, 34. White’s additional essays and books written on the subject of education are cited throughout this dissertation.

For White, God is the ultimate metaphysical source of education. “In a knowledge of God all true knowledge and real development have their source.”²⁵⁴ She stated the fundamental aim of education in the following words: “To restore in man the image of his maker, to bring him back to the perfection in which he was created, to promote the development of body, mind and soul, that the divine purpose in his creation might be realized—this was to be the work of redemption. This is the object of education, the great object of life.”²⁵⁵ This concept makes the work of education and the work of redemption one and the same.²⁵⁶

White’s ideas about education were holistic and biblical.²⁵⁷ For her, education was a life-time process that encompassed the whole person and the preparation for service in this life and for eternity. She did not view education as being static or finite but dynamic.²⁵⁸ White described this process in the following words:

True education means more than the pursual of a certain course of study. It means more than a preparation for the life that now is. It has to do with the whole being, and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the physical, the mental, and the spiritual powers. It prepares the

²⁵⁴White, *Education*, 14.

²⁵⁵Ibid., 15, 16.

²⁵⁶Ibid., 30.

²⁵⁷God’s plan of redemption was holistic in nature. It envisaged a full restoration of the individual’s body, mind, soul, and social interaction. Jesus sustained this view in the New Testament as well. This concept is discussed above, p. 14.

²⁵⁸Ibid., 19; and Erling Bernhard Snorrason, “The Aims of Education in the Writings of Ellen White” (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2005), 186.

student for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come.²⁵⁹

According to White, true education does not include merely the study of certain disciplines. It also has some epistemological and axiological goals. Genuine education aims to restore God's image in humankind, to teach the proper knowledge of God, to convert the heart, to develop the individual's faculties and character, and to restore humanity to the perfection in which it was created.²⁶⁰ Therefore, authentic education must be pursued by all proper means available at all stages of life. This type of education contributes to the harmonious development of all the powers available to human beings.²⁶¹

White argued that preparation for service should be imparted in three settings: the home, the temple/church, and the school.²⁶² This is a clear illustration of her commitment to the biblical model. The home is the setting where education begins; it is the child's first school.²⁶³ "The family circle is the school in which the child receives its first and

²⁵⁹White, *Education*, 13; idem, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 328, 512.

²⁶⁰White, *Education*, 15, 16, 30; idem, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1913), 11, 16-18, 21, 24, 49; and Snorrason, 188-234. According to Snorrason, "White believed that the ultimate aims of education have to do with the nature of human beings and God's purpose in creating them." Snorrason, 181.

²⁶¹Snorrason, 188.

²⁶²White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 231; idem, *Counsels on Education*, 154-61; idem, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*, 107-200; and George R. Knight, "Seventh-day Adventist Education," *EDCE*, 627, 628.

²⁶³Ellen G. White, *Child Guidance* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982), 1-2, 26-28. This concept is also discussed in idem,

most enduring lessons.”²⁶⁴ Lessons of respect, obedience, reverence, and self-control contribute to building the character of the person.²⁶⁵ White viewed instruction at home as a positive influence for training the youth.

Home education prevailed during the patriarchal period, and, according to White, it “was the method of education that God desired to establish in Israel.”²⁶⁶ Bondage in Egypt and Israel’s exposure to the Egyptian religion, however, created the need for parents to be instructed as well. Thus God commanded Moses to build a sanctuary (Exod 25:8, 9). The sanctuary was the place where home education was complemented and the people received important lessons. “In the home and the sanctuary, through the things of nature and of art, in labor and in festivity . . . by methods and rites and symbols unnumbered, God gave to Israel lessons illustrating His principles and preserving the memory of His wonderful works. Then, as inquiry was made, the instruction given impressed the mind and heart.”²⁶⁷

White also saw the school as an important contributor to the education of the young. In biblical times, the “schools were intended to serve as a barrier against the wide-spreading corruption, to provide for the mental and spiritual welfare of the youth,

Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students, 107.

²⁶⁴White, *Child Guidance*, 65. White believed that the family should be the greatest educational agency. White, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*, 107; idem, *Counsels on Education*, 155-57.

²⁶⁵White, *Child Guidance*, 65.

²⁶⁶Ibid., 34. See also idem, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 95.

²⁶⁷White, *Education*, 41.

and to promote the prosperity of the nation by furnishing it with men qualified to act in the fear of God as leaders and counselors.”²⁶⁸ White viewed schools as effective means to advance righteousness among the people and believed that God uses them “as an aid to the parents in educating and preparing their children.”²⁶⁹ She counseled leaders in the Seventh-day Adventist Church to establish schools founded “upon the principles, and controlled by the precepts, of God’s word.”²⁷⁰

In addition to the home, church, and school settings, the Bible played a very significant epistemological role in White’s philosophy of education. She described it as “the most perfect educational book in our world.”²⁷¹ For her, the word of God was foundational for all learning, and its study “should have the first place in our system of education.”²⁷² More than any other book, the study of the scriptures strengthens, refines, and elevates the mind.²⁷³ As White analyzed the function of the home, the temple/church, the school, and the scriptures in the experiences of God’s children in the biblical period, she concluded that success in education can be attained only when the Christian Church

²⁶⁸Ibid., 46; idem, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 96, 368.

²⁶⁹White, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*, 167.

²⁷⁰White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 99.

²⁷¹Ibid., 392; idem, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*, 52.

²⁷²Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948), 5:21, 26. Although White viewed the Bible as foundational for instruction, she did not consider it the only source for learning.

²⁷³White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 393, 445, 449, 451; idem, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*, 421-30.

follows the biblical pattern. “With us, as with Israel of old, success in education depends on fidelity in carrying out the Creator’s plan. Adherence to the principles of God’s word will bring as great blessings to us as it would have brought to the Hebrew people.”²⁷⁴

When compared with the biblical model and analyzed from the perspective of the main philosophical categories, White’s philosophy of education appears to offer an approach to religious instruction based on scriptural principles. White’s educational concepts are reflected in the official literature of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.²⁷⁵ Thus, Adventist educational philosophy finds its basis in a Christian view of reality and concerns itself with God’s purpose in creating humanity, the nature and destiny of humans, and the challenges of educating for character development.²⁷⁶

According to the official literature of the denomination, the Seventh-day Adventist Church promotes religious education from a redemptive perspective through the home, church, and denominational educational institutions around the world. Religious instruction in the home setting is especially stressed through the study of the Sabbath school lesson. Sabbath school lessons are prepared by the General Conference

²⁷⁴White, *Education*, 50.

²⁷⁵Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *Seventh-day Adventist Minister’s Handbook* (Silver Spring, MD: Ministerial Association, 1997), 183, 184; and General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *Church Manual*, 16th ed. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2000), 117.

²⁷⁶Notwithstanding the ideals of the mission statement and educational philosophy of the Adventist Church, there are some challenges that hinder the ability of the denomination to achieve its goals. These challenges will be discussed later in this section. It should also be noted that Adventist religious education is not unique regarding the biblical model. Other Christians are also working diligently to achieve the same ideals of a strategy for education focused on the Bible, home, church, and school.

Sabbath School Department and made available to every church through the local Sabbath School department. This department is the primary system of religious education for the local congregation, and its publications give members an opportunity to study the Bible and to teach their children in a systematic way.²⁷⁷ In each quarterly publication, the lessons feature a new biblical topic, book, or doctrine. Both adults and children receive quarterly lessons according to their age level and are encouraged to study these lessons at home with family members on a daily basis.²⁷⁸

In addition to the study of the Sabbath school lesson in the home, the Adventist Church also emphasizes the importance of the home through the Family Ministries department. The denomination has family life directors at all structural levels of the church. These individuals present seminars on marriage and family issues for leaders and laity and promote the importance of positive family and parenting practices within the church community.²⁷⁹

Religious learning also takes place in the church. Local pastors and lay leaders work together to help parishioners experience spiritual nurture and growth. Every Sabbath morning, the church program is divided into two structured activities: Sabbath

²⁷⁷General Conference, *Church Manual*, 71.

²⁷⁸Ibid., 95, 96; and Ellen G. White, *Counsels on Sabbath School Work* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1938), 9-60. White counseled parents to study with their children at home to show the importance of the message presented in the Sabbath school lesson. White, *Sabbath School Work*, 56.

²⁷⁹General Conference, *Church Manual*, 116, 117, 130, 131; idem, *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook 2006*, 35-397. A number of family life directors are pastors who have been trained to serve the needs of the church in this area.

school and the church worship service. Sabbath school is the time when the congregation studies together. After a short inspirational program, the members divide into classes according to age level to review the Sabbath school lesson. Class members are encouraged to share what they learned at home while studying the lesson. The study of the Sabbath school lesson connects the learning experiences of the home and church. The church service gives the congregation an opportunity to grow through the worship program and the exposition of God's word.

In addition to the Sabbath morning program, church leaders and laity conduct various activities like seminars on different biblical topics, training workshops, and different outreach programs to help congregations grow.²⁸⁰ “The purpose of the services and meetings of the church is to worship God for His creative work and for all the benefits of His salvation; to understand His Word, His teachings, and His purposes; to fellowship with one another . . . and to learn how to fulfill the gospel commission of making disciples in all the world (Matt 28:19, 20).”²⁸¹

The third agency for religious education in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is the school. The Adventist Church has founded numerous educational institutions around the world to meet the learning needs of its members. These institutions include schools at the elementary, secondary, and tertiary levels.²⁸² The

²⁸⁰General Conference, *Church Manual*, 67-92; and Ministerial Association, *Minister's Handbook*, 145-60.

²⁸¹General Conference, *Church Manual*, 67.

²⁸²General Conference, *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook 2006*, 401-511; idem, *Church Manual*, 26, 27, 108-10; and Ministerial Association, *Minister's Handbook*, 195,

educational philosophy of the church is to “ensure that its youth may receive a balanced physical, mental, spiritual, social, and vocational education in harmony with denominational standards and ideals, with God as the source of all moral value and truth.”²⁸³ The staff from the General Conference Education Department is

responsible for the supervision, coordination, promotion, training, and quality of the global Seventh-day Adventist educational system. . . . The staff also provides support through the world divisions to educational leaders at union/conference/mission levels and to teachers in Adventist elementary and secondary schools to ensure that the Adventist philosophy of education and the principles of faith-and-learning are integrated into the life of each institution.²⁸⁴

The Seventh-day Adventist Church considers that by the grace of God it works through these schools to restore the *imago Dei* in individuals and to prepare them for joyous service in this world and the world to come.²⁸⁵

In addition to the three settings or agencies of religious education, the scriptures play an important role in the teaching ministry of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The Adventist denomination accepts the Bible as the revealed word of God and the primary epistemological source of instruction. As a result, the scriptures are considered essential

196. As of 31 December 2006, the worldwide educational program of the Adventist Church includes a total of 7,284 schools. The number of schools is divided into 106 tertiary institutions, 1,470 secondary schools, and 5,666 primary schools. Seventh-day Adventist Church, “Seventh-day Adventist World Church Statistics,” *Facts and Figures*, 28 January 2008, www.adventist.org/world_church/facts_and_figures/index.html (accessed 28 January 2008).

²⁸³General Conference, *Church Manual*, 108.

²⁸⁴Seventh-day Adventist Church Department of Education, “Mission and Scope,” *Department of Education Home*, 8 April 2007, www.education.gc.adventist.org (accessed 8 April 2007).

²⁸⁵General Conference, *Church Manual*, 108.

to the instruction imparted in each agency of the biblical model but not necessarily the class textbook in all areas of education. This concept is presented in the following statement:

The Holy Scriptures, Old and New Testaments, are the written Word of God, given by divine inspiration through holy men of God who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. In this Word, God has committed to man the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are the infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the test of experience, the authoritative revealer of doctrines, and the trustworthy record of God's acts in history.²⁸⁶

While the philosophical foundation as well as the aims and mission of the Adventist Church sets high ideals, some challenges militate against achieving all the objectives of its mission statements. According to Adventist pastors and educators, the church faces issues employing the three agencies of the biblical model to transmit the covenant relationship to future generations.²⁸⁷ Such difficulties as parents' work schedules, participation in extra-curricular activities of children, single parents raising

²⁸⁶Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *Seventh-day Adventists Believe: An Exposition of the Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 2005), 11. See also General Conference, *Church Manual*, 9; idem, *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook 2006*, 5.

²⁸⁷Keith Gray, interview by author, "Challenges Facing Religious Education in the Adventist Church," 7 January 2008, Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX; Randy Gilliam, interview by author, "Some Challenges in the Adventist Educational System," 7 January 2008, Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX; William Kilgore, interview by author, "Challenges Facing Religious Education in the Adventist Church," 7 January 2008, Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX; Osvaldo Rigacci, interview by author, "Issues Regarding Membership Attendance in the Adventist Church," 9 January 2008, Keene Seventh-day Adventist Church, Keene, TX; Ingo Sorke, interview by author, "Some Challenges in the Adventist Educational System," 7 January 2008, Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX; and Robert Gardner, "Follow-up on Religious Education," typed manuscript, 19 December 2007, 1-3, in my possession.

children, and conflicts between couples reduce the amount of time available for meaningful family worship and study of the Bible and Sabbath school lesson. Keith Gray, pastor, educator, and director of family life for the Southwest Region Conference,²⁸⁸ argues that some parents are not communicating their faith to their children. In some cases, he adds, a number of these parents may even be functioning as church lay leaders without having a clear understanding of the Adventist message.²⁸⁹

Religious education in the church setting also faces challenges in the areas of leadership and membership. Gray and William Kilgore, pastor and professor of religion, perceive a tendency in some Adventist pastors to preach less on the doctrinal foundations of the church. In an effort to be more popular, Gray and Kilgore feel that these denominational ministers are not properly emphasizing the distinctive beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist message including its educational focus. As a result, parishioners are not well instructed on the foundations of the Adventist faith.²⁹⁰

Oswaldo Rigacci, an Adventist pastor, views lack of church attendance as another difficulty hindering the transmission of the Adventist faith to congregations. According to him, there are two types of parishioners who do not significantly benefit from the spiritual programs of the church. The first group includes those who mainly attend the Sabbath worship service. These do not profit from the instruction provided in other

²⁸⁸The Southwest Region Conference is a Seventh-day Adventist organization that serves mainly black communities in Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

²⁸⁹Gray, interview by author.

²⁹⁰Ibid.; and Kilgore, interview by author.

services like the Sabbath school and mid-week prayer meeting. The second cluster involves members who stay home watching the Sabbath school, worship service, or any other Christian program on a satellite Adventist television channel. Though congregants in this group may still benefit from the instruction imparted, he argues that they do not take advantage of the learning that occurs through interaction with other parishioners.²⁹¹

Religious Education in the school setting also faces challenges. Enrollment, finances, and instruction are three main issues affecting the school agency in the Adventist Church.²⁹² Low enrollment and limited finances appeared to be the primary reasons for closing some elementary schools and academies in different parts of North America.²⁹³ Other educational institutions that remain open are facing fiscal

²⁹¹Rigacci, interview by author. Rigacci's description of the second group refers to church members who are physically able to attend church services, but choose to remain at home.

²⁹²Studies show that parental attitudes toward the quality of Adventist education, the cost of attending Adventist schools, faculty dedication, spiritual climate, and unsupportive pastors are among the reasons for the decline of enrollment in Adventist educational institutions. Jerrell Newton Fink, "Perceptions of Seventh-day Adventist Church Ministers Toward Seventh-day Adventist Schools" (Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1989); Lawrence Gilbert Kromann, "A Study of Parental Attitudes Regarding Secondary Boarding Schools of the Mid-America Union of Seventh-day Adventists" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1983); Mike Mile Lekic, "Perceptions and Attitudes of Selected Adventist and Non-Adventist Parents of School-Age Children Toward Adventist Schools in Canada" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2005); and Jeanette Wright Bryson, "Factors Influencing Enrollment Trends in Seventh-day Boarding Schools in North America" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2006).

²⁹³Some Adventist schools that have recently been closed include Heights Adventist Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Midland Adventist Elementary School in Midland, Texas; Broadview Academy in LaFox, Illinois; and Garden State Academy in Tranquility, New Jersey.

challenges.²⁹⁴ Some Adventist educators cite two main reasons for the diminished enrollment and financial difficulties. First, there seems to be a lack of support from a number of pastors. Gilliam, a former academy principal and current chair of the Department of Education at Southwestern Adventist University (SWAU),²⁹⁵ believes there is a growing number of ministers who lack familiarity with the practices and traditions of the Adventist denomination they are trained to serve.²⁹⁶ He thinks these pastors do not fully comprehend the philosophy and *raison d'être* of Adventist education.²⁹⁷ Therefore, it becomes difficult for parishioners to send their children to Adventist schools when they see their clergy not supporting the Adventist educational

²⁹⁴Educational institutions that are operating on a tight budget include Sandia View Academy in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Ozark Adventist Academy in Gentry, Arkansas; Atlantic Union College in South Lancaster, Massachusetts; and Columbia Union College in Takoma Park, Maryland.

²⁹⁵SWAU is a Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher learning located in Keene, Texas.

²⁹⁶In his book, William Sullivan asserts that clergy from many Christian denominations traditionally came from families with long experience in the religious tradition for which they were trained. In recent decades, however, increasing numbers of individuals are attending seminaries with much less exposure to the traditions of religious practice. Because the church is central to the religious education of the members, he argues that pastors must know the tradition deeply and feel the obligation to transmit it to the community of faith. William Sullivan, *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005), 217-21. Interestingly, a significant proportion of students currently attending the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary fall into this category of ministerial candidates who do not understand or embrace the historical distinctives of Adventism because of their recent introduction to the church. To accommodate this development, the revised M.Div. curriculum, voted in the fall of 2007, includes a track for students with little or no academic background in Adventist doctrine and practice. See Andrews University, *Bulletin 2008-2009*, vol. 97 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2008), 319-21.

²⁹⁷Gilliam, interview by author.

system.²⁹⁸ Second, Gilliam and Gray also consider that several parents perceive learning in other Christian and private schools to be better than Adventist education. As a result, these parents view the Adventist educational system as an option, but not a necessity.²⁹⁹

Another issue challenging Seventh-day Adventist education involves financing. According to White, Adventist educational institutions should give students work opportunities to enhance their learning experience. “Schools should be established that, in addition to the highest mental and moral culture, shall provide the best possible facilities for physical development and industrial training.”³⁰⁰ In addition, White wrote that labor offers students a chance to finance their schooling and minimize educational debts. “Instead of incurring debts, or depending on the self-denial of their parents, let young men and young women depend on themselves.”³⁰¹ Although a good concept, the implementation of this educational principle has progressively diminished. Many Adventist educational institutions do not provide sufficient employment opportunities to students. Consequently, because of the high cost of private education, numerous students graduate each year from secondary and tertiary schools with large amounts of student loans.³⁰²

²⁹⁸Gray, interview by author.

²⁹⁹Ibid.; and Gilliam, interview by author.

³⁰⁰White, *Education*, 218.

³⁰¹Ibid., 221.

³⁰²Some friends and colleagues completed their academic programs with loans as high as \$100,000.00. Student loans have also been the main source to cover most of my education.

Robert Gardner, an educator and director of the Adult Degree Program at SWAU, alleges that many Adventist church leaders and educators are not clear about the purpose for having a distinctive educational philosophy and program. He suggests that the “fundamental core of religious education is the ‘formative education’ that is carried out for the purpose of forming an educated, cultured, moral Seventh-day Adventist citizen with the wisdom (biblical and civic . . .) necessary to provide moral leadership for a home, a local SDA Church, and an American (multi-cultural) community.”³⁰³ Instead of focusing on what he calls “formative education,” Gardner views the Adventist educational system as being increasingly driven by economic and market demands for the appropriate skills to obtain a good job with a good income. As a result, graduates seem to concentrate more on having “a life with material goods rather than moral goodness.”³⁰⁴

Based on the foregoing discussion, it appears that the Seventh-day Adventist philosophical foundation for religious education is established on the biblical model. This foundation offers a theistic approach to religious education contributing to the restoration of humankind to the edenic condition. Notwithstanding the good ideals of its educational philosophy and mission, the Seventh-day Adventist Church still faces some significant challenges. These obstacles militate against a complete implementation of the home, church, and school agencies to transmit the covenant relationship to the believers.

³⁰³Gardner, “Follow-up on Religious Education,” 1.

³⁰⁴Ibid.

Conclusions

Religious education in the twenty-first century has numerous antecedents, beginning with the biblical era and culminating with the REA, APRRE, and NAPCE in the twentieth century. During the biblical period, the Bible was central to most religious instruction, and the family, church, and school served as foundational institutions or agencies for religious education. This biblical model established the framework for the coherent practice of religious education by future generations of Christians.

There were times in the history of the Old Testament, in the era of the apostolic and early church, during the Protestant Reformation and Pietistic revivals, and even in the initiatives of twentieth-century religious educators when the ideals and principles of the biblical model have been approached. Often, however, the scriptural model has been distorted or neglected. At times the educational activities of the church have been predominant. At times, educational initiatives in the schools operated by the church have been the main focus of religious education. The importance of religious education within the family has sometimes been stressed, though this has probably been the agency of religious education most neglected by institutional leadership through the centuries.

Naturally, in each era there have been challenges which have demanded new strategies. Sometimes these strategies have departed from the educational foundation and philosophy of scripture. The challenge always has been to devise appropriate strategies to meet current needs while at the same time remaining true to the biblical model. This was the challenge in 1960 when Andrews University initiated its program in Religious Education, and it remains the challenge of the Religious Education program at Andrews

in the twenty-first century. The study of the Adventist philosophical foundations of religious education offers a framework for evaluating the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Analyzing Religious Education is the task of this dissertation in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM AT ANDREWS

UNIVERSITY: THE EARLY YEARS

The Religious Education program at Andrews University was established early in the second half of the twentieth century. During the first half of the century, the field of religious education experienced significant growth. Religious education programs were established in a number of theological seminaries across North America, and advanced degrees in religious education were offered.¹ By the 1950s, a number of evangelicals became uncomfortable with the inclusion of other religious faiths and the influence of progressive education and liberalism in the REA.² As a result, liberal Protestant and evangelical scholars engaged in a debate concerning the theological and philosophical foundations of religious education. This climate of debate provides a context for the founding of the Religious Education program at Andrews University in 1960.

Chapter 2 discusses the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews University from its inception. It presents the elements of the model for Religious

¹Powers, 335; and Reed and Prevost, 367. Some of the institutions that founded Religious Education programs were Columbia University, Union Theological Seminary, the University of Chicago, Yale University, and Boston College.

²DeMott, 471; and Williams, 132. In addition to Protestant scholars, the REA invited Catholic and Jewish religious educators to join the association.

Education until 1981 when the program began to face strong challenges. This chapter also examines the philosophy of the program from its beginning, describing the initial philosophical foundations of the program and how it was refocused with the addition of the doctoral degree in 1974. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings pertaining to this portion of the history and philosophy of the Religious Education program at Andrews University.

History of the Program: Initial Master's Degree³

The Religious Education program at Andrews University was introduced in 1960 as a concentration in the Master of Arts degree in the Department of Education at the University.⁴ The stated mission of the department was to train individuals for a variety of positions within the Seventh-day Adventist educational system. In order to accomplish its mission, the Department of Education followed the Adventist philosophy of education, which was “reflected throughout the various programs.”⁵ The goals of the department

³Comments in this section relate to the entire first fourteen years of the Religious Education program when there was only an M.A. program in Religious Education. Information was obtained mainly from the bulletins pertaining to this period.

⁴Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 50.

⁵The Adventist educational philosophy had been traditionally taught in undergraduate courses in philosophy of education, and the description for the MA in Religious Education makes clear that a more thorough examination of the model was envisaged. At the graduate level, the Adventist philosophy was incorporated in the Religious Education program as shown in course descriptions for a number of classes such as Administration of Religious Education, Religious Education of Adults, Sociology, Youth Guidance, Elementary Curriculum, and Secondary Curriculum. Emmanuel Missionary College, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, vol. 49, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: College of Liberal Arts, 1960), 88, 90; idem, *Bulletin 1961-1962*, vol. 50, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: College of Liberal Arts, 1961), 88, 90; idem, *Bulletin 1962-1964*, vol. 51,

were to lay “a broad foundation for the various types of educational leadership and to give professional training necessary for teachers, school administrators, supervisors, superintendents of education, guidance counselors, and certain types of religious workers.”⁶ Thus, the mission, philosophy, and goals of the Department of Education shaped the philosophical foundation of all its programs.

The Department of Education was divided into four major areas: Foundations of Education, Administration and Guidance, Instruction and Supervision, and Religious Education. Each concentration in the Department of Education had a defined mission. The concentration in Religious Education was designed for “Bible instructors engaged in church or evangelistic work, leaders in the various departments of the denomination (e.g., Sabbath School, Home Missionary, Missionary Volunteer, etc.), directors of religious education in churches, home and overseas missionaries, and for laymen with the necessary educational background who wish to increase their effectiveness in church activities.”⁷ Another goal of the program was to provide an opportunity for advanced

no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Undergraduate College of Andrews University, 1962), 63; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 63-65; idem, *Bulletin 1964-1965*, vol. 53, no. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1964), 44. The basis of the Adventist philosophy of education is explained on pp. 83-92.

⁶Andrews University, *Bulletin 1964-1965*, 44.

⁷Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 60. It is unlikely that graduates were appointed as directors of religious education in local churches. This would have been common in other evangelical denominations, but in the Adventist Church the position of a director of religious education has never flourished at the local church level. Unlike religious education, the Home Missionary and Missionary Volunteer Departments grew to become important components of the ministry of local congregations. Both were established during the first decade of the twentieth century. The Home Missionary Department began as a subdivision of the Publishing Department and, eventually,

study to teachers of religion and religious education in colleges, for instructors of religion in elementary and secondary schools, for experienced pastors, and other leaders in church and religious educational activities.⁸

The mission statements of the four areas in the Department of Education indicate that each had a clear purpose and was designed to meet a specific need. The foundations concentration provided the cardinal elements for educational practice. The administration area prepared individuals for positions of educational administration and counseling and guidance. Instruction and supervision trained professionals for teaching, curriculum development, and instructional supervision. Religious Education educated denominational workers to serve as Bible instructors and leaders in different departments at various levels of the Adventist organization.

The organizational structure and purposes of the Department of Education remained essentially the same throughout the 1960s and into the early 1970s. The only area that underwent some changes in its general organization was Instruction and

incorporated the lay evangelistic activities of the local church. Through this department, numerous church members have been challenged to be involved in witnessing programs. Concerns for the development and instruction of Adventist youth led church leaders to create the Missionary Volunteer Department. The three main goals of the department were the development in youth of a solid devotional life, missionary endeavor, and educational activities. Leaders in this department have developed and sponsored various youth events and organizations which have contributed to the spiritual and numeric growth of Adventist youth around the world. R. W. Schwarz and Floyd Greenleaf, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, rev. and updated ed. (Nampa, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 2000), 317, 320, 342, 343.

⁸Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 60.

Supervision. By 1968, the program was primarily focused in curriculum and instruction.⁹ The concentration in Religious Education followed a pattern similar to the other M.A. programs in education. The main difference was that its religion requirements were met by courses taken from the Seminary.¹⁰

The faculty in the Department of Education were well qualified in education, Adventist educational philosophy, and religious education. Each concentration had specialists in the area to ensure the fulfillment of its mission statement. Frederick E. J. Harder was the religious education expert in the department.¹¹ He was the most logical scholar to provide leadership and direction to the program at the time of its inception.¹² In addition to the work he did defining the mission and goals of Religious Education, Harder's leadership gave the concentration a defined identity and purpose dedicated to

⁹ Andrews University, *Bulletin 1968-1969*, vol. 57, no. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1968), 41, 42.

¹⁰ Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 60; idem, *Bulletin 1968-1969*, 43.

¹¹ Frederick Harder received his Ph.D. in Religious Education from the University of New York in 1960. As a Christian educator, he served the Adventist Church in various capacities. Harder worked as a school teacher and superintendent of education. He chaired the Departments of Education at Atlantic Union College in Massachusetts and Emmanuel Missionary College in Michigan. In Michigan, he served the department as teacher and chair from 1959 until 1970. During his career, Harder accepted the positions as dean of the Graduate School at Andrews University and president of Middle East College in Beirut, Lebanon. Before his retirement, he served the denomination as chair of the North American Division Board of Higher Education (NADBHE).

¹² During this time, there were no trained religious educators teaching in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary (SDATS). See Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 50.

producing well-rounded professionals in the field.¹³

The Religious Education program began as an interdisciplinary concentration. The curriculum was focused on two areas: the ministry of the Adventist Church and the educational needs of the denomination. Students enrolled in Religious Education were required to choose courses in education and religion.¹⁴ All candidates had to complete credits in educational philosophy, psychology, instruction, and evaluation. From a minimum of thirty semester hours, students chose fourteen credits in foundations of education and instruction, ten in religion and religious education, and four to six for the thesis.¹⁵ This distribution of credits shows that the class load was more heavily weighted on the side of education than it was on religion and religious education combined.

¹³Winston Ferris and Beatrice Neall are two examples of professionals who were trained in the M.A. program in Religious Education at Andrews University during the 1960s and 1970s. Ferris earned his degree in 1965 while Neall completed hers in 1971. While the latter served the church as Bible teacher in Southeast Asia Union College in Singapore and Union College in Lincoln, Nebraska, the former made his contribution as a teacher and school principal during the 1960s and 1970s. Beatrice Neall, Answers to a Questionnaire from Jorge E. Rico, 23 June 2004, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, in my possession; and "An Idea Whose Time Has Come," *Focus Supplement No. 28*, June-July 1975, Religious Education Department files (REDF), School of Education (SED), Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. These two documents are cited for their historical content regarding the professional history of these two Adventist religious educators.

¹⁴Courses in the program were selected in consultation with the student's advisor and with the approval of the dean of the School of Graduate Studies. This curricular plan remained unchanged throughout the first one and one-half decades of the program. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 60; idem, *Bulletin 1968-1969*, 43.

¹⁵Andrews University, *Bulletin 1961-1962*, vol. 24, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1961), 50, 51; idem, *Bulletin 1962-1963*, vol. 25, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1962), 44; idem, *Bulletin 1963-1964*, vol. 52, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1963), 42, 43.

In addition to the mission and goals of the Department of Education, these academic requirements gave the concentration an educational thrust with religion as a substantial but subordinate emphasis.¹⁶ Basically, the location and development of the program in the Department of Education influenced the philosophical platform of the Religious Education program for the next four decades. The philosophy of Religious Education reflected the philosophy of the Department of Education and the Adventist philosophy of education. This design also provided for close cooperation between the Department of Education and the Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews.

As Harder and other faculty members in the Department of Education were designing the mission and goals of the Religious Education concentration, they followed the components of the biblical model and held the Bible central to the program.¹⁷ The M.A. curriculum in Religious Education included courses that covered each element of the model.¹⁸ The classes offered in the concentration were divided into four areas:

¹⁶Andrews University, *Bulletin 1961-1962*, 50, 51.

¹⁷The biblical model for religious education is based on three settings: the home, the church, and the school. Because it was the main source of religious instruction in the biblical period, the Bible remained central to the model. The biblical pattern is described in chapter 1, pp. 11-20.

¹⁸Courses that reflected the home setting included Marriage and Family and Seminar in Marriage and Family Problems. The church component was represented in such courses as Pastoral Ministry, Pastoral Counseling, and Church Music. Examples of classes for the school element were History of Education, Comparative Education, and Foundations of Religious Education. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 64, 65; idem, *Bulletin 1961-1962*, 59, 60.

biblical studies, Christian philosophy, historical studies, and applied religious education.¹⁹

Classes in biblical studies and Christian philosophy emphasized theological themes, making the Bible their main focus.²⁰ Two classes illustrate the centrality of the Bible in these two areas: Literature of the Bible and Teachings of Jesus. While the latter studied the main religious themes of the life and ministry of Jesus and their significance for salvation and Christian experience, the former discussed the Bible as “literature with a view to appreciation and understanding of the relation of literary values to interpretation” of the various biblical genres.²¹ The concept of redemption featured prominently in the Doctrine of the Sanctuary course. It examined the “meaning and place of the sanctuary and its ministration in the redemptive plan, with particular emphasis upon the mediatorial work of Christ.”²²

The third cluster, historical studies, contained courses in the history of the Christian Church and Christian missions. In this section, the instructor of the Ellen G. White and Denominational Development class analyzed White’s messages “as they are related to the development of the activities and teachings of the Adventist Church.”²³ The

¹⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 60-65; idem, *Bulletin 1963-1964*, 50-53; idem, *Bulletin 1965-1966*, vol. 54, no. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1965), 59-62.

²⁰Some of those classes included introductions to the Old and New Testaments, the Gospels, the Doctrine of God and Man, the Doctrine of the Sanctuary, and Christian Ethics.

²¹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 61.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid., 62.

study of White's writings explored the biblical basis of her educational ideas and revealed the influence that her educational philosophy had in the evolution of the Seventh-day Adventist system and philosophy of education and consequently in the founding of the concentration in Religious Education.²⁴

The last area, applied religious education, offered classes in sociology, ecumenical trends, public relations, psychology for religious workers, pastoral ministry, worship, youth, and family. Courses in this area and those in historical studies emphasized the place of the three components of the biblical model in the ministry of the church and of the school. According to the course descriptions, professors teaching these subjects discussed biblical themes and their application to various issues of life.²⁵ Assuming that the bulletin is an accurate reflection of what was taught, it can be inferred that the Bible was integrated into the content of these courses and once again exemplified its centrality in the program.

Through courses in these four areas, the concentration in Religious Education

²⁴"A Proposed Master of Arts Program," 1. White's educational philosophy is presented on pp. 83-88.

²⁵Some non-religion classes offered in this area included Public Relations, Health Education in the Church, Psychology for Religious Workers, and Youth Guidance. In these courses, instructors discussed biblical themes. In particular, the description of the Religious Education of Adults class exemplifies the application of biblical concepts to different contexts: "A study of personal work problems and teaching techniques in evangelism as they relate to the Bible instructors; helping the inquirer, step by step, to develop a sound faith for overcoming unchristian practices; dealing with the problems of the home, business, military, and social life of the new believer; plans for organizing and teaching public Bible class, and health and youth baptismal classes; outlines of progressive Bible studies; instruction in meeting questions and objections, winning and developing staunch believers." Andrews University, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 63, 64.

manifested a clear connection with the elements of the biblical model. The courses also show how the program was theologically rooted in the scriptures and philosophically fashioned in terms of White's educational philosophy. The inclusion of these subjects in the curriculum indicates Harder's commitment to the biblical plan and suggests that the scriptures were considered a primary source of religious training in the program.

Notwithstanding the primacy of the Bible and the required religion courses, the schooling element of the biblical model received more emphasis in the Religious Education program.

In Religious Education, the faculty emphasized the work of teaching the word of God. The continuous growth of the Adventist Church during this time created the need to train students in two areas.²⁶ Some would be educated as Bible instructors to provide religious training to potential and new church members.²⁷ Others would be equipped as religion teachers to serve Adventist educational institutions in this capacity. The growth pattern of the denomination during this time contributed to the opening of new schools in

²⁶See appendix C for a comparative table showing the membership growth of the Adventist Church around the world.

²⁷According to the official annual report of the Adventist Church, the category of Bible instructors, separate from ministers and missionaries, was introduced in 1942. Their work was mainly instructional at the church level. Part of the mission of Religious Education was to train individuals for this type of service. Annual reports also show that between 1942 and 1960 the number of Bible instructors had more than doubled in the Adventist Church. See appendix C for growth comparison of this category of workers. "Statistical Report of Seventh-day Adventist Conferences, Missions, and Institutions in North America (Including Summaries from World Field)," Eightieth Annual Report (Takoma Park-Washington, DC: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1942), 4, 5; and "Ninety-Eighth Annual Statistical Report of Seventh-day Adventists" (Takoma Park-Washington, DC: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1960), 4, 5.

different parts of the world and created the necessity of training more individuals as religion instructors for elementary and secondary schools and colleges.²⁸

The demand for religion teachers was acknowledged in 1968 when the General Conference Advisory Committee on Bible Teaching met to discuss concerns in this area. The members of the Advisory Committee recognized two needs. First, there were no structured channels for preparing Bible teachers in the Adventist denomination. Second, it was agreed that teaching Bible in a classroom required special abilities and professional training.²⁹ The conclusions of the Advisory Committee provided additional confirmation of the necessity for preparing Bible teachers for the educational program of the church. According to its mission and objectives, the Religious Education program at Andrews University could meet the need for both Bible instruction and Bible teachers, contributing to the worldwide mission of the Adventist Church. Training of Bible instructors and religion teachers was an educational need that the other three concentrations in the Department of Education were not meeting at this time.

Despite some slight changes in the specific requirements of the concentration in Religious Education, its general structure and philosophy were not significantly altered

²⁸See appendix C for growth comparison of Adventist educational institutions, teachers, and enrollment. Growth figures for schools, educators, and students from 1942 to 1960 show a steady development. The number of individuals in each classification almost doubled between 1942 and 1960.

²⁹“Minutes of the General Conference Advisory Committee on Bible Teaching,” 6-8 May 1968, Department of Education, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, MD. See also “A Proposed Master of Arts Program with a Concentration in Religious Education,” Document #17, no date, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2. The approximate date for Document #17 is 1969.

through the sixties and early seventies. The philosophy remained founded on the Adventist philosophy of education and focused on training Bible instructors, denominational leaders, and religion teachers. Specialized training to serve the home, the church, and the school as separate educational agencies was not envisaged at this time. This level of specialization was only envisioned and articulated when the first doctoral degree in Religious Education was offered.³⁰

History of the Program: Doctoral Degree

In 1973, changes occurred that affected the scope, structure, and philosophy of the Religious Education program at Andrews. The administration of Andrews University submitted a proposal to the NADBHE³¹ requesting approval for the development of doctoral programs in Educational and Counseling Psychology and Educational Administration.³² The proposed doctoral degrees were an addition to the D.Min.

³⁰Andrews University, *Bulletin 1976-1977*, vol. 65, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1976), 93.

³¹The NADBHE was the committee that guided and approved academic programs for denominational institutions of higher education in the North American Division (NAD), of Seventh-day Adventists.

³²George Akers, "The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University," answers given by the author, transcription, cassette 1, Berrien Springs, MI, 2002; Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 1; and John V. G. Matthews, "Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education," Document #39, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. The information furnished by Akers, Youngberg, and Matthews about this period of the history of the program is very significant for this study. While Youngberg was invited to sit on the committees studying the proposed doctorates, Akers was called to be the first director of the Religious Education program in 1974. Matthews was a student in Religious Education, and on campus from 1977 to 1979, just when the program was producing its first graduates.

(summer 1973) and Th.D. (summer 1974) that had been planned in the Adventist Theological Seminary since early 1970.³³ When the proposal was presented, Frederick E. J. Harder, chair of the NADBHE, indicated that a third doctoral program must be included in the request.³⁴ This program was Religious Education.³⁵

Harder's response can be understood in light of his former role as chair of the Department of Education (1963-1970) and director of the Religious Education concentration (1960-1970). He saw the evolution of the program and recognized the gap it was filling in the mission of the Adventist Church. In addition, the growing need to educate Bible instructors, denominational leaders in various departments of the Adventist organization, and religion teachers for the educational system of the church still existed.³⁶ Harder was convinced that a doctoral degree in Religious Education would help to meet these needs.

Publications from the mid-1970s state that around this time the Adventist Church was operating a worldwide educational system "to ensure that its youth may receive a balanced religious, intellectual, vocational, social, and physical education in harmony

³³"Minutes of Graduate School Faculty Meeting," 16 April 1973, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁴In 1970, Harder accepted the invitation to chair the NADBHE.

³⁵Akers, cassette 1; Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 1; and Matthews, 1.

³⁶See appendix C for a growth comparison of Bible instructors, educational institutions, teachers, and enrollment from 1960 to 1974. The figures demonstrate how the Adventist Church maintained a steady development in those areas.

with the church's standards and ideals."³⁷ The primary emphasis of the educational program of the church appeared to be directed toward establishing a spiritual foundation in the lives of its youth, helping them toward an intellectual understanding of the teachings of the Bible and the church, and to facilitating an experiential relationship with God.

As chair of the NADBHE, Harder considered that this focus of the Adventist educational system was of paramount importance for the teaching ministry of the church, and he felt that Religious Education was already meeting that need as a concentration in the M.A. program in Education. To Harder, it seemed incongruent with the worldwide educational mission of the church to have doctorates in Educational Psychology and Educational Administration and not have one in Religious Education.

The proposed doctorate in Educational Psychology and Counseling had two concentrations, depending on the student's particular professional needs and interests. One was Educational Psychology and the other was Counseling and Guidance. The major purpose of the doctoral concentration in Educational Psychology was to prepare college and university teachers in the areas of human development, personality, learning

³⁷"Program for a Major in Religious Education," 1; John B. Youngberg, "Some Ideas on the Proposed Religious Education Program," Document #22, 14 February 1973, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 82, 83. In order to fulfill the educational mission of the church, there was a unique body of knowledge, values, and ideals that must be transmitted. According to the first bulletin that listed a doctoral program in Religious Education at Andrews University, the transmission of this knowledge required that religious educators be competent in the following fields: the various theological disciplines, education, behavioral sciences, and social sciences. "Program for a Major in Religious Education," 3; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 82.

and instructional theory, and educational measurement. The concentration in Counseling and Guidance was designed to train professionals for service across a broad spectrum of student personnel positions.³⁸

The Educational Administration doctoral degree prepared individuals for professional careers in education such as superintendents of schools, elementary and secondary school administrators, administrators in higher education, administrators and supervisors for educational agencies or programs, and business managers. By combining study in educational administration with courses in supervision, curriculum, educational psychology and counseling, religious education, research, business administration, or other areas, a student may prepare for a wide variety of administrative and supervisory careers on all levels of education.³⁹

As noted in the description, the Educational Administration doctorate basically trained professionals for administrative and supervisory service on all levels of education. It was focused on the technical skills and knowledge required for administration of educational institutions. The missions and goals of both proposed doctoral programs clearly indicate that their emphasis was not primarily focused on the spiritual development of Adventist youth. Therefore, approval of these two doctorates alone would leave a crucial area of the church mission unmet at this academic level.

The two doctoral degrees in the SDATS were not meeting the educational mission of the church either. The aim of the D.Min. degree was pastoral in nature. It was “designed specifically to augment competencies for pastoral evangelistic ministry.”⁴⁰ The

³⁸Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 81.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 78.

⁴⁰Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, vol. 63, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1974), 72.

curriculum encouraged students to develop their skills in integrating biblical, theological, and social studies into their ministry, and to highlight material that increased their insights in the practice of ministry. The focus of the Th.D. was to “provide teacher-scholars in the fields of biblical studies and theology”⁴¹ for the Adventist Church. Students were equipped to conduct original and responsible research. Through course work, they also became acquainted with their Christian heritage as found in the scriptures and as understood by Seventh-day Adventists. Instruction in the two Seminary programs basically revolved around subjects in biblical, systematic, and applied theology. Bible interpretation, doctrines, and the practical aspects of ministry were stressed.

The focus of these four doctorates suggests a concentration on either educational or pastoral/theological studies, but no program was an integration of both. They did not emphasize the preparation of professionals to provide a “balanced religious, intellectual, vocational, social, and physical education” for the harmonious development of the whole person.⁴² The focal point was narrow, stressing one specific field of study.

In order to accomplish the harmonious development of the individual, the leaders of the program capitalized on the best resources of the Department of Education and the SDATS. They trained students to meet the needs of the growing educational system of the Adventist Church.⁴³ Candidates were equipped to serve the church as Bible

⁴¹Ibid., 77.

⁴²Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, School of Graduate Studies, 82.

⁴³See comparative table of the educational growth of the Adventist Church around the world in appendix C.

instructors, religion teachers, religious educators, and church leaders in various facets of denominational work like youth ministries and Sabbath School. They were prepared to integrate their biblical knowledge and teaching skills to fulfill the Adventist educational philosophy all over the world. The result was the preparation of multifaceted professionals to serve the Adventist Church in ministerial, educational, and administrative leadership positions.

Harder foresaw that Religious Education would make this contribution. He was aware of the role that a doctorate in Religious Education could play in fulfilling the Adventist educational philosophy and mission of the Church. This might explain why, as chair of the NADBHE, he responded positively to a request by the administration of Andrews University for inclusion in their proposal a doctoral degree in Religious Education. His recommendation was interpreted by Richard Hammill, president of Andrews University, as a mandate from the NADBHE. In his report to the General Conference Session of Seventh-day Adventists in Vienna in 1975, Hammill expressed his thoughts in the following words: “Our church charged us to offer these programs to meet the need for personnel in fields for which other institutions could not serve our special needs. . . . While we may not offer many doctoral-degree programs, those we do offer must be of high academic quality and fully worthy of the standard held in America by fine-quality universities.”⁴⁴ In his statement, Hammill referred to all the doctoral degrees that were offered by Andrews University at the time, including Religious Education. He seemed to understand the current educational need of the denomination and was

⁴⁴“An Idea Whose Time Has Come,” 3.

committed to ensure that Andrews would provide excellent terminal degrees.

As a result of Harder's recommendation, in 1973, the board of Andrews University formed a steering committee to work on the development of a doctoral program in Religious Education. This committee was formed under the leadership of Gordon Madgwick, dean of the School of Graduate Studies, with broad representation from the various departments of the SDATS, the Department of Education, and other professors from the Humanities and Sciences.⁴⁵ After visiting some universities and seminaries throughout the country that offered doctoral degrees in religious education, Madgwick returned with a report and some recommendations about the structure of the new Religious Education program at Andrews University.⁴⁶

In his report, Madgwick stated that religious education in America was generally conceived as a church-based activity that involved the Sunday school and other spiritual activities of local congregations.⁴⁷ He also pointed out that research on religious

⁴⁵“Minutes of the Doctor of Education Steering Committee Meeting,” 16 July 1973, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; John B. Youngberg, “A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs in Religious Education as They Relate to the Overall Graduate Structure of Andrews University,” Document # 29, 19 May 1986, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and Matthews, 1.

⁴⁶“Minutes of the Doctor of Education Steering Committee Meeting,” 16 July 1973; and Youngberg, “A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs,” 1.

⁴⁷Religious education literature published before 1974 confirms Madgwick's conclusions. Mary Parnaby, “The Training of Teachers of Religious Education: Training Colleges and Colleges of Education,” in *Religious Education: 1944-1984*, ed. A. G. Wedderspoon (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966), 82-95; Frederick Hilliard, “The Training of Teachers of Religious Education: The University Departments of Education,” in *Religious Education: 1944-1984*, ed. A. G. Wedderspoon (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966), 96-111; James Deforest Murch, *Christian Education and the Local Church: History, Principles, Practice* (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1943),

education had shown that instruction in doctrine and principles of belief did not necessarily result in the communication of values and the establishment of religious practices. Madgwick made three recommendations. First, he recommended that “in harmony with religious education programs in general, Andrews University offers a program that allows flexibility. It is designed to meet the varied religious education needs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and the program advisor will guide each student into a unified pattern of studies to meet specific needs and goals.”⁴⁸ Second, he suggested that Religious Education at Andrews University should no longer be thought of as an area within the Department of Education, but as a program that bridged the department with the Seminary. Third, he advised that the responsibility for the new program should be shared jointly between the Department of Education and the SDATS.⁴⁹

After studying Madgwick’s report and recommendations, the committee favored the idea of having a doctoral program in Religious Education that would capitalize on the

75; James D. Smart, *The Teaching Ministry of the Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 11; Paul H. Vieth, *The Church and Christian Education* (St. Louis, MO: Bethany Press, 1947), 20, 21; Kenneth D. Blazier and Evelyn M. Huber, *Planning Christian Education in Your Church* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1974); J. Gordon Chamberlain, *Freedom and Faith: New Approaches to Christian Education* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965); H. W. Byrne, *Christian Education for the Local Church: An Evangelical and Functional Approach*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1973), 22; and Clifford V. Anderson, “The Practice of Evangelical Christian Education Since World War II,” in *Changing Patterns of Religious Education*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984), 129-142.

⁴⁸“Program for a Major in Religious Education,” 3. See also Youngberg, “A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs,” 1, 2; and “The Religious Educator,” Document #65, no date, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 3. The context and content of Document #65 suggest that it was written in 1973.

⁴⁹“The Religious Educator,” 3.

best resources of the Seminary and the Graduate School.⁵⁰ The members of the steering committee viewed the projected program in Religious Education as complementing the work of the SDATS rather than competing with it. The Th.D. degree already being offered in the Seminary was designed to train individuals for the “unique mission and role of teachers in religion in Seventh-day Adventist institutions.”⁵¹

The intent of the Ed.D. program in Religious Education might have conflicted with the Th.D. if it had not been for the broader nature of the proposed Ed.D. The mission of the doctoral degree in Religious Education at Andrews University was based on the current “needs of contemporary Adventism and S.D.A. education.”⁵² These needs were identified as preparation for various leadership roles within the denomination, and the ability to nurture the religious experience of Adventist youth. An Adventist worker “may move around several times from campus to congregation to conference, during his entire career, and it seemed appropriate to us that an advanced degree be formulated that might cover these possibilities.”⁵³ Thus, the Religious Education program aimed at training professionals with marketable competencies that would make them more adaptable and versatile leaders.

⁵⁰“Minutes of the Doctor of Education Steering Committee Meeting,” 16 July 1973; and Matthews, 1. No comments were recorded concerning Madgwick’s and the committee’s views relating to the church-focused nature of other religious education programs.

⁵¹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 77.

⁵²Youngberg, “Some Ideas,” 1.

⁵³“An Idea Whose Time Has Come,” 3.

There was also the necessity of bridging the gap between religious instruction and religious experience among Adventist youth. It was felt that many Adventist parents, church programs like the Sabbath school and youth societies, and denominational schools had been successful in transmitting the “truth by mental assent but not experimentally.”⁵⁴ While the Th.D. was designed to train academic professionals as theological and doctrinal scholars of the Adventist Church, the Ed.D. would facilitate scholarship in nurturing and educating youth in the areas of biblical standards and personal commitment.⁵⁵ The idea was finally approved by the trustees of Andrews University and the NADBHE in 1973.⁵⁶

During a period of several months, a curricular plan and rationale were formulated.⁵⁷ The steering committee considered the existing philosophical structure of the M.A. concentration in Religious Education and Madgwick’s recommendations in the formation of the initial philosophical foundation of the newly established doctoral program.⁵⁸ The committee asked John B. Youngberg, an adjunct professor in the

⁵⁴Youngberg, “Some Ideas,” 1. This concept was also expressed in W. Judd, “Religious Education at Andrews University,” Document #21, 13 February 1973, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

⁵⁵See appendix A for a comparison of the major curricular emphases of the degrees in Religious Education and the Th.D. program in the Seminary in 1974.

⁵⁶“An Idea Whose Time Has Come,” 2.

⁵⁷Youngberg, “Some Ideas,” 1-3; and “Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations: Master Plan for the North Central Association Self-Study Report,” Document #30, 19 April 1988, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. The last reference is cited here because it contains information pertaining to the origins of the doctoral program in the 1970s.

⁵⁸“An Idea Whose Time Has Come,” 3.

Department of Education, to do much of the groundwork for the doctoral curriculum in Religious Education.⁵⁹ In addition to Youngberg, the committee selected three professors from the Adventist Theological Seminary to provide advice on the religion cognate and to coordinate the religious comprehensive examinations.⁶⁰

⁵⁹Youngberg served the Adventist denomination as a teacher, school principal, and educational secretary in a number of countries in South America from 1955 to 1971. In 1974, he received his Ed.D. degree from Western Michigan University in Educational Leadership. He also became a Certified Family Life Educator in 1990. Although Youngberg was not hired officially as a full-time faculty member by Andrews University until April 1974, he was asked by president Hammill to sit in on the deliberations of the steering committee studying the proposed doctorate. See Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 1; idem, "A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs," 1; and Matthews, 1.

⁶⁰The three professors selected were Kenneth Strand, Werner Vyhmeister, and Raoul Dederen. Before teaching in the Seminary, these three faculty members served the Adventist Church in various capacities. Strand worked as a pastor in the Adventist Church. After earning a Ph.D. degree in Church History from the University of Michigan, he joined the Seminary faculty and in 1973 he was professor of Church History. During his career, Strand wrote numerous books and articles for various scholarly and religious periodicals. He also edited the SDATS journal, *Andrews University Seminary Studies (AUSS)*. Vyhmeister earned his Ph.D. in Missions from the University of Chile. During his teaching career, he wrote a book and published several articles in *La Revista Ministerio*, *El Universitario Adventista*, *Revista Adventista*, and *AUSS*. After teaching theology and leading out as vice-president of Chile Adventist College and River Plate College in Argentina, Vyhmeister taught courses in missions at the SDATS. He then became the dean of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in the Philippines. After several years in the Philippines, he was invited to return to Andrews to serve as dean of the Seminary. Dederen was an Adventist pastor and evangelist in Belgium. After receiving his doctorate from the University of Geneva, he joined the religion faculty of the French Adventist Seminary at Collonges-Sous-Saleve, France. Some years later he was invited to teach theology in the SDATS. Later in his career, Dederen served as associate dean and dean of the SDATS. During his professional life, he authored a book and a number of published and unpublished papers and articles, and was an editor of a journal and two magazines. The support received from the Seminary and the input provided by these three renowned professors helped the program develop a reputation for academic rigor. Youngberg, "A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs," 2.

The work of Youngberg and the three Seminary professors produced a doctoral program in Religious Education that was rooted in the scriptures. They were careful to include in their curriculum planning an appropriate emphasis on the home, church, and school settings of the biblical model for religious instruction.⁶¹ The suggested curriculum was initially divided into five areas: religion, religious education, research, general courses, and electives. This structure included the elements of the biblical model without making specific mention of them.⁶² This philosophical platform was fine-tuned over the years, starting with the arrival of the director of the program.⁶³

When all the preliminary work was completed, the first students were admitted into the doctoral program in the summer of 1974, and the first courses leading toward the Ed.D. degree in Religious Education were offered.⁶⁴ That same summer, George H.

⁶¹“The Religious Educator,” 2.

⁶²The area of religion included courses in biblical and systematic theology and church ministry. The section on religious education required courses in curriculum, counseling and psychology, sociology, and character development. General courses were selected in religion or education depending on the student’s undergraduate and graduate background, and professional goals. “Program for a Major in Religious Education,” 3-5; Judd, 1; Youngberg, “Some Ideas,” 1-3; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 84.

⁶³Youngberg, “A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs,” 3.

⁶⁴The first graduates of the Ed.D. program were Alexander Currie and John Fowler in 1977. “Andrews University Doctoral Graduates in Religious Education,” Document #33, 1989, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. After completion of their programs, the two graduates returned to their respective countries. In Australia, Currie worked as a senior pastor in the Greater Sydney Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, New South Wales. Fowler went to work as Director of Education of the Southern Asia Division of Seventh-day Adventists in Pune, India. “Andrews University Doctoral Graduates in Religious Education,” Document #13, no date, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. Document #13 was written in approximately 1989. This document is cited for the statistical information it provides regarding all

Akers⁶⁵ was called by Hammill to serve as the first coordinator of the Religious Education program at Andrews University, with Youngberg as his associate, and Strand in joint appointment to coordinate the Religion component of the program.⁶⁶ Although Akers was not formally trained in religious education, he was familiar with the Religious Education program at Andrews. Akers had joined the faculty of the Department of Education at Andrews in 1964 and served there for several years.⁶⁷

The launching of the doctoral degree began a new era for Religious Education at Andrews University. Before 1974, Religious Education existed as a concentration within a program in the Department of Education; after 1974, it became a program in its own right, administered by the Department of Education in the College of Arts and Sciences, and offering two graduate degrees: a Master of Arts and a Doctor of Education.

Notwithstanding the administration of the program by the Department of Education, the Religious Education program was accountable to the School of Graduate

Religious Education graduates until 1989.

⁶⁵Akers earned his Ed.D. degree from University of Southern California in Curriculum and Instruction. Prior to his coming to lead the Religious Education program at Andrews University, he served as a dean of students, vice-president of academic affairs, professor of education at Andrews, and president of Columbia Union College. After serving Religious Education for eight years, Akers was called to chair the Department of Education. He was then invited by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to work as director of the Department of Education. Throughout his career, Akers had presented lectures on integration of faith and learning and other educational topics in various parts of the world.

⁶⁶“Department of Religious Education,” 1, 3.

⁶⁷Andrews University, *Bulletin 1964-1965*, 44; and Akers, cassette 1.

Studies in terms of its academic standards.⁶⁸ The rationale for keeping the program in the Department of Education was based on a distinctive understanding of what religious education was within the Adventist Church. This distinctive understanding was grounded on the following three concepts:

- a. The Adventist educational system was perceived to encompass a wholistic approach to education including the home, the church and the school.
- b. This understanding was in contrast to the understanding of the broader Christian Church, where religious education was at the time more narrowly focused on work for children and youth in the Sunday school.
- c. The Adventist approach included the vision of preparing staff and leadership for a worldwide parochial elementary, secondary, and tertiary school system.⁶⁹

The broader approach that Adventists gave to education, including both the formal school setting and non-formal family and church settings, made it appropriate to keep Religious Education in the Department of Education under the supervision of the School of Graduate Studies.⁷⁰

As a program in its own right, and in accordance with the recommendations by

⁶⁸Matthews, 1. The doctoral program was started when Thomas S. Geraty was the chair of the Department of Education, Gordon Madgwick was the dean of the School of Graduate Studies, and J. Grady Smoot was the vice-president for Academic Affairs. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 83; “Minutes of the Faculty Meeting,” 10 November 1974, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Religious Education, Area Faculty,” Document #24, November 1974, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; and Matthews, 2.

⁶⁹Matthews, 1. In his document, Matthews does not attempt to present the full picture of the state of religious education during this time. He is reflecting only on one branch of the religious education movement. As I argue on pp. 68-72, 77-79, there were other more liberal emphases and ongoing debates regarding the nature of religious education. See also Judd, “Religious Education at Andrews University,” 1.

⁷⁰Youngberg saw the influence of Harder as the reason for establishing the Religious Education program in the Department of Education. Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 4.

Madgwick, Religious Education allowed students to customize their respective degrees in accordance with their specific areas of interest. The student's course plan was designed after a careful evaluation of individual goals, background of study, and professional experience.⁷¹ This flexibility demonstrated one of the strengths of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. As a result, the program attracted a number of quality students whose contributions to the Adventist Church around the world have been significant.⁷² The detailed preparatory work, smooth implementation, and quality student enrollment of the new doctoral program are evidence that the Religious Education program at Andrews University had a good beginning.

Collaboration with the Seminary

Despite these auspicious beginnings and a strong enrollment, the establishment of the doctoral degree in Religious Education at Andrews University was not free from tensions and potential challenges. Certain professors from the Th.D. faculty in the SDATS raised two major issues regarding the degree in Religious Education. The first concern was about competition.⁷³ These professors saw that a number of bright students

⁷¹ Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 83; and Matthews, 2.

⁷² Some capable students were attracted to Religious Education because of its flexibility and because the expected completion time was considerably shorter than the Th.D. degree. Students were able to focus their studies in accordance with their career goals without being tied into a more narrowly focused area of scholarship and theological specialization. John Matthews, "Written Responses to Jorge E. Rico," March 2006, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, in my possession. See also appendix B for a comparison of the requirements between the two doctoral programs.

⁷³ George H. Akers, letter to J. G. Smoot, 24 February 1977, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2, 3; idem, cassette 1. See

with master's degrees in religion chose the Religious Education doctorate over the Th.D. The enrollment of those students in the Religious Education doctoral degree was perceived as a loss for the Th.D. program in the Seminary. The choice of the Ed.D. by these students was made, to a great degree, as a result of the demanding prerequisites and projected length of the Th.D.⁷⁴ The competition was, in fact, not over a preferred degree, but over the extent of the requirements in each of the programs.

The second concern was related to the perceived academic weakness in the Religious Education doctoral degree. A number of professors from the Seminary viewed the degree as deficient for its lack of language requirements. They felt that Religious Education students were not grounded thoroughly in biblical languages and therefore these students were academically ill-prepared to teach biblical theology.⁷⁵

appendix B for a comparison of the requirements of the Ed.D and Th.D. programs at this early stage. The only similarity between the two degrees was the Religion component. Outside of this element, the Ed.D included other areas that prepared students to be pedagogically competent to serve in educational institutions at any level. Conversely, the Th.D. was focused on Religion, thus making its graduates biblical and theological specialists whose expertise did not include skills in education and the social sciences.

⁷⁴“A Comparative Chart of Graduate Studies–AU,” Document # 79, March 1978, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico;” Nancy Vyhmeister, Answers to a Questionnaire from Jorge E. Rico, 21 June 2004, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, in my possession; and Warren Ashworth, Answers to a Questionnaire from Jorge E. Rico, 9 July 2004, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, in my possession.

⁷⁵“Religion Courses Recommended for the Ed.D. in Religious Education,” Document #80, January 1975, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-3; George H. Akers, letter to Religious Education Area Faculty, 8 November 1976, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; “Religious Education Curriculum Revision–Cont’d with Resultant S.G.S. 77-78 *Bulletin* Copy Changes,” Document #81, 9 April 1976, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2, 5-8; and George H. Akers, “Conference Called by President Smoot to

An analysis of the religion cognate of the curriculum in Religious Education shows that it was the largest of all the core studies in Religious Education. The cognate required students to take at least forty quarter credits [twenty-seven semester credits] in biblical studies, systematic and applied theology, Christian philosophy, and church history. "Coursework in this block has been selected on the basis of its emphasis on biblical studies, where the student will be immersed in Scripture. That is, primarily involved in the study of the Bible itself, not what men have said or written about it. The objective is to give free reign to the self-authenticating character of the Word of God."⁷⁶

Forty quarter credits in religion out of a total requirement of 113 credits (seventy-

Discuss Relationship of Ed.D. Program in Religious Education with Two Doctoral Programs Offered in the Seminary," Document #25, 15 June 1977, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 6. Curriculum revisions for the 1977-1978 bulletin contemplated the inclusion of a special college Bible teaching track. The teaching track proposed a total of fifty-nine quarter credits (thirty-nine semester credits) in religion which included courses that required competence in biblical Greek. The Seminary professors who were uncomfortable with the situation felt that the Seminary could not accept a doctoral degree in Religious Education unless the Department of Religious Education was willing to include a disclaimer in the program description. The disclaimer should state that the degree did not prepare students to teach theology on the college level. Otherwise, the department should require a biblical language competency demonstrated by taking and passing language courses or by passing language tests. This language requirement was approved and voted by the Religious Education area faculty in November 1975. The requirement could be fulfilled by completing two years of Biblical Greek at the college level, by completing the Intermediate Greek course in the SDATS, or by passing the Seminary Greek examination with a minimum grade of 70 percent. "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 6 November 1975, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and "Notes on the Interviews," Document #52, no date, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2. The interviews transcribed in Document #52 were conducted around October 2000 by Thayer and Matthews. The people interviewed were Seminary professors who still remembered the concerns raised in the early stages of the Religious Education program.

⁷⁶"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 9 April 1976, appendix C, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

six semester credits) were a clear indication of the theological strength of the program. The extent of this emphasis also denoted the significance that the Bible and the church-related component had in the curriculum and mission of Religious Education. Biblical languages, however, were not mandated in the first two or three years that the Religious Education doctorate was offered, and this was considered by some an evidence of academic weakness in the curriculum.

These two concerns raised tensions between the Religious Education faculty and some professors in the Seminary. If left unresolved, these tensions had the potential to threaten the identity and philosophical foundation of the new Religious Education program. Partnership with the SDATS was an important feature of Religious Education at Andrews University. The success of the program depended on access to the resources available in the Seminary, without which Religious Education would be defined only by its educational focus. A diminished religion component would mean a loss of the identity and *raison d'être* of the program. The philosophical platform would be affected without the centrality of the Bible and the church setting of the biblical model.

In order to remedy the situation, the Religious Education area faculty made two decisions.⁷⁷ In 1975, the faculty voted to modify the structure of the program to channel its actions through the Department of Education and the School of Graduate Studies as

⁷⁷The Religious Education area faculty consisted of sixteen members and two ex-officio members, all appointed by Hammill. Some of these members were from the Seminary while others came from the Department of Education. Akers and Youngberg were the only two listed as full-time faculty in the program. The other fourteen members were support faculty who taught in other programs. As area faculty, they met on the first Sunday of each month. "Minutes of the Faculty Meeting," 10 November 1974; and "Religious Education, Area Faculty," 1, 2.

well as to receive input from the SDATS faculty represented by the Seminary dean in the Religious Education faculty meeting.⁷⁸ The effects of this action were twofold. It gave the SDATS administration greater participation in the development of the program, and it furnished the Religious Education faculty with the opportunity to help the Seminary faculty better understand the nature and mission of the program. By improving the channels of communication, the Religious Education faculty also attempted to eliminate the tensions raised by the concerns over academic rigor and competition for students between the doctoral programs of the two schools. The second determination was made late in 1975. The Religious Education faculty accepted the inclusion of a language proficiency requirement in the program.⁷⁹ By adding the language proficiency prerequisite to strengthen the religion cognate, the Religious Education leaders removed the perceived deficiency and fortified the rationale and philosophy of the program.

In 1975, the Religious Education faculty also added three program hallmarks, which they considered to be central to the mission of the program. These hallmarks, as stated in the program description in the University bulletin, were an emphasis in the following three areas: “(a) the study of character development as a deliberate and focused science, (b) factors in the transmission of religious heritage, and (c) delivery systems for a

⁷⁸“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 17 January 1975, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁷⁹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 6 November 1975; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 9 April 1976; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 84; idem, *Bulletin 1976-1977*, 95.

teaching/training ministry.”⁸⁰ Emphasis on these three aspects enabled the graduates from

Religious Education at Andrews University to be competent:

1. To understand the Seventh-day Adventist Church’s mission in the world and the religious educator’s role as a spiritual leader in the educational ministry.
2. To understand and appreciate God’s plan of salvation in all its aspects, including its relationship to contemporary life.
3. To grasp issues and problems which religious educators meet in the field, together with approaches to possible solutions to these problems.
4. To relate educational practice, descriptive and prescriptive, to the educational ministry of the church and to the specific goals of religious education.
5. To understand developmental psychology and the learning process.
6. To master the necessary skills for such roles as classroom teacher, program coordinator, design-innovator, and age-group specialist (e.g., adult education).
7. To judge and evaluate educational programs, curriculums, and other aspects of religious education.⁸¹

The hallmarks facilitated the integration of the Adventist theological message as taught in the Seminary and the professional insights and skills presented in the Department of Education. These hallmarks also clarified the role of the Religious Education program at Andrews University and in the Adventist Church. Competency in the seven designated areas distinguished Ed.D. graduates in Religious Education from Th.D., D.Min., Educational Psychology (doctoral), and Educational Administration (doctoral) graduates. As a result, the addition of the hallmarks of religious education strengthened the philosophical foundation and identity of the program. The hallmarks also gave distinctiveness to the mission of Religious Education at Andrews.

During the November 1975 Religious Education area faculty meeting, the faculty

⁸⁰Andrews University, *Bulletin 1975-1976*, vol. 64, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1975), 87.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 88.

voted to add a fourth hallmark to the program: the integration of faith and learning.⁸² Its inclusion cemented the four hallmarks together into a meaningful philosophy.

The emphasis of the first hallmark was on character development. The Religious Education faculty argued that character building demands more than religious indoctrination. It involves fostering the whole Christian experience and includes strengthening the powers of judgment and decision. Basically, the holistic development of the individual, mentally, physically, and socially, is a function of character development and, from a Christian perspective, character development is a function of spiritual growth.⁸³ This concept was in line with the primary emphasis of the educational program of the Seventh-day Adventist Church as conceived and implemented at Andrews University. The focus of the Adventist Church's educational system is "directed to the spiritual foundations in the lives of its youth."⁸⁴

The second and third hallmarks provided the means through which character development could be attained. Whereas the second hallmark accentuated the biblical concepts included in the transmission of religious heritage, the third underlined the delivery systems for a teaching ministry. Elementally, both were concerned with the content and teaching methodologies that would ensure the proper transmission of the

⁸²"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 6 November 1975; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 9 April 1976; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1976-1977*, 93.

⁸³"Program for a Major in Religious Education," 2; Akers, "Conference Called by President Smoot," 1; and "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 23 May 1975, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁸⁴Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 82.

Judeo-Christian heritage to future generations of believers.⁸⁵

The emphasis of the fourth hallmark was on the integration of the student's intellectual understanding, professional commitment, and experiential relationship with God. The concern was to facilitate harmony between the "truths" of one's Christian beliefs and the "truths" of the academic endeavor. According to the faculty, "faith" unites spiritual growth with the transmission of religious heritage. As young people intellectually and experientially know more about God and his plan of redemption, they will grow spiritually and enhance their relationship with their Creator and Savior. "Learning" embraces the truths of general revelation (the natural world) within the framework of God's truth. The concept of integration of faith and learning, bringing together theological and intellectual understanding into a single process, is well illustrated in the following statement from the faculty minutes: "Because our theology impregnates our philosophy, biblical studies—in the sense of what God has spoken—undergird the traditional foundational areas generally associated with an advanced professional degree in education, that is, the historical, psychological, and sociological aspects of education."⁸⁶

⁸⁵"Doctorate in Religious Education: The Curriculum," Document #26, eighth draft, 9 November 1981, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

⁸⁶Ibid., appendix C, 1. Akers's objective in connection with the fourth hallmark was that "any student finishing this program should be able to take his or her Bible and present a logical, reasonable Bible study on any important subject. A student in this program should be able to be conversant on the critical issues comparing the biblical viewpoint against contemporary positions in the following areas: revelation, nature of God, the person of Christ and His work, man's fall, salvation, the church, the sanctuary, and eschatology." "Minutes of the Executive Committee—Religious Education Area Faculty," 15 November 1976, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

All four hallmarks made the redemption of humankind central to the thrust of the Religious Education curriculum. The hallmarks presented the study of religion as having direct implications for instructional procedures. Through the hallmarks, the Religious Education faculty helped students to envision broader and more inclusive fields of professional service. According to the faculty, the emphasis of the hallmarks was twofold: the preparation for service in this life and the joy of eternal life.⁸⁷ This philosophical concept is an integral part of White's philosophy of education and of the Seventh-day Adventist philosophy of Christian education. The connection can be seen clearly in White's use of the terms "redemption" and "service," which she links closely to the work of education.⁸⁸

Incorporating the hallmarks into the philosophical platform of the Religious Education program also gave purpose to the program by affirming its mission and objectives. The hallmarks made the program distinctive from the other doctoral degrees in the Department of Education, the emphases of which were mainly educational administration and counseling. They also demonstrate that the development of the philosophy of the program was a work in progress designed to solidify the identity and mission of the Religious Education program at Andrews University.⁸⁹

⁸⁷White, *Education*, 13.

⁸⁸Ibid., 15, 16. The Adventist philosophy of education grows out of White's reflections and understanding of the biblical concept of the plan of salvation. The connection between the Adventist philosophy of education and the final restoration of humanity to its edenic state is presented on pp. 84-88.

⁸⁹"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 9 April 1976.

In addition to the linkage between the hallmarks and White's educational philosophy, each setting of the biblical model is connected to a hallmark. The study of character development is linked to the family setting. In the Bible, positive character development is portrayed as the result of appropriate education experienced by the child at home (cf. Luke 2:39, 40).⁹⁰ The church setting is a vehicle to facilitate communication for nurture and outreach. By teaching the scriptures, as indicated by the apostles, the community of believers contributes to the restoration of the knowledge of God in humanity (Acts 20:20, 21; 1 Tim 3:15). The church setting is thus primarily concerned with transmission of the religious heritage.

Integration of faith and learning fits within the school setting. In this setting, the means of communication for nurture and outreach ministry also call for a knowledge of learning theory and teaching methodology. Integration of faith and learning focuses on the pervasive Christian principles that should permeate all educational processes.⁹¹ As a result, the Religious Education faculty at Andrews pursued a balanced integration of faith, scholarship, and professional practice to fulfill the redemptive ministry of the Adventist Church around the world. The faculty was concerned with theoretical research and the practical application of Christian nurture in the family, church, and school settings. This concern constituted the unifying theme and primary thrust of the program.⁹²

⁹⁰White, *Child Guidance*, 65.

⁹¹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1976-1977*, 92, 93. Christian belief provides the foundation for what is learned.

⁹²*Ibid.*, 93, 94.

The four hallmarks were equally found in the curricular design of the Religious Education program. Each hallmark was reflected in a cognate. Emphasis on character development was reflected in the religion area. Particularly, classes taken in the Seminary in biblical studies and systematic theology gave students the necessary theological knowledge to effect positive changes in their lives. The study of psychology was also important for character development. The religious education cognate encompassed the transmission of religious heritage and the development of teaching skills through courses in the history of religious education, psychology, and curriculum. Stress on delivery systems was also covered in the general core requirement of the program. To fulfill the core, students had to take courses in education. The integration of faith and learning was included in the research and religious education cognates. In both areas, graduates took subjects in research, and in curriculum and instruction. While curriculum classes gave students the opportunity to integrate Christian doctrine with educational practice, research courses trained them to measure the results of that consolidation through carefully planned investigation and assessment.⁹³

The significance of the inclusion of the four hallmarks in the philosophical platform of Religious Education is increased when the foundation of the program is analyzed in light of the three main philosophical categories: metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology.⁹⁴ Attention will now be given to how the structure of the Religious

⁹³Ibid., 95, 96.

⁹⁴A theistic approach to the three philosophical classifications is discussed early in chapter 1, on pp. 2-11.

Education program as well as the content of the curriculum and methods of teaching prepared students to answer the major philosophical questions: “What is real?,” “What is true?,” and “What is of value?” In order to respond to these questions, the leaders of the program used the Bible as the main source of knowledge.

The centrality of the Bible can be noticed when each metaphysical subdivision is addressed. The Religious Education faculty answered the theological concerns about God and the supernatural by emphasizing an experiential knowledge of God as the heart of the program.⁹⁵ This knowledge would be attained through the study of the scriptures in the courses offered in the religion cognate.

Questions about metaphysical cosmology dealing with the origins and nature of the universe were answered by stressing the concept that the universe was made by a creator God (Gen 1:1). The Religious Education faculty did not view the world as resulting from an evolutionary process, but rather as the consequence of a creative act. The ontological concern is an extension of the cosmological. According to the faculty, God is primary in the quest for ontological meaning. From their perspective, humanity is contingent upon God, the non-contingent creator. When making the first human beings, God created them in His image (Gen 1:26-27).

The creation of Adam and Eve leads to the next category: anthropology. This philosophical category focuses on the nature of humanity. According to the biblical understanding communicated in the Religious Education program, God made the first

⁹⁵According to Jesus, the knowledge of God is essential for eternal life (John 17:3).

couple perfect, but sin marred that perfection. Now man has a sinful nature that is in need of restoration (Gen 3:1-7; Rom 3:10, 23). The overarching aim of the program in Religious Education at Andrews University was to nurture a relationship with Christ and nurture spiritual growth, first of the student, and ultimately of those whom the student would later serve as a religious educator.

The last metaphysical subdivision in this discussion is teleology. Teleology's view of reality is concerned with design and purpose. From a Christian perspective, it asks, "What is the reason for the plan of salvation established by God?" The answer proposed by the leaders of the Religious Education program was the restoration of the image of God in man and an end to sin. Through His plan of redemption, God wants to restore His creation to the original sinless condition. According to White, this is the great object of education.⁹⁶

This analysis and response to five major metaphysical concerns highlights the solid scriptural foundation of Religious Education at Andrews. A conservative biblical theology is clearly the basis for defining reality. In addition, White's educational understanding is integrated with the biblical approach to provide a metaphysical perspective that gives meaning to the mission of Religious Education as defined at the inception of the doctoral program.

Epistemological questions explore the source of truth. They are concerned with how a person knows and how knowledge is transmitted. The Religious Education faculty addressed these concerns with the inclusion of two hallmarks: the transmission of

⁹⁶White, *Education*, 15, 16.

religious heritage and the study of delivery systems. They recognized that supernatural revelation is an avenue, and in fact the most important avenue through which humans can learn. The biblical narrative, taken seriously, demands that reality and truth are not restricted to natural phenomena (1 Cor 2:10-14; 2 Tim 3:16, 17). Knowledge has its origin in God and He is the one who enables the individual to think and learn (2 Pet 1:20, 21). According to the faculty, humanity has a God-given ability to think and to choose freely. Humans do not, however, have the freedom to distort the word of the God or to assign to it a private interpretation (Deut 4:1, 2; Rev 22:17, 18). The acknowledgment that God is the source of truth ensured the primacy of the scriptures in the philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews University.

Transmission of biblical knowledge, according to the faculty, involves the home, church, and school settings of the biblical model. These three agencies were established in Bible times to provide religious instruction. Religious Education students could focus their studies in one of these settings while having an awareness of all three. Answers to the epistemological concerns exhibit the intrinsic connection between the biblical model, the hallmarks, and the Religious Education curriculum. Whereas biblical and theological concepts constitute religious knowledge, effective instructional methodologies ensure the proper communication of that knowledge.

The axiological concern involves issues regarding beauty and ethics. In the scriptures, beauty is aesthetically reflected through God's holiness (Ps 29:2) and character (1 Pet 1:15, 16). This concept links beauty with the first hallmark of a religious educator. The emphasis of this hallmark is on the development of the individual's character. When

the person grows spiritually and develops sound judgment, the Religious Education staff asserted that the individual will reflect the true beauty whose source is divine (Phil 4:8, 9). In addition, the human being, made in the image of the divine, has the ability to emulate the divine in creativity and imagination. As the individual grows in the hallmarks of character, learning, and integration, he or she most nearly approaches the image of God through creatively and imaginatively doing the works of God. Another axiological area that is biblically connected to character development is ethics (Exod 34:6, 7; Ps 34:8). According to scripture, goodness results when the believer has experienced spiritual growth (Gal 5:22) and focuses on service to God and to others (Matt 19:16, 17). White's ideas on education are a reflection of these biblical responses to the philosophical questions, and along with the biblical perspectives, White's writings informed the structure of the Religious Education program.

The philosophical foundation of Religious Education was carefully crafted by the Religious Education faculty. Each component of this foundation was carefully integrated to give the Religious Education program a defined identity and a sense of mission, based on a clearly theistic response to the major philosophical questions. The manner in which the philosophical structure was crafted suggests that the leaders of the program were well informed theologically and philosophically. As a consequence, the program was well balanced and well focused. The intrinsic connection between the biblical model, White's educational philosophy, the four hallmarks of religious education, the four cognates of the program, and the Religious Education curriculum indicates that the Religious Education program at Andrews University was theistic and holistic in nature, and that it had a clear

purpose in harmony with the philosophical base of the program.

In November 1975, the Religious Education area faculty also voted to publish in the University bulletin, for the first time, the components of the biblical model. These became integral to the philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. The program degrees were conceptualized to prepare students for professional leadership in the home, church, and school.⁹⁷ This conceptualization, which emphasized religious education as taking place in these three settings, reflected the biblical model.⁹⁸

After the incorporation of the four hallmarks and the publication of the elements of the biblical pattern, the general goal of the Religious Education faculty was that all graduates in religious education must emerge from the program understanding the distinctiveness of the Seventh-day Adventist mission and philosophy of Christian education as well as the program's philosophy of religious education.⁹⁹ This philosophical foundation shaped the Religious Education program at Andrews University

⁹⁷Early in the program, Akers and Youngberg perceived that the interplay between the home, church, and school settings was to be the benchmark of the program. George H. Akers, letter to Grady Smoot, Gordon Madgwick, and T.S. Geraty, 31 October 1975, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1976-1977*, 93; and "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 6 November 1975.

⁹⁸The conceptualization of the philosophy of Religious Education as being based on the home, church, and school, and expanded with the four hallmarks, was understood by students in the program. Neall, 1; Vyhmeister, 1; and Ashworth, 1. This biblical model is discussed early on pp. 11-20.

⁹⁹Akers, "Conference Called by President Smoot," 2; and Youngberg, "Some Ideas," 1.

and made it distinctive in the religious education discipline. Moreover, it gave the program a particular specialization and brought it close to the felt needs of the Adventist Church around the world.¹⁰⁰

Program Evaluation

After the initial development of the program, Religious Education at Andrews University faced some challenges in 1978 in terms of its identity and philosophical foundation. The first test was internal, involving faculty members of two programs (the Th.D. and Religious Education) at Andrews University.¹⁰¹ The second was external. It involved a well-known leader in the field of religious education, the accrediting body of the program, the Religious Education faculty, and Andrews University administrators.

All the programs in the Department of Education were to be reviewed by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) in the Spring of 1979.¹⁰² This review was an element of the ongoing NCACS assessment for accreditation of the Department of Education. Because Religious Education was a program in the

¹⁰⁰See Judd, 1; and Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 2.

¹⁰¹The first test was introduced on pp. 125-29.

¹⁰²“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 24 October 1978, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program”; George H. Akers, letter to G. Smoot, R. Graham, R. Schwarz, R. Williams, and M. Dyer, 10 July 1981, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Akers, cassette 1. Akers wrote this letter in preparation for the Fall 1981 NCACS visitation team. In his letter, he referred to the Spring 1979 NCACS visit and indicated his reasons for objecting to Taylor ever returning to Andrews’s campus to assess the Religious Education program.

Department of Education, Akers decided to invite a consultant to appraise the program and determine its readiness for the NCACS review. Failure to pass the NCACS review would jeopardize the credibility of Religious Education at Andrews University and its ability to continue operating as a bona fide program. The Department of Education would have been under pressure to drop any unaccredited degrees.

Following the recommendations of some members of the Seminary faculty, the Religious Education leaders invited Marvin J. Taylor to the campus in 1978 to evaluate the program.¹⁰³ Far from being a consultation, Taylor's work became an academic inspection. When he arrived on campus on the morning of October 23, he requested the Religious Education faculty to give him the program syllabi and to let him talk with the students. He proposed that these two sources would provide him with enough information to determine how bona fide the program was.¹⁰⁴

According to Akers, the suggested two sources did not seem to be a sufficient basis for assessment and consultation. He felt that the omission of other sources like the review of the mission and philosophy of the program, interviews with the Religious Education faculty, discussions with the University and Department of Education administrators, and an appraisal of the enrollment and financial conditions of the program

¹⁰³Taylor was a prominent religious educator of the time, a published authority in the area of religious education, and the president of the American Religious Education Association. The Seminary faculty highly recommended him as one who was very sympathetic and congenial. "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 24 October 1978; Akers to Roy Naden, 20 November 1978, 1; Akers, cassette 1; and Matthews, "Andrews University Program in Religious Education," 2.

¹⁰⁴Akers to Roy Naden, 20 November 1978, 1.

led Taylor to arrive at some faulty conclusions regarding the program. In Akers's opinion, Taylor was unable to assess the credibility of the program because he did not take time to understand the philosophy and mission of Religious Education at Andrews University.

At day's end, Taylor met with the Religious Education faculty in Akers's office for a debriefing.¹⁰⁵ During this meeting, Taylor told the faculty that the curricular core of the program had no integrity. As Akers evaluated Taylor's report, he concluded that Taylor gave no indication that he had really understood the distinctive philosophical foundation of the program.¹⁰⁶ Taylor's conclusions reflected the traditional understanding of religious education at the time. He saw the church setting of the biblical model as the central focus of religious education and the Sunday school as the main instrument for instruction.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵Akers, cassette 1.

¹⁰⁶Akers to Roy Naden, 20 November 1978, 2. Taylor's evaluation left the impression that the Religious Education program at Andrews University was basically defrauding all the students enrolled in the program. As a result, it took a great deal of explaining by the Religious Education faculty and the University administration to convey to Taylor the mission and purpose of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Matthews, "Andrews University Program in Religious Education," 2.

¹⁰⁷Marvin J. Taylor, "Introduction," in *An Introduction to Christian Education*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), 5. Taylor's conception of religious education did not allow him at first to comprehend the nature of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. He was initially confused, it seems, by the elements of a Religious Education program that was not focused primarily on the local church, but that included strong elements pertaining to formal education and to family life issues. For him, religious education was a "collective discipline, catching up much of its substance from other areas (biblical and theological studies, learning theory, psychology, educational philosophy, etc.)." Although he acknowledged that there are other programs

Akers and other program leaders explained to Taylor that the philosophy and mission of Religious Education went beyond the ministry of the local church. They shared how the Religious Education program at Andrews University was designed to serve the needs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church worldwide through three educational agencies: the home, the church, and the school. These three agencies, components of the biblical model, were intrinsic to the Adventist philosophy of education, and students were trained to provide leadership in these agencies.

According to Matthews, Akers had a sparkle in his eye when he shared with the students the results of the visit and how he gave Taylor a lesson in Christian educational philosophy based on a holistic biblical model rather than a church model.¹⁰⁸ The meeting turned out rather differently from what Taylor had intended when he called the faculty and administrators together to make his exit report. He became convinced in the end that the Religious Education program at Andrews was indeed established on a sound philosophical base and that the curriculum was well crafted in terms of the educational philosophy and mission it was intended to support. Subsequently, Taylor recommended

like summer camps and vacation Bible schools that also provide religious instruction, Taylor believed that “the heart of Protestantism’s educational endeavor always has been and will continue to be in the local church itself.” Idem, *Religious and Moral Education* (New York: Center for the Applied Research in Education, 1965), 50, 51. Taylor’s apparent confusion can be better understood in light of the discussion on the nature of religious education during the mid-twentieth century on pp. 70-76, 100-21.

¹⁰⁸Matthews was in attendance when Akers reported to the Religious Education students on the results of Taylor’s visit. Subsequently, when Matthews has discussed the matter with Akers, it has been clear that Akers took some delight in being able to defend the program which he and Youngberg, among others, had so carefully crafted to meet the needs of the worldwide educational program of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico”; and Akers, cassette 1.

the Religious Education program, the NCACS accepted the recommendation, and Religious Education was accredited to continue serving the needs of the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church.

With full recognition of the degrees, the Religious Education program experienced rapid growth. Increased enrollment brought additional strength to the Religious Education program and resulted in curricular development.¹⁰⁹ The preparation for and experience of these challenges provided strong incentives for the program to define itself in the context of the broader scholarly world, the educational focus of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and the educational mission of Andrews University.

The “tripartite model,”¹¹⁰ as Akers called the home, church, and school approach, was functioning well in the home and the school settings, with Youngberg and Akers leading out in each one respectively. The only setting that was lacking proper leadership was the church, and Roy Naden was invited to coordinate the church setting of the tripartite model.¹¹¹ With the arrival of Naden in 1979, the Religious Education program

¹⁰⁹The Religious Education faculty added new course offerings and workshops in family life, Sabbath school leadership, child evangelism, and the integration of faith and learning to the program. Three tracks in the religious education, religion, and research cognates had been previously included in the program. Moreover, they invited a new faculty member to join the Religious Education program. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1978-1979*, vol. 67, no. 4 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1978), 81; and “Minutes of the Executive Committee—Religious Education Area Faculty,” 15 November 1976.

¹¹⁰Akers, cassette 1.

¹¹¹Naden had a doctorate in Curriculum from the University of California, Los Angeles campus. He also had wide experience in public, radio, and television evangelism, and a specialty in nurture and outreach through religious education in the local church and community. Roy Naden, “Naden’s Answers to the Questionnaire,”

became fully functional with a distinctive philosophical foundation and the faculty to support it. Instruction in the program was provided by three full-time professors, Youngberg, Naden, and Akers, who provided leadership in the home, church, and school settings respectively.

The Religious Education program was further strengthened when Donna Habenicht, a professor of psychology, accepted a joint appointment in Religious Education in 1980,¹¹² and E. Stanley Chase agreed to anchor the course EDRE688 Integration of Faith, Learning, and Practice.¹¹³ Another important contribution came as a result of the appointment of W. Richard Lesher as the president of Andrews University in 1984.¹¹⁴ Lesher's contribution to the program was significant. After the introduction of

TMs, 4 May 2004, in my possession, 1; Akers, cassette 1; and "Department of Religious Education," 2.

¹¹²Habenicht earned an Ed.D. degree in Educational Psychology and Counseling with a cognate in Religious Education from Andrews University in 1977. She had expertise in counseling, character development, and psychology of learning. She was also a consulting psychologist and visiting instructor in psychology in the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Michigan. Her contribution to the program was to supply a link between psychology and religious education by teaching courses like Developmental Psychology, Psychology of Character Development, and the Spiritual Nurture of Children.

¹¹³"Department of Religious Education," 2. Chase received an Ed.D. in Curriculum, Psychology, and Administration in 1960 from the University of Tennessee. In addition to his strong background in curriculum, he was also a teacher, a principal, lecturer in psychology, and visiting professor in curriculum in schools across the United States.

¹¹⁴Lesher graduated in 1970 from the University of New York with a Ph.D. in Religious Education. He served as a pastor in Northern New England, academy principal in Egypt, and secretary of the Middle East Division of Seventh-day Adventists. Then he taught religion and was assistant to the president at Atlantic Union College. Before taking up the appointment at Andrews University, he was associate director of the

the Religious Education doctoral degree, he was the first person with a Religious Education degree to provide some instruction in the program.¹¹⁵ The contributions of the additional faculty and adjuncts not only strengthened the program, but these also opened the way for the founding of the Ph.D. degree in Religious Education in 1982.¹¹⁶

The new degree followed the same general structure and philosophical foundation as the Ed.D. in Religious Education. The basic difference between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. degrees in Religious Education was in the preparation and completion of the dissertation. Whereas dissertations for the former degree tended to be more field-oriented

General Conference Sabbath School Department, director of the Biblical Research Institute, and vice-president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. In addition to his presidential responsibilities at Andrews University, Leshar was appointed an adjunct professor of Religious Education.

¹¹⁵In addition to his administrative responsibilities, Leshar gave occasional lectures in conceptual dimensions of religious education and team-taught the class EDRE864 Doctoral Seminar which was required of all doctoral candidates. The next full-time faculty in the Religious Education program at Andrews University trained specifically in religious education was not appointed for another twelve years. Akers, cassette 1; and “Department of Religious Education,” 2.

¹¹⁶“Department of Religious Education,” 3. The Ph.D. degree in Religious Education was officially published in the 1983-1984 University bulletin under the Educational Leadership and Management program in the School of Education. The first graduates with the Ph.D. degree were Beatrice Neall and Gilbert Valentine in 1982. Beatrice Neall was a professor in the Department of Religion (1977-1994) at Union College in Lincoln, Nebraska, and Gilbert Valentine was religion teacher and dean of men (1982-1985) at Longburn Adventist College in New Zealand and then president of the Pakistan Adventist Seminary and College (1985-1990) in Farooqabad, Pakistan. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1983-1984*, vol. 72, no. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1983), 44, 45; “Andrews University Doctoral Graduates,” Document #33, 2; and “Andrews University Doctoral Graduates,” Document #13, 1.

and practical, the latter were more research-oriented and theoretical.¹¹⁷ With three graduate degrees now being offered (the M.A., Ed.D., and Ph.D.), the Department of Religious Education appeared to be moving forward solidly in serving its students and in graduating individuals who were capable educational leaders.

Conclusions

Religious Education was fundamentally a program that developed leadership through exposure to the disciplines of religion, education, and the social sciences. It also provided a distinctive sense of the structure, philosophy, purpose, and mission to Christian education in the Adventist context. The Religious Education degree was distinctive among other religious education programs because it was centered on a particular biblical and philosophical approach to holistic education.

Studies in religious education commenced at the master's level in 1960 with an educational emphasis and a strong religion cognate. The mission of the program reflected the mission of the Department of Education: to train people for all kinds of educational service within the worldwide Adventist Church school system. This mission was conceptualized to mirror the redemptive concept of Ellen White and the Adventist philosophy of Christian education. The elements of the biblical model were an

¹¹⁷The new degree required two research tools to be selected from biblical languages, modern languages, computer competency, advanced statistical competency, or advanced documentary research competency as required by the dissertation topic. Twelve quarter credits (eight semester credits) were also added in basic research skills development to sharpen expertise in professional research. John B. Youngberg, "The Current Ph.D. in Religious Education," Document #27, 23 September 1983, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1983-1984*, 44, 45.

important component of the mission and philosophy of Religious Education. The commission of Religious Education was to serve a world church with the goal that the effects of its service would impact Adventist education around the world.

In 1974, the philosophical parameters and mission of the Religious Education program were expanded with the establishment of the first doctorate in religious education. The three components of the biblical model were the benchmark of the program. Graduates would be afforded a vision of education based on the Bible and White's educational philosophy, and skills in leadership that prepared them to meet the educational needs of the Adventist Church in the settings of the home, the church, and the school.¹¹⁸ The graduates would use their skills in one or more of these three settings to serve as agents under God in achieving the primary goal of Adventist educational initiative—restoration of the image of God in humanity.

Faculty and leaders of Religious Education continued to fine-tune the philosophy of the program over the next few years. The four hallmarks of religious education were adopted, namely, character development, transmission of religious heritage, delivery systems, and integration of faith and learning. These hallmarks enabled the integration of the Adventist theological message as taught in the SDATS with the instructional insights and skills presented in the Department of Education. In addition to fine-tuning the philosophical platform, the program was fortified with the arrival of a third full-time

¹¹⁸Examples of the settings and sub-settings include teachers, pastors, administrators, Sabbath school directors, family life directors, family counselors, education directors and supervisors of teaching, youth leaders, campus chaplains, residence deans, and academic and curricular leaders.

faculty member and the inclusion of other adjunct professors who taught courses in the areas of their expertise.

These developments expanded the philosophical basis, brought growth and stability, and enhanced the identity and sense of mission of the Religious Education program at Andrews. But despite the promising beginnings of the program, two challenges threatened to undermine its mission. One emerged from the Theological Seminary and the other was related to issues arising from an upcoming NCACS accreditation visit. Both difficulties challenged the identity and philosophy of the program. The challenges were met successfully and it appeared that the Religious Education program was well established and poised to make a significant contribution in the years ahead. There were, however, even greater challenges ahead which did indeed undermine the mission of the program. These problems are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM AT ANDREWS

UNIVERSITY: THE CHALLENGING YEARS

The Religious Education program at Andrews University developed a distinctive mission under the competent leadership of Harder. The distinctive mission and philosophical foundation were integral to the program from the very beginning. Religious Education was designed to train denominational workers to meet the growing needs of the Adventist Church around the world. During the 1970s, the program grew to include three full-time professors, two graduate degrees, intensive courses in addition to regular programs, and a broader description of the three settings for religious education. All these developments were a clear sign of a healthy, stable, and growing program. In addition, the expansion of the philosophical foundation of the program connected religious education in the Adventist Church with such important concepts as nurture, spiritual growth, and transmission of the religious heritage. In spite of these auspicious beginnings, however, some challenges arose in the early 1980s that tested the strength of the program and led to its erosion.

Chapter 3 describes the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews University during this difficult period. It discusses the nature of the troubles faced during

the 1980s and 1990s until the arrival of two new professors in the program. The chapter analyzes how the identity and mission of Religious Education were weakened, leading to uncertainty about the future of the program. The chapter ends with a summary of the developments during this challenging period.

Governance and Cross-Campus Strains

In 1981, a year before the Religious Education Ph.D. was introduced, the Department of Education at Andrews University established the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (C&I). The description of the new doctorate manifests a considerable amount of overlap with the requirements of Religious Education. The educational doctoral degree gave students two instructional options. “One permits an individual who wishes to become a subject specialist in school systems or teach both education and content courses in a college or university to have a strong content emphasis in addition to a concentration in Curriculum and Instruction. The second option permits content emphasis in several areas for individuals who wish to function as curriculum coordinators or supervisors of instruction where general knowledge of several areas is important.”¹

The C&I doctorate was basically designed to train scholars in the areas of teaching, learning, supervision, curriculum development, and research within the Adventist and other systems of education. Professionals educated in these areas would contribute to the field of education through research and leadership in curriculum

¹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1981-1982*, vol. 70, no. 7 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1981), 47.

development and instructional improvement in learning organizations.² The new doctorate gave students who had an academic background in education the option of pursuing a more specialized degree in curriculum and instruction. In addition, with approval from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the credibility of the C&I degree within the public sector would be much greater than a degree in religious education.³ Religious education was outside of the parameters of NCATE accreditation. Consequently, Religious Education faced the possibility of losing students to the new program.

In 1982, changes in governance were initiated in all graduate programs and schools within the University.⁴ Akers was appointed director of the Department of Education and all the Religious Education degrees were housed within this Department under the Educational Leadership and Management program and the supervision of the School of Graduate Studies.⁵ Akers's departure affected the program in two ways. First,

²Ibid., 48.

³During the late 1960s, Andrews University considered application for NCATE accreditation. The council considered and approved the University's request for accreditation of its educational programs beginning 1 September 1970. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1999-2000*, vol. 88, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1999), 160.

⁴The School of Business had been organized in 1980 and the leadership in the Department of Education was developing plans to institute the School of Education (SED) in 1983. During this time, the Seminary also added a Ph.D. degree in Religion to its graduate program. Matthews, "Andrews University Program in Religious Education," 2, 3. See appendix B for a comparison of the requirements for the Ph.D. degrees.

⁵Andrews University, *Bulletin 1982-1983*, vol. 71, no. 4 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1982), 44, 45. The Religious Education courses were structured under the following areas: Foundations of Religious Education, The

it decreased the capabilities of the program in a quantitative way. Instead of having three professors, Religious Education was left with only two full-time faculty to carry the academic load of the program and to maintain its philosophical integrity. The director's departure put serious constraints on the program's available areas of expertise. Since the arrival of Naden, each of the three full-time faculty had contributed to one of the areas of the tripartite model: Youngberg's area was the home, Naden's emphasis was the church, and Akers's specialty was the school setting. With the reassignment of Akers, the school setting of the biblical model was left without strong leadership at the same time that the doctorate in C&I was introduced.

Second, Akers's departure put the accreditation of the program in jeopardy with the NCACS. In an early message, the NCACS had communicated that it "will not accredit an institution if there are doctoral programs being offered even in departments other than Teacher Education which do not have the equivalent of three full-time staff."⁶ The difficulty was resolved when the NCACS found acceptable the use of the pool of Religious Education area faculty members. Nonetheless, Akers's appointment to lead the educational division at Andrews marked the beginning of a series of significant challenges that threatened the strength and philosophical integrity of the program.

In 1982, while Akers was in transition, the Adventist Theological Seminary

Church/Community Setting, The Family Setting, The School Setting, Religious Education Research and Practicum, and Other Related Courses in Religious Education.

⁶John B. Youngberg, letter to Richard W. Leshner, 20 October 1987, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. This letter is cited for its content referring to this particular situation.

established the Ph.D. in Religion. Like the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, the creation of this doctoral degree posed a problem for the Religious Education doctoral program. The new Seminary doctorate offered students with an academic background in religion the opportunity to earn an academic doctoral degree in their main area of interest. In addition, in contrast to the extensive requirements of the Th.D., candidates were required to take a similar number of credits and complete the program in about the same time frame as the Ph.D. in Religious Education.⁷ This doctoral degree in Religion

was designed to train individuals to be able to do original and responsible research, equipped with skills and methods appropriate to genuine scholarship, proficient in applying sound and valid principles of biblical interpretation and historical research, and effective in the classroom. It [sought] to acquaint students with the Judeo-Christian heritage and the findings of various branches of biblical scholarship, to communicate the religious and ethical values of the Judeo-Christian heritage as found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and as understood by conservative Christians in general and Seventh-day Adventists in particular.⁸

Students with an academic background in education or religion were the main sources of enrollment for the Religious Education doctoral degrees. Once the Ed.D. in C&I and Ph.D. in Religion were established, prospective students had the opportunity to pursue more specialized doctoral degrees in their areas of interest.⁹ As a result, the number who

⁷Andrews University, *Bulletin 1982-1983*, vol. 71, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: The Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1982), 44. See appendix B for a comparison of the requirements of both doctoral programs.

⁸*Ibid.*, 43.

⁹Education students tended to choose a terminal degree in education, and students with prior studies in religion were inclined to select the Ph.D. in Religion when this became an option. Consequently, the Religious Education program which had benefited from Religion students opting for Religious Education rather than the Th.D. no longer had a ready supply of strong candidates.

opted to take Religious Education dropped, creating an enrollment problem for the doctorates in Religious Education. But the troubles for Religious Education did not end here.

In 1983, the Department of Education was upgraded in status to become a degree-granting school of the University in its own right. Akers was appointed dean of the SED, and the Religious Education program continued as an offering under the auspices of the new school.¹⁰ With the creation of the SED, some graduate programs housed in the Department of Education were no longer supervised by the School of Graduate Studies. This situation brought some confusion in the administrative structure of the three Religious Education degrees. The three programs were divided between two schools. Supervision for the M.A. and Ed.D. degrees was transferred to the SED while the Ph.D. degree was retained and offered through the School of Graduate Studies.¹¹ Yet even the Ph.D. was to all intents and purposes administered by the SED. Despite the structural changes, Religious Education maintained its identity and philosophical integrity based on the home, church, and school components of the biblical model. The four hallmarks, as they were called by the faculty, also continued to serve as a framework for the

¹⁰Andrews University, *Bulletin 1982-1983*, 44; idem, *Summer Bulletin 1984* (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1984), 1.

¹¹Andrews University, *Summer Bulletin 1984*, 1. The retention of the Ph.D. degree in Religious Education was done at the behest of President Smoot who wanted the degree to be an interdisciplinary program with the Seminary. "Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting," 13 September 1985, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and "Ph.D. Program in Religious Education: Summary of Developments," Document #32, 28 April 1988, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

curriculum.¹² All three Religious Education degrees were listed under the new Religious Education and Educational Foundations Department whose chair was Youngberg.

Akers was not happy about the retention of the Ph.D. degree in the School of Graduate Studies, believing this was a loss for the SED. He noted the confusion that resulted from the way the program was restructured and observed that the retention of the doctorate in the School of Graduate Studies deprived Religious Education of the Ph.D. degree as well as the cohort of students pursuing that degree. He felt that “the conjoint program that was developed between the Seminary and the Graduate School was more political than academic.”¹³ Akers’s statement seems to indicate that there was an intentional plan on the part of the School of Graduate Studies to retain supervision of the Ph.D. in Religious Education to favor the Seminary leadership who had recently begun their Ph.D. in Religion.¹⁴

It also appeared to Akers that Gerhard Hasel, dean of the SDATS, was trying to take advantage of the plans to retain the Ph.D. in Religious Education in the School of Graduate Studies. According to Akers’s perception, Hasel was attempting to eliminate all the Religious Education doctoral degrees by not making Seminary professors available for teaching its courses. Apparently, the dean of the SDATS had indicated that the

¹²Andrews University, *Summer Bulletin 1984*, 1.

¹³Akers to Richard Leshar, 11 June 1985, 1. See also E. Stanley Chace, letter to W. Richard Leshar, 18 March 1986, transcript in the SED files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁴The addition of the Ph.D. in Religion appeared to have revived the competition for students between Religious Education and the Seminary. This issue is mentioned on pp. 125, 126.

Seminary faculty were so occupied with their own doctoral programs that they could not meet the demands of the doctoral degrees in Religious Education. But Akers felt that Hasel's rationale for trying to eliminate the Religious Education doctorates had a different foundation. Because the Religious Education program was not part of the Theological Seminary, he believed that Hasel viewed its doctoral degrees as being of questionable academic reputation.¹⁵ The result was a growing disengagement of the Seminary faculty from the Religious Education program.¹⁶

In addition to Hasel's apparent attempts to terminate collaboration with the Religious Education degrees administered in the SED, the Graduate School faculty organized themselves to restructure the Ph.D. in Religious Education in a way that would transfer its control to the Seminary. Fritz Guy, vice-chairperson of the Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee, was involved in "refashioning the program into interdisciplinary studies in religion, with education as a supporting field."¹⁷

¹⁵Akers to Richard Leshar, 11 June 1985, 1.

¹⁶George H. Akers, letter to Richard Schwarz, 29 August 1985, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Matthews, "Andrews University Program in Religious Education," 3.

¹⁷John B. Youngberg, "Notes Taken on the Ph.D. in Religious Education Committee Held on November 21, 1983," Document #66, 21 November 1983, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; Fritz Guy, "Doctor of Philosophy in Religious Education: Preliminary Draft," Document #67, 21 March 1984, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; "Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting," 13 April 1984, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Akers to Richard Leshar, 11 June 1985, 2. In an effort to keep the Religious Education Ph.D. in the School of Graduate Studies, the Doctoral Program Committee recommended that "all non-professional doctoral degrees should be channeled through the SGS, in harmony with what is standard educational practice in the most reputable doctoral degree-granting institutions in our part of the country." "Minutes of Doctoral

Guy proposed that the Ph.D. in Religious Education should be an interdisciplinary program of studies “designed for students who are interested in special forms of religious service that are facilitated by a diversified doctoral education. These forms of service include (among others) the development and supervision of religious education in large congregations, family-life education and nurture, campus ministry at church-related and secular colleges and universities, and leadership of church organizations and departments that are involved in educational activities of various kinds.”¹⁸ Students whose aim was teaching religion/theology in colleges or seminaries ought to apply to the program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Religion offered through the SDATS.¹⁹

In his proposal, Guy stated that the Religious Education Ph.D. should be administered by the director of the program, under the supervision of the Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee of the School of Graduate Studies. As research tools, he suggested including foreign languages (either ancient or modern), computer languages, and statistics.²⁰ According to Guy’s revised mission of the doctoral program in Religious Education, his goal was to discourage students who desired to teach religion in Adventist institutions of higher learning from pursuing the Ph.D. in Religious Education. This role was, in Guy’s view, the exclusive purview of the Ph.D. in Religion.

This growing division between the Seminary and the Religious Education

(Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting,” 13 September 1985.

¹⁸Guy, “Doctor of Philosophy,” 1.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., 1, 6.

program affected the quality and philosophical foundation of the Ph.D. degree during the 1980s. The dissension led the leadership of the Religious Education program to focus more on the educational setting within the confines of the SED, which tended to relegate the religion component of the program to the status of prerequisites. The reduced requirements in religion were reflected in the description of the program given in the University bulletin. Students were required to take most of their courses in religious education, psychological development, educational foundations, and research. In 1984, the biblical language requirement was dropped.²¹ As a result, theology and religion lost their place as integral components of the Religious Education program.²² Thus the church component of the “tripartite” model was relegated to the background and the structure of the program began to erode.

During this time, a number of Seminary professors observed that students who had been rejected by the SDATS on academic grounds applied for admission to the program in Religious Education and were accepted into that doctoral degree.²³ Then upon successful completion of their programs, and to the consternation of some of the

²¹Andrews University, *Summer Bulletin 1984*, 3, 4.

²²Matthews, “Andrews University Program in Religious Education,” 3.

²³“Notes on the Interviews,” 2; and Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 2. Perhaps the quality of the students as seen by the Seminary was inferior. At first, in the 1970s, some Seminary professors were concerned about the perceived weaknesses of Religious Education. Now, in the 1980s, when students rejected by the Seminary were admitted to degrees in religious education, those professors had good reason to say that the Religious Education doctoral program was inferior. This situation seems to indicate that Religious Education was already facing enrollment problems and it needed students to survive.

Seminary professors, a number of these graduates in Religious Education went out to teach religion or theology in undergraduate programs of Adventist colleges and universities.²⁴ This situation increased the tensions between the two entities.

In addition to the conflict that had developed with the Seminary, in 1984 the SED introduced a new doctoral degree: the Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (C&I). This degree was introduced to prepare “educational leaders who will contribute to curriculum change and instructional improvement through original theoretical and conceptual research.”²⁵ Students in the Curriculum and Instruction Ph.D. could choose a specialization from one of four different areas: Elementary Education, Middle/Secondary Education, K-12 Education, or Higher Education. Within these specialties there were a variety of emphases relating to both academic subjects and supervisory specializations.²⁶

The C&I program was strong in methods in the transmission of religious heritage, delivery systems for a teaching/training ministry, and integration of faith and learning, which were three of the hallmarks of a religious educator at Andrews University. This was clearly expressed in the philosophy of the department. “The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is committed to a Christian world view and seeks to demonstrate through both precept and practice the integration of faith and learning. Programs are designed for experienced educators who wish to improve their instructional

²⁴“Notes on the Interviews,” 2.

²⁵Andrews University, *Bulletin 1984-1986*, vol. 73, no. 1 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1984), 97.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 96.

skills and prepare themselves as curricularists. They are planned to prepare educational leaders who possess the skills to understand, initiate, and manage curricular changes in their respective fields.”²⁷

The introduction of this doctorate made the difficulties of the doctoral program in Religious Education even more acute. Numerically, the new degree brought additional competition for students with an academic degree in education. More students who had teaching as their main goal chose the C&I doctorate over the one in Religious Education. While the Ph.D. in Religious Education trained educational leaders as generalists, the doctoral program in Curriculum and Instruction prepared educators as specialists. Philosophically, the mission of the Curriculum and Instruction Ph.D. clearly overlapped with the mission and philosophical structure of Religious Education. Hence, the hallmarks of religious education were no longer a special characteristic of the Religious Education program.

Meetings regarding the administration of the Religious Education Ph.D. by the School of Graduate Studies continued throughout 1985 and most of 1986.²⁸ Meanwhile, the Religious Education faculty voted in January 1986 to request president Smoot to

²⁷Ibid., 92. Course content of classes like Foundations of Curriculum Development, Improving Instruction, and K-12 Curriculum reflected the three hallmarks of a religious educator at Andrews.

²⁸“Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting,” 13 September 1985; “Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting,” 5 September 1986, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting,” 26 September 1986, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

arrange the reunification of the Religious Education program.²⁹ The deans of the SED and School of Graduate Studies as well as president Smoot expressed a willingness to finally reunite all the Religious Education degrees within the SED.

The request to consolidate the Religious Education program in the SED was reinforced later in the year by a consultant who was invited to advise Andrews University regarding a recent emphasis of the Council of Graduate Schools of the United States of America on unified quality control measures for all graduate programs. The consultant was also invited to discuss the suitability of Andrews's current organizational structures, administration, and quality control of its graduate programs. He "recommended an organizational arrangement for Andrews University whereby a university-wide school of graduate studies would be responsible for the quality control of all graduate programs as specifically housed within departments of other schools of the university."³⁰

As a consequence, the University administration acceded to the request and, starting with the academic year 1987-1988, the administration of the Ph.D. in Religious Education was transferred to the SED.³¹ Under the umbrella of the Religious Education

²⁹"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 15 January 1986, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁰"Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting," 5 September 1986. While quality control of the doctorates remained with the School of Graduate Studies, administration of the degrees should be within the various schools.

³¹"Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting," 26 September 1986; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1987-1988*, vol. 76, no. 7 (Berrien Springs, MI: Graduate Programs, 1987), 167; John B. Youngberg, letter to Stanley Chace, 14 July 1986, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; "Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations: Tentative 1986-1988 Bulletin," Document #53, October 1986, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien

and Educational Foundations Department of the SED, the Religious Education program was set to operate as a unified entity in an integrated department functioning under the auspices of one academic division of the university.

The reunification of all the Religious Education graduate degrees in the SED was very significant for the program at this time. It prevented the Ph.D. degree from being completely absorbed into the Ph.D. in Religion and eliminated as a degree in its own right by being reconstituted as an interdisciplinary religion degree with education as a supporting field. Although Seminary professors continued to oversee the cognate comprehensive examinations in religion, they did not retain significant influence over the program in Religious Education. This state of affairs furthered weakened Seminary collaboration with Religious Education. However, the decreased collaboration from the Seminary was not the only challenge confronting the Religious Education program. Despite the reunification of the Religious Education degrees in the SED, the collaboration that the Religious Education program was receiving from the SED also diminished.

The Identity of Religious Education in the SED

In 1988, two developments provided some support for the weakened Religious Education program at Andrews. First, the Religious Education faculty devised a broader description of the home, church, and school settings for religious education. This revision was done in preparation for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) visit. In their description of the curriculum, the faculty

Springs, MI, 1; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1986-1988*, vol. 74, no. 1 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1986), 140; and "Ph.D. Program in Religious Education," 1.

members amplified the kind of service that each of these settings would provide to the Adventist Church around the world.³² The broadening of the role of the home setting increased its significance for religious instruction. This agency was to meet the needs of the Adventist denomination in three main areas: (1) reclaiming the home as the cornerstone of society and the cradle of values transmission; (2) providing ways for reconciliation in family relationships; and (3) cooperating with the worldwide church and national professional organizations in the certification of family life educators.³³

The church setting, as offered through collaboration with the SDATS, would serve the church by training religious educators who were specialists in the various areas of the Church Ministries Department of the Adventist Church.³⁴ The school setting would assist in the preparation of teachers who could integrate the theological message of Adventism with the educational ideals and mission of the denomination. In addition, graduates would be well grounded in the foundations of education as understood from an Adventist perspective. As teachers or administrators, this grounding would be a guide to their professional contributions. Broadening the three components of the biblical model amplified their role in the mission and identity of the program.

The second development was the creation of a new graduate degree in Religious

³²“Department of Religious Education,” 4.

³³“Mission of the Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations,” Document #5, 20 October 1988, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

³⁴Some of the facets of church ministry include leadership, administration, youth ministry, and family life. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1987-1988*, 98.

Education. The Religious Education faculty called for a consultative meeting and voted to recommend to the faculty of the SED the founding of the Ed.S. degree in Religious Education.³⁵ The recommendation was approved by the faculty of the SED and referred to the Academic Policies and Curricula Committee for the purpose of fine-tuning the requirements.³⁶ The committee met and discussed the different components of the Ed.S. degree and voted to recommend the program to the Graduate Council.³⁷ The degree was accepted by the Graduate Council and officially introduced to potential candidates in 1990. The Ed.S. in Religious Education was designed for students who were more interested in content courses and practical applications than in pursuing a degree that would primarily involve a research component.³⁸

The introduction and approval of the specialist degree showed that the Religious Education program was still able to meet the needs of its clientele. However, the

³⁵The only participants in this consultation meeting were Youngberg, Naden, Habenicht, and Chace due to difficulties in getting the whole area faculty together for a meeting. Yet their recommendation was ratified in the Religious Education area faculty meeting of January 1989. The recommendation came as a result of the continuing interest expressed by a number of students in pursuing a Specialist Degree (Ed.S.) in Religious Education. "Minutes of the Faculty Meeting," 1 December 1988, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; "Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting," 7 December 1988, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 31 January 1989, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁶"Minutes of the Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting," 12 January 1989, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁷*Ibid.*; and "Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting," 30 November 1989, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

³⁸Andrews University, *Bulletin 1990-1991*, 168.

additional support obtained did not effectively restore the tripartite model of the program. Its philosophical platform continued the emphasis on the home and school elements of the biblical plan, but the church component, which to all intents and purposes had been relegated to the status of religion prerequisites in the Ed.D. and Ph.D., was not revived by the Ed.S. The Bible was still important in the new degree through the integration of faith and learning that permeated the whole program, and through religion courses taken by advisement on the chosen setting: home, church, or school.³⁹ However, the religious elements of the program had clearly been diluted by the schism between the SED and the Seminary.

While the Ed.S. was being planned, Youngberg was also working to introduce the Family Life Ministries emphasis as part of the M.A. in Religious Education. This emphasis expanded the home element of the Religious Education program and required candidates to have competence in eleven areas of family life education.⁴⁰ Students were

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰The emphasis on family life required candidates to develop competencies in the areas of theological foundations of family life; family science; internal dynamics of families; human growth and development; human sexuality; interpersonal relationships; family resource management; parent education and guidance; the family, the law, and public policy; ethics; and family life programs and implementation. The reason for having various Family Life competencies was to prepare students to become professional family life counselors through certification with the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR). Andrews University, *Bulletin 1989-1990*, vol. 78, no. 7 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1989), 176; and Matthews, "Andrews University Program in Religious Education," 3.

required to take more courses in psychology, education, and family life than in biblical studies and theology.⁴¹

The developments noted above served to support a diminished program, but they did not really improve the current condition of Religious Education. In addition to having lost the church component to the Seminary, the school element of the biblical model was basically lost to the developing C&I doctoral degrees.⁴² When these two educational doctoral degrees were introduced, the broad curriculum of Religious Education proved insufficient for the needs and requirements of the field of professional educators. This situation left two elements as the main components of the Religious Education program: the home setting of the biblical model and the Foundations courses.⁴³

⁴¹“Andrews University: Courses Taken by Religious Education Students,” Document #54, 26 August 2005, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, in my possession. This document is a statistical printout of all courses taken by Religious Education students since 1977. Out of thirty-seven courses taken by Ed.D. and Ph.D. candidates in 1990, only nine were in religion and pastoral ministry, fourteen in education and research, ten in psychology and family, and four in foundations. By 1994, Ed.D. and Ph.D. students took no courses in religion, fifteen in education and research, eleven in psychology and family, and four in foundations, for a total of thirty classes taken.

⁴²Even though Naden was still teaching in the Religious Education program at this time, the church setting was lost to the Seminary for three reasons. First, the Religion cognate was relegated to the status of a prerequisite. Second, the relationship with the Seminary was broken. Third, he was the liaison between the SDATS and Religious Education and, according to Youngberg, he “seldom if ever attended” any meeting in the Seminary. Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 6. See also pp. 156-60 for additional information regarding the church element, and pp. 152-55 for information about the C&I program.

⁴³The Religious Education program offered foundations courses in philosophy, history, psychology, sociology, and theology. Two courses were offered in theological foundations: Teaching Ministry of Christ and A Theology for Christian Educators. All these foundational courses were taught by the Religious Education faculty as a service to the whole of the SED. “Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula

As more professional competencies were required by accrediting bodies like NCATE and other professional organizations, C&I as well as other programs in the SED cut more of the foundations requirements and instituted their own core classes. The foundations courses of these programs were incorporated to address specific issues within their professions rather than the broad perspectives of educational foundations in general or Adventist educational philosophy in particular.⁴⁴ The result was a decrease in the contribution made by Religious Education in offering foundations courses as a service to the SED.

As a consequence of the need by professional educators for a more specialized curriculum being offered by C&I, and with the reduction of courses in educational foundations that could be offered by Religious Education faculty, the revenue base for the program was jeopardized. The philosophical integrity of the program was also challenged. Of the three areas of the tripartite model, the area of church vitality and leadership was being addressed in the Seminary through the growing Christian Ministry Department, and the area of formal education was being addressed by programs in

Committee Meeting,” 28 February 1986, Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1990-1991*, 171, 172; “Regular Review,” 1; and “Program of Religious Education and Educational Foundations Mission Statement,” Document #36, 9 January 1994, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2.

⁴⁴Paul Brantley, “Some Random Thoughts About Foundations,” 1996, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; John B. Youngberg, “Some of the Issues Involved in Foundations of Education,” 7 May 1997, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; “Minutes of Foundations of Education Faculty Meeting,” 7 May 1997, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

educational administration and curriculum and instruction. This situation left Religious Education with only one area, namely, family life. Fortunately, this was John Youngberg's area of expertise, and he was able to maintain Religious Education through the 1990s based to a large degree on this remaining strength of the Religious Education program. Essentially, the philosophical structure of the program was reduced to one component of the biblical model, and the viability and contribution of Religious Education became even more precarious.

Changes in the SED continued to marginalize Religious Education as a credible academic program with a defined purpose. Toward the end of 1989, a structural realignment was considered by the faculty and administration of the SED in its December meeting. They voted to merge the Religious Education and Educational Foundations Department with the Teacher Education and the Curriculum and Instruction Departments.⁴⁵ These three departments were merged to form the new Teaching and Learning Department in the SED beginning the 1990-1991 school year.⁴⁶ The new structure brought to an end the status of Religious Education as a department in its own right and required that it be redefined in order to fit into the new department.⁴⁷

In 1991, further developments threatened to terminate the Religious Education program at Andrews University altogether. First, the growing disengagement of the

⁴⁵“Regular Review,” 1, 2.

⁴⁶Andrews University, *Bulletin 1990-1991*, 164.

⁴⁷In spite of housing Religious Education in a new department, the main thrust of the program continued unchanged. The emphasis remained primarily educational rather than religious. Ibid. See also “Regular Review,” 2, 3.

Seminary faculty from Religious Education culminated in the Seminary finally separating itself completely from the program.⁴⁸ This move was the denouement of all that had gone before. The separation was not due to an “inappropriate match, but for other reasons relating to the vision of particular individuals.”⁴⁹ In view of this situation, the Religious Education program included religion in its general sequence of comprehensive examinations and eliminated a separate religion cognate examination.⁵⁰

Second, the administration of the SED expressed serious concerns about continuing the Religious Education program at Andrews even in its recently reconfigured setting within the Department of Teaching and Learning. The rationale for wanting to discontinue the program was twofold. First, there was a need for some financial cuts and the closure of Religious Education was considered as one of the options to accomplish this. Second, the leaders of the SED had come to the conclusion that the Religious Education program had not integrated appropriately into the Department of Teaching and Learning and was no longer serving any major needs in the area of foundations that could

⁴⁸“Minutes of Graduate School Faculty Meeting,” 12 March 1991, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁴⁹“Toward an Understanding of Religious Education,” Document #38, 1 June 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. This document was prepared as a discussion document for a meeting held on 1 June 1999 between the Seminary leadership and the Religious Education faculty and SED dean. The author was John Matthews and the document was based on information Matthews obtained in interviews with Youngberg and Akers in preparation for that meeting with the Seminary leaders.

⁵⁰“Minutes of Graduate School Faculty Meeting,” 12 March 1991. The separate religion core examination had been conducted as part of the assistance and contribution of the Seminary to the Religious Education program.

not be met in some other manner.⁵¹ Consequently, it was concluded that it would be best to close Religious Education at the end of the 1992-1993 academic year.

Youngberg's vision and industry in the face of the mounting challenge held the program together. Through the Family Life program, Youngberg played a significant role in saving the Religious Education program. His efforts convinced the administration of the SED about the viability of the program, and that it could continue to make a significant academic contribution. However, the perceived ability of Religious Education to continue operating as a viable program would not be long-lived in the minds of the administrators.

In 1994, the Family Life Educator Certification was incorporated into the Religious Education program, which strengthened the Family Life Ministries component of the program.⁵² Although the certificate program maintained elements of the philosophical structure of Religious Education by supporting the home setting, it did not significantly improve the status of the Religious Education program. After fifteen years

⁵¹When Youngberg sought the input of the provost, Arthur Coetzee, concerning the rationale for closing the Religious Education program, Coetzee responded that this was only his advice and not a mandate. During this time, however, some programs like Counseling Psychology, Leadership and Administration, and Teacher Education began pulling away from the foundations courses offered by Religious Education as a service to the SED. These programs offered their own foundations courses. Therefore, the impact of the Religious Education program on the SED was no longer considered a great service to the SED and the conclusion was that Religious Education was no longer needed. John B. Youngberg, "Dialogue," Document #68, 1991, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 4-16; idem, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 5.

⁵²Andrews University, *Bulletin 1994-1995*, vol. 83, no. 8 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1994), 173.

of service, Naden retired in 1994 and was not replaced due to budget constraints.⁵³ The decision not to replace Naden left Youngberg as the only full-time faculty of the Religious Education program. This situation meant that the doctoral program was no longer viable with only one full-time faculty member.⁵⁴

At the request of William H. Green, chair of the Teaching and Learning Department, Youngberg developed a new focus for the Religious Education program.⁵⁵ This focus included a greater emphasis on the family life component, a need not being met in the Seminary or School of Education. In addition, an initiative was undertaken to offer some video courses through the Distance Learning Center to lessen the academic load. Youngberg envisioned that this offering would improve the enrollment and financial condition of Religious Education. After its presentation to the faculty of the SED, the new focus was approved and the program was authorized to continue.⁵⁶

This approval, however, did not address the inevitable problems that would arise from running a “one-man” program. It was impossible to do justice to all the components of the program that had undergirded the doctoral degree in Religious Education since the

⁵³Naden, 4; Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 11; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1994-1995*, 22.

⁵⁴Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 11.

⁵⁵Ibid.; and Matthews, “Andrews University Program in Religious Education,” 3.

⁵⁶Youngberg, “Information on the Religious Education Program,” 12. Use of video delivery was a significant distance learning innovation introduced by Youngberg and Religious Education at Andrews. Youngberg was among the pioneers in the SED in developing this method of course delivery. “Mission and Future,” 1; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

1970s. Greater emphasis was placed on the home setting of the philosophical framework at the expense of the church and school settings.

The attempt to run Religious Education with only one full-time faculty member caused the final erosion of the original identity of the program. Under pressure from other doctoral programs in the SED and Seminary, in the face of significant financial constraints, and with very limited human resources, Youngberg valiantly sustained the family component of the “tripartite model.” Through most of the 1990s, Family Life Education grew and prospered as the main focus of the Religious Education program. The other significant contribution was the service courses in the area of educational foundations.

Despite these challenges, new opportunities arose that helped the program. The SDATS had new leadership. Werner Vyhmeister, who had replaced Hasel as the Seminary dean, had a much higher regard for Religious Education than did his predecessor. He had served as an advisor in the religion cognate and coordinator of the religion comprehensive examinations in the early stages of the doctorate in Religious Education. Furthermore, his wife Nancy was an Ed.D. graduate of the Religious Education program at Andrews University.⁵⁷

Vyhmeister’s affinity with the program effected some favorable changes. The attitudes of the Seminary faculty and the Religious Education personnel became more

⁵⁷Youngberg, “A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs,” 2; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 19 April 1979, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. Nancy Vyhmeister received her Ed.D. in Religious Education from Andrews University in 1978. “Andrews University Doctoral Graduates,” Document #33, 1.

positive and conducive to reestablishing the closer links enjoyed in the past.⁵⁸ Thus the Religious Education area faculty voted in late 1994 to recommend that the Department of Teaching and Learning and the SED forge a new partnership between the Religious Education program and the Seminary. The recommendation also specified that one representative of the Christian Ministry Department and one representative of the World Mission Department would sit as members of the Religious Education faculty.⁵⁹

The Religious Education program envisioned its goal as “producing professionals who have a strong Biblical base, who understand faith development, Christian nurture and the pedagogy derived from the Bible and from the sciences, and who, because of their broader base, can equip and empower disciples in one or several arena(s) of ministry.”⁶⁰ In order to attain this goal, the leaders of the program formulated two plans. First, cooperate with the SDATS in the establishment of a Center for the Theological Education of the Laity. Whereas Religious Education could concentrate on teaching principles and strategies, the SDATS could offer the theological and pastoral portions of this training center. Second, increase the use of co-advisement between Religious Education and the Seminary.⁶¹ This recommendation was accepted by the SED and the Seminary.⁶² As a

⁵⁸“Toward an Understanding,” 1.

⁵⁹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 3 November 1994, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁶⁰“Mission and Future,” 2.

⁶¹Ibid., 6, 7.

⁶²“Toward an Understanding,” 1; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 2 December 1994, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Minutes of the School

result, Religious Education started a new relationship with the Seminary.

Around the same time, a second opportunity arose to which the Religious Education faculty responded positively. A number of individuals who wanted to pursue a graduate degree at Andrews University could not break away from their jobs in order to attend graduate school for several quarters. Thus, in the summer of 1995, the Religious Education program implemented a summer intensive track for its students as part of a plan to make available alternative formats for religious education instruction.⁶³ This was another way in which Religious Education at Andrews University sought to maintain its viability by considering the particular needs of its potential students.

The success of the summer track led the Religious Education area faculty to divide the program into two educational tracks.⁶⁴ The first track was the traditional year-round, on-campus study based on fulfilling course work requirements.⁶⁵ The second track was the summer track which included various alternative formats like the summer intensive modules and seminars, an individual development plan, distance education

of Education Faculty Meeting,” 10 February 1995, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁶³The summer track was offered during the months of July and August with an elective post-session for the Family Life International seminar to be scheduled for August 1995. “Mission and Future,” 3.

⁶⁴“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 27 January 1995, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁶⁵Andrews University, *Bulletin 1996-1997*, vol. 85, no. 9 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1996), 217.

through video presentations, and the development of a portfolio.⁶⁶ This track was based on fulfilling competencies, often through course work.⁶⁷

While the Religious Education faculty was planning these two tracks, the SED administration restructured the Teaching and Learning Department under a different name. The new name was the Teaching, Learning and Administration Department. This reorganization proved to be beneficial to Religious Education because it gave the faculty an opportunity to strengthen the program. The new department was now composed of five distinct programs.⁶⁸ One of those programs was Leadership. The Leadership doctoral program was experiencing high enrollment and good cash flow.⁶⁹ Consequently, the faculty of the Leadership doctorate received budget approval in the fall of 1995 for a new teaching position.

The list of candidates for the new position was narrowed to two names. One of them was O. Jane Thayer, then completing her doctoral degree in Religious Education at

⁶⁶The individual development plan was based on meeting competencies in research, leadership, cross-cultural missions, and individualized special interest competencies as worked out with an advisor. "Mission and Future," 3; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 1996-1997*, 218.

⁶⁷Andrews University, *Bulletin 1996-1997*, 217; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 27 January 1995; and "Mission and Future," 3.

⁶⁸Andrews University, *Bulletin 1995-1996*, vol. 84, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1995), 119-42. All the programs housed in this department were Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration and Supervision, Reading Education, Religious Education, and Leadership.

⁶⁹The Leadership doctoral program was introduced in 1995 in the SED under the guidance of James Tucker. Additional information about the program is given on p. 203. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1995-1996*, 139; and Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 4, 5.

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.⁷⁰ Her strengths in Religious Education, discipling, spiritual formation, and learning theory, together with the serious need for additional dissertation advisors motivated the Religious Education area faculty to take an unusual step. They voted to recommend to the faculty of the Leadership program that serious consideration should be given to hiring Thayer for the available teaching position.⁷¹ The recommendation was accepted by the faculty. As a result, Thayer was hired in the summer of 1996 after obtaining her doctoral degree.⁷²

This decision helped the Religious Education program more than it did the doctorate in Leadership. Thayer's hiring brought three significant contributions to the Religious Education program. It made the program more viable with a second faculty member, it gave the Religious Education staff the opportunity to begin rebuilding the

⁷⁰Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 12. Thayer received her Ph.D. in Christian Education from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in June 1996. She had been an English teacher, freelance writer, and editor of the *Journal of Research on Christian Education*. Her doctoral expertise and interest were on assessment of spirituality/religiosity, spiritual development of adults, and the ministry of the church.

⁷¹The step was unusual because the budget was approved for the Leadership doctoral program yet the name recommended would benefit Religious Education. The Religious Education area faculty took advantage of the fact that the Leadership and Religious Education programs were both located in the Department of Teaching and Learning, which afforded them the opportunity to make their recommendation. Andrews University, *Bulletin 1995-1996*, 138, 139.

⁷²"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 29 November 1995, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. Initially, Thayer's responsibilities were divided into two areas. She was 75 percent director of University Assessment and 25 percent teacher in the Religious Education program. The following year the proportion of her responsibilities changed to 50 percent in each area. Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 12; Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 2; and Neils-Erik Andreasen, letter to O. Jane Thayer, 27 March 1996, transcript in the SED files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

philosophical framework and identity of the program, and it furnished Religious Education with a full-time faculty member trained in religious education at the doctoral level.⁷³

Thayer's appointment did not alleviate all the difficulties that Religious Education faced in the late 1990s. Youngberg had framed the Family Life program in terms of requirements of the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR),⁷⁴ and the annual summer conferences were well attended and productive. Students enrolled in the Family Life summer conferences also became part of the regular academic program. But the academic standards that the NCFR expected were not achieved by the summer conferences. There were questions about the academic integrity of the program in terms of offering Ph.D., Ed.D., Ed.S., or even M.A. degrees. These questions struck at the very heart of the Family Life emphasis.

Though regular students had additional work not required of attendees at the summer seminars, the conferences were open to individuals not necessarily enrolled in graduate degrees. This meant that the standard of presentation and scholarship could not

⁷³During the 1960s, Harder was the first full-time faculty member of the program trained in religious education at the doctoral level. Thayer became the second one about thirty-six years later. During the 1980s, Leshner, former president of Andrews University and a trained religious educator, also provided some instruction in the program.

⁷⁴The NCFR is an approved provider of continuing professional education for the American Psychological Association, National Association of Social Workers (Metro Washington Chapter), and the National Board for Certified Counselors. It "provides a forum for family researchers, educators, and practitioners to share in the development and dissemination of knowledge about families and family relationships, establishes professional standards, and works to promote family well-being." National Council on Family Relations, "NCFR's Mission," *About Us*, 15 May 2006, www.ncfr.org/about_us/index.asp (accessed 15 May 2006).

be highly academic. In addition, the number of contact hours between professor and student in courses built around the summer conferences was likely to be much less than that required by academic policy. Therefore, negotiations with leaders of Family Life Ministries at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and the North American Division (NAD) of Seventh-day Adventists in 1999 and 2000 encouraged the NAD leaders to take responsibility for the summer conferences, and the leadership of the Religious Education program to take responsibility for the academic credit, with the conferences as supplemental to rather than the foundation for academic credit. Credit was to be generated by intensive summer courses with sufficient contact time between teacher and student, and rigorous pre- and post-intensive assignments.⁷⁵

Shortly before the retirement of Youngberg, John V. G. Matthews joined the Religious Education faculty in January 1999.⁷⁶ When Youngberg retired in June 1999, Matthews was named the new coordinator of the Religious Education program. But

⁷⁵“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 30 April 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 31 May 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 22 September 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 27 October 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Family Life Discussions,” 27 October 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

⁷⁶Matthews, “Andrews University Program in Religious Education,” 3; and Neils-Erik Andreasen, letter to John V. G. Matthews, 15 September 1998, transcript in the SED files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. Matthews earned his Ph.D. in Religious Education from Andrews University in 1988. He had served the Seventh-day Adventist Church as a pastor, educator, and administrator in Africa, Europe, and Asia. His responsibilities had included teaching education and church history, and he had served as chair of a religion department, academic dean, and senior administrator of a college campus. His expertise was in educational philosophy and administration.

during the Christmas break of 1999, Matthews resigned from this administrative duty, preferring to focus on teaching and research, and Thayer was asked to take up the responsibility.⁷⁷ As a result, she became the new director of the Religious Education program at Andrews University, a position she held until her retirement on 1 September 2007.

Conclusions

From the early 1980s to 2000, the Religious Education program at Andrews University passed through a critical period in its history. This crisis started after the creation of the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction. Conflicts and challenges in the program increased, which affected the identity and implementation of the philosophy of the program. These critical challenges include Akers's appointment as director of the Department of Education, the establishment of the Ph.D. in Religion (1982) and Ph.D. in C&I (1984), and Naden's retirement.

As a result, the contributions of the Religious Education program to the SED and the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church were significantly reduced. The leaders of the program had not only faced challenges from outside, but also from inside the SED. These difficulties reveal an interesting phenomenon. During the time of crisis with the Seminary in the mid-1980s, the administration of the SED supported Religious Education. In the early 1990s, a few years after the Seminary crisis was over, the SED leaders emerged as a threat to the Religious Education program. During this period,

⁷⁷Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 2; and Matthews, "Written Responses to Rico."

Religious Education was maintained essentially through the efforts and industry of Youngberg.

At the end of this critical time, two new faculty, Thayer and Matthews, commenced the process of redefining Religious Education at Andrews. They asked searching questions about the mission and future of the program. The new Religious Education faculty looked for ways to strengthen the philosophical foundation of Religious Education. The significance of Thayer's and Matthews's work will be the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE RELOCATION OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM TO THE SEMINARY

The arrival of Jane Thayer in 1996 and John Matthews in 1999 initiated a new phase in the history of Religious Education at Andrews University. Their academic backgrounds in religious education enabled them to reassess and critique the philosophy and mission of the program. Their questions regarding its philosophical platform, location in the SED, and contribution to the worldwide mission of the Adventist Church began a process that led to the redefinition and restructuring of Religious Education at Andrews University.¹ During this process, the Religious Education faculty incorporated the six roles of a religious educator into the framework of the program, thus enhancing its philosophy and structure and beginning to rebuild its identity. Toward the end of 1999 and through 2000, meetings were held between Religious Education faculty members and Seminary professors as well as the deans of the SED and SDATS. These meetings set in motion a series of events that led to the eventual transfer of the Religious Education program to the Seminary in July 2002.

Chapter 4 covers the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews

¹Matthews, “Andrews University Program in Religious Education,” 4.

University from the time Thayer and Matthews started the work of redefining its mission until 2007. It describes the meetings between the SED and SDATS faculties, the reasons for the involvement of their respective deans, and the discussions regarding the best location for Religious Education at Andrews University. In addition, it explains the rationale for choosing the SDATS as the best setting for the program and examines the reasons that supported this conclusion. The practical challenges of relocating Religious Education to the SDATS are considered, and the contributions of the program to the mission of the Adventist Church around the world are re-examined. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the most recent history of the Religious Education program at Andrews University.

Redefining Religious Education at Andrews University

Three personnel changes in the Religious Education program created the opportunity for reflection on the identity and mission of the program: Thayer's appointment to full-time status, the arrival of Matthews, and the retirement of Youngberg² after twenty-five years of service as professor and later director of Religious Education. Youngberg had accomplished the monumental task of keeping the program running, but on his own he could not stop the breakdown of the program nor the erosion of its philosophical foundation. Due to the changed circumstances, Youngberg needed additional support to maintain the viability of Religious Education.

The two new faculty members, Thayer and Matthews, attempted to understand

²These three events are outlined on pp. 177-80.

Religious Education at Andrews and the nature of their own roles in the program. They asked questions about the relationship of the program with the SED, earlier collaboration with the SDATS, the future contribution of Religious Education, and where that contribution could best be made.

During this time, the SED was also preparing for the NCATE visit scheduled for April 1999.³ Through the latter half of 1998, the administration and faculty of the SED, under the leadership of the new dean, Karen Graham, engaged in intensive preparation for this visit.⁴ The previous NCATE evaluation had resulted in a short-term, provisional approval for the initial and advanced levels of the programs for professional education.⁵ The reason given for approving the SED only provisionally was that “the members of the professional community [did] not share an understanding of how the professional education knowledge bases undergird the unit’s conceptual framework.”⁶ Under the

³“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 5 April 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁴Upon her arrival as dean of the School of Education in 1997, Karen Graham saw the need to improve communication channels across program boundaries. She also acknowledged that one way to facilitate development of a more collegial spirit was to revisit the SED mission and conceptual framework. “Design of Professional Education: NCATE Institutional Self-Study Report, 1999,” Document #50, February 1999, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2, 3.

⁵The initial level of the design for professional education refers to the undergraduate program where initial teacher preparation takes place. The advanced level relates to graduate programs.

⁶“Accreditation Action Report: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education,” Document #78, April 1997, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; Arthur E. Wise, letter to Neils-Erik A. Andreasen, 24 April 1997, transcript in the SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and John Matthews, “Journey Toward an Owned Conceptual Framework: A Narrative and Documents Illustrating Our NCATE

pressures accompanying preparation for the important NCATE visit of April 1999, any serious redefinition of the Religious Education philosophy and identity remained a low priority. The entire SED faculty was expected to work together in the process of getting ready for the NCATE visit. Before the mission of Religious Education at Andrews could be redefined, a clear SED philosophy and mission was needed in order to determine the contribution of the program to the SED.

Preparation by the SED for the 1999 NCATE visit involved two important issues for Religious Education. The first was an examination of the offerings in educational foundations. The main contribution of Religious Education to the SED was in the provision of foundations courses as a service to all the programs. The Religious Education faculty recognized that the teaching of foundations courses was important for the program, and that any major reduction in the need for these offerings would probably mean the demise of Religious Education at Andrews. According to the University bulletin, one foundations course served the whole of the SED as a required course, and others served as electives to students in Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration, and Educational and Counseling Psychology. In the Leadership area, students were not required to take foundations courses in a regular classroom setting. Instead, the Leadership faculty organized students in cohorts and in online settings to

Preparation Experiences,” 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 4, 5, 7. The latter document is also cited for its content relating to the NCATE 1996 visit and placing the SED on probation.

study issues pertaining to foundations.⁷ As a result, enrollment in the optional foundations courses was relatively small, and at times the classes were cancelled due to low enrollment. The Leadership faculty encouraged students needing those courses to take independent studies or request petitions to replace a foundations course with an alternative. Thus the contribution made by Religious Education to the SED was rather tenuous. No program that offered only one or two service courses could be sustained over the long term by the SED.⁸

The second issue regarding the preparation of the SED for the NCATE visit was the evaluation and restatement of the philosophy of the SED. In late 1998, a group of faculty members from the SED worked on the conceptual framework and philosophy statement of the school. After several drafts, the SED faculty voted in January 1999 to accept the theme “Educar es Redimir (To Educate Is to Redeem): Harmonious Development for Service.”⁹ This motif became the keystone statement of the conceptual framework and philosophy of the SED. Programs in the SED were planned around a

⁷Brantley, 1; Youngberg, “Some of the Issues,” 1; Andrews University, *Bulletin 1998-1999*, 177-86; idem, *Bulletin 1999-2000*, 169-78; idem, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, vol. 89, no. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2000), 181-90. EDFN500 Philosophical Foundations of Education and Psychology was the only course required by other programs in the SED.

⁸“A Statement on the Undergirding and Integrating Function of Foundations Within the School of Education: Andrews University,” Document #69, November 1996, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; Brantley, 1; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 5 April 1999; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

⁹“Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting,” 12 January 1999, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Design of Professional Education,” 4; and Matthews, “Journey Toward an Owned Conceptual Framework,” 12.

framework composed of these two concepts: “Educar es Redimir” and “Harmonious Development for Service.” The two concepts made explicit the faculty’s professional commitments, dispositions, and values that supported them. As educators, they were to be about the business of service for and redemption of humanity.

The “Educar es Redimir: Harmonious Development for Service” theme fit very well with the current philosophical foundation and mission of the Religious Education program. The mission of the program as stated in 1999 was to “prepare qualified professionals of all nationalities who wish to integrate the presentation of biblical truth with the gift of teaching. The program is designed to equip Christian workers in a variety of settings for a more effective discipling ministry in the world. . . . Spiritual formation and character development constitute the basis of the entire curriculum.”¹⁰

From the genesis of the program, the Religious Education faculty saw themselves as partners and emissaries in God’s work of redemption.¹¹ They were committed to be life-changing agents and to make the world a better place by sharing the reality of Christ as Savior. Thus the connection of the two main concepts of the philosophical framework of the SED with the mission of Religious Education was natural and harmonious.¹²

During the January 1999 meetings, the leadership of the SED asked participants to

¹⁰Andrews University, *Bulletin 1999-2000*, 174.

¹¹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 82, 83. When the concentration in Religious Education was founded in 1960, the faculty who taught the courses in the Department of Education also saw themselves as collaborators in God’s plan of salvation. Idem, *Bulletin 1960-1961*, 60.

¹²The connection of the theme of the SED with the mission of Religious Education is discussed on pp. 120-22.

identify various knowledge bases common to all programs in the SED.¹³ The representatives of all programs in the SED came up with six areas.¹⁴ These knowledge bases addressed the areas of theoretical understanding, analytical ability, practical expertise, personal application, and professional growth that students needed to develop in their educational experience.¹⁵ Although these meetings involved the SED as a whole, the issues of foundations and educational philosophy were particularly associated with the philosophical platform and identity of the Religious Education program. The results of these meetings were significant for Religious Education because they prepared the way for redefining the philosophical foundation of the program.¹⁶

In the fall of 1999, Matthews, Thayer, and Youngberg met to discuss the

¹³Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 5; "Design of Professional Education," 2; "Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting," 12 January 1999; and "Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting," 10 March 1999, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. As faculty got involved, it became clear that they were actually crafting a new conceptual framework in which instructors of each program had some input and were able to share together across all SED programs.

¹⁴The six knowledge bases were World View; Human Growth and Change; Groups, Leadership, and Change; Communication and Technology; Research and Evaluation; and Personal and Professional Growth. "Design of Professional Education," 5, 6.

¹⁵"Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Doctoral Comprehensive Preparation Guidelines," Document #71, 6 November 2001, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and "Design of Professional Education," 5, 6.

¹⁶In fact, Matthews was contracted as a consultant by the dean to write up the new philosophy and conceptual framework of the SED, which meant that he began thinking seriously about the philosophy of Religious Education in relationship to the SED within a month of his arrival at Andrews as a faculty member.

application of the SED knowledge bases to Religious Education.¹⁷ This task was part of Graham’s requirement for each program: to identify and define a seventh knowledge base, that is, a program-related knowledge base.¹⁸ This could be a seventh area or a redefinition of the six knowledge bases in terms of the individual program.¹⁹ At the meeting, Matthews, Thayer, and Youngberg discussed various options, including some ideas on which Thayer had been working.

After careful study, the Religious Education faculty “took those six knowledge bases . . . and changed them into specific roles of a religious educator.”²⁰ These roles were Christian Apologist, Pastor-Teacher, Servant-Leader, Reflective Researcher, Maturing Christian, and Lifelong Scholar.²¹ Because this was a challenging time for the

¹⁷Matthews led the Religious Education program during this period following Youngberg’s retirement.

¹⁸“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 26 April 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

¹⁹“Design of Professional Education,” 6-8.

²⁰Thayer, “Questionnaire on Religious Education,” 5; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

²¹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 21 October 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Assessment Results,” Document #42, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2. The relationship between the SED knowledge bases and the Religious Education roles is simplistically presented in the following listing:

SED Knowledge Bases	Religious Education Roles
World View	Christian Apologist
Human Growth and Change	Pastor-Teacher
Groups, Leadership, and Change	Servant-Leader
Communication and Technology	Lifelong Scholar
Research and Evaluation	Reflective Researcher

Religious Education faculty in recrafting the philosophical foundation and identity of their program offerings, the results of this process were significant.

The roles of a religious educator at Andrews, according to the faculty, did not replace the biblical model for religious education or the components of the philosophical foundation of the program. On the contrary, they enhanced the philosophical base and identity of the program. The roles fit in with the SED competencies and, at the same time, established a framework for defining a religious educator. In addition, the roles could easily be set up in terms of competencies of a religious educator. They reflected the traditional emphases of the Religious Education program in the past while encouraging new curricular initiatives for the future.²²

The focus of the Christian Apologist role was, among other things, on the interpretation and communication of God’s word for contemporary needs from an Adventist perspective, the importance of Jesus’ plan of salvation as the foundation and rationale for religious education, and the articulation of a philosophy of religious

Personal and Professional Growth

Maturing Christian

²²A number of competencies is assigned to each role. These competencies reflect each one of the components of the biblical model. This is illustrated in the following listing:

Religious Education Roles

Components of Biblical Model

Christian Apologist

Bible; Church, School, and Home settings

Pastor-Teacher

Bible; Church and School settings

Servant-Leader

Church, School, and Home settings

Lifelong Scholar

Church and School settings

Reflective Researcher

School setting

Maturing Christian

Home setting

education. The Pastor-Teacher role was centered around educational elements like understanding human development, articulating and applying current theories of learning, designing and evaluating curriculum materials, and facilitating the preparation of trainers. The role of Servant-Leader helped students to function as servant-leaders; demonstrate ability to apply principles of leadership in the home, church, or school settings; contextualize content and methods of religious education to reach the culture in which he or she is ministering; and effectively recruit, train, and support the laity for ministry.

As a Reflective Researcher, the religious educator was prepared to conduct and evaluate research and report on its findings, and to assess spiritual gifts and indicators of spiritual maturity. The Maturing Christian role equipped the student to practice the harmonious development of the spiritual, mental, physical, and social aspects of his or her life. These aspects included family time, church activities, and spiritual growth. The stress of the Lifelong Scholar was on personal and professional development, and the effective use of technology for professional communication, teaching, and research.²³ While maintaining the conventional emphasis on the home, the church, the school, and the Bible, the six roles also gave Religious Education additional elements for future expansion of the mission and identity of the program into more specialized applications in these agencies of the biblical model.²⁴ This potential would allow Religious Education

²³“Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Program Plan: Religious Education,” Document #70, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and “Assessment Results,” 1, 2.

²⁴The connection between the components of the biblical model and the roles of a religious educator is made below on pp. 194-99.

students to focus on ministries not addressed by other degrees and programs in either the SED or Seminary.

The focus of the six roles was on the religious educator himself or herself, rather than on the educational settings in which he or she might work. This approach has a stronger basis in current professional religious education and educational literature. The roles define the religious educator in three ways: cognitively, conatively, and affectively.²⁵ First, the Christian Apologist characterizes the Christian educator cognitively, that is, by

²⁵Howard A. Ozmon and Samuel M. Craver, *Philosophical Foundations of Education*, 6th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1999), 299; Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, 209-40; Jeff Astly, *The Philosophy of Christian Religious Education* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1994), 24-30; and Charles F. Melchert, "What Is Religious Education?," in *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education*, ed. Jeff Astly and Leslie J. Francis (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1994), 48-50. Competency in the six roles, along with a focused emphasis area, prepares graduates in accordance with their own purposes to function as religious educators in chosen ministries in the home, church, or school settings. The three domains of learning have been identified as cognitive, psychomotor, and affective. As defined by Benjamin Bloom et al., the psychomotor domain has not been easily applicable to learning in the formal setting, and this domain has more recently been redefined and renamed. The conative domain describes more accurately the kind of procedural learning that takes place in the regular educational setting, in contrast to technical or special educational settings. Robert F. Biehler, *Psychology Applied to Teaching* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), 212-17, 381-83; David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book 2 Affective Domain* (New York: Longman, 1964), 15-85; Benjamin S. Bloom, *Human Characteristics and School Learning* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976), 30-160; W. Huitt, "Conation as an Important Factor of Mind," 28 March 2008, chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/regsys/conation.html (accessed 28 March 2008); and Abhijit Rao, "Recognition of Conative and Affective Behavior in Web Learning Using Digital Gestures," 28 March 2008, www.unb.ca/naweb/proceedings/2001/po3Rao.html (accessed 28 March 2008). There is, of course, transfer of knowledge, skills, and values between the various domains, which means that the roles of a religious educator cannot be delimited to one domain. The manner in which the roles are defined here is merely to give an idea of the major emphases of the roles in terms of the three learning domains.

what the individual knows. Second, the Pastor-Teacher and the Servant-Leader identify the graduate by what he or she does, namely, the skills, competencies, gifts, and abilities. The role of a Reflective Researcher may be included in both the first two categories. Third, the Maturing Christian and the Lifelong Scholar define the religious instructor by what the individual is, which includes commitment to spiritual growth and intellectual curiosity.²⁶ These roles gave distinctiveness to Religious Education at Andrews University.

Thayer incorporated the six roles of a religious educator into the content of Synthesis in Religious Education, a course that was added to the Ph.D. curriculum in 1996.²⁷ Thayer taught this course and it served as part of the student's culminating experience in the program. Initially, the emphasis of the class was on evaluating the student's Individual Development Plan or professional goal statement and completing a portfolio that highlighted the various elements and experiences of the doctoral program.²⁸ But in the process of teaching this course, Thayer had to come to terms with the purpose and mission of the Religious Education program. The roles of a religious educator provided her with a purpose and a sense of direction for the program. After the inclusion of the six roles, the focus of the class has been on examining the structure of the discipline, discussing its major issues, and reviewing its basic literature. Students are

²⁶“Doctor of Philosophy Program Plan,” 1; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185.

²⁷Andrews University, *Bulletin 1996-1997*, 221.

²⁸*Ibid.*; idem, *Bulletin 1998-1999*, 192.

required to develop portfolios and provide written critiques to demonstrate proficiency in the various competencies described in the six roles of a religious educator.²⁹

The roles and their competencies are used to set academic standards in the students' programs of study.³⁰ Moreover, the roles help students gain a clearer understanding of what Religious Education is all about and to define more clearly their program of studies.³¹ "Each of these roles includes a number of competencies that serve as a guide to students in designing their programs of study and choosing their courses."³² The core competencies of the various degrees in Religious Education are no longer centered around the three broad categories of the home, church, and school, though the new framework for the program remains open to specific curricular emphases within these three areas. In consultation with an advisor, students identify an area of specialty designed to meet their specific needs.³³ This specialty (for example, Family Life Education or Theological Curriculum and Instruction) can be accommodated by the flexibility of the program, but in each case the roles and competencies of a religious educator remain the framework that shape the study program of each Religious Education

²⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 196.

³⁰The six roles of a religious educator and their corresponding competencies are listed in appendix D.

³¹Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 5.

³²Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185. These roles may also help leaders in the Adventist Church and prospective employers of Religious Education graduates to understand the program better.

³³*Ibid.*

student at Andrews.³⁴ Assessment of each graduate's competency in the roles and emphasis area as a religious educator is based on course work, the portfolio, and comprehensive examinations.³⁵

By developing these roles, the faculty of the Religious Education program rebuilt and redefined the philosophy and parameters of the program even though Religious Education did not constitute a department in its own right. The roles also enabled the Religious Education faculty to start identifying the contribution and place of Religious Education in the SED by redefining the curriculum in terms of specific niches that would not result in conflicts with existing SED or Seminary programs. As a result of curricular developments through the 1980s and 1990s, with the church and school settings being offered respectively by Christian Ministry in the Seminary and Curriculum and Instruction in the SED, Religious Education was effectively left with only the family setting. The new framework for Religious Education was an attempt to seek lacunae in the home, church, and school components of the biblical model that were not already being met.

Those unmet needs ultimately led the Religious Education faculty to offer four specialized areas: Family Life Education, Campus Spiritual Leadership, Theological Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational History.³⁶ These new specializations helped the Religious Education faculty to conclude that the reason for the existence of the

³⁴Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 5.

³⁵Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 186.

³⁶Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 305.

program was not lost and that it had a distinctive contribution to make. This contribution was strongly based on its educational philosophy founded on the Bible and the writings of Ellen White, its definition of the roles and competencies of a religious educator in the context of the discipling mandate of the gospel commission, and the need for training in specialized educational ministries across the lifespan of the rapidly expanding membership of the Adventist Church.³⁷

When compared with the philosophical structure that Akers conceptualized,³⁸ the expanded foundation presented some similarities and some differences. The first two components of the philosophical foundation of Religious Education underwent no alterations. The Religious Education program was still based on the home, church, and school settings of the biblical model, having the Bible central to the program. White's biblical educational views were still an integral part of the philosophy of the program. The connection between these two components remained unchanged.³⁹

The difference in the philosophical structure of Religious Education was made with the inclusion of the roles of a religious educator.⁴⁰ Previously, the Religious Education curriculum was structured in four different cognates; after the rebuilding process, the curriculum was based on the six roles. This change did not remove the

³⁷Matthews, "Written Responses to Rico."

³⁸An analysis of Akers's conceptualization is on pp. 129-40.

³⁹The connection between the biblical model for religious education and White's educational philosophy is presented on pp. 83-88.

⁴⁰Appendix D enumerates the roles and their respective competencies.

biblical model from the curriculum of the program. Rather, the elements of the biblical pattern permeated the different roles. An analysis of each role and its respective competencies showed how the components of the biblical model were included. The competencies listed under the Christian Apologist role particularly reflected three elements of the biblical model: Bible, church, and school. The Bible was presented in two competencies: interpreting and communicating the scriptures from an Adventist perspective and valuing the salvation work of Christ as foundational for religious education. The church and school settings were incorporated in two other competencies: the historical development of education and effective communication in all forms for various audiences.

The church and school components of the biblical model were also included in the following three roles: Pastor-Teacher, Servant-Leader, and Lifelong Scholar. In the Pastor-Teacher role, students are required to use appropriate learning strategies to disciple Christians. They also are challenged to explain the processes of spiritual formation from theological, psychological, and sociological perspectives.

The Servant-Leader role encompassed two elements of the biblical model. For example, individuals need to demonstrate the ability to apply leadership principles in the church or school setting, and they have to recruit, train, and support the laity for ministry. Similarly, the Lifelong Scholar role required Religious Education candidates to use technology effectively for professional communication, teaching, and research.

The competencies of the Reflective Researcher role were focused particularly but not exclusively on the school setting. In this role, students are required to be capable of

reading, conducting and evaluating research, and reporting their findings. The components of the biblical model were also reflected in the role of Maturing Christian. In one competency, individuals are challenged to pursue the harmonious development of the spiritual, mental, physical, and social aspects of their lives. While the spiritual aspect includes the church setting, the mental and social aspects involve academic learning and family relationships respectively. In a second competency, students are to engage in spiritual growth and transformation, which implies the Bible and church setting.

Despite the curricular changes from the four cognates to the six roles of a religious educator, the elements of the biblical model remained foundational to the philosophical structure of Religious Education at Andrews. The same is true regarding the educational philosophy of Ellen White. Knowledge of God, character development, and service were key concepts in her educational ideas.⁴¹ These views were also present in the various competencies. For example, a knowledge of God was included in competencies relating to the interpretation and communication of the Bible, and in valuing the redemptive work of Jesus.⁴² Character development was articulated in the Pastor-Teacher role under competencies focused on the understanding of human development, and strategies for the implementation of individual change. The concept of service is particularly reflected in the Servant-Leader role. Through this role, students learn to function as servant leaders and relate effectively with various cultural, racial, and special interest groups.

⁴¹White's educational ideas are described on pp. 83-88.

⁴²These competencies are part of the Christian Apologist role.

This analysis has identified a clear connection between the biblical model for religious education, White's educational philosophy, and the six roles of a religious educator. These three components were united in the new conceptual framework for Religious Education at Andrews, gave the program a strong identity and a clear sense of mission, and helped address some unmet needs in areas like Campus Spiritual Leadership and Theological Curriculum and Instruction.

The enhanced philosophical framework for the Religious Education program also addressed the major philosophical questions. An analysis of the philosophy shows that the metaphysical and axiological concerns were not altered, and the questions raised by these two philosophical categories were addressed in the various roles and competencies of a religious educator. For the Religious Education faculty, God was the center of all metaphysical realities. Such competencies as "critique from a Christian perspective the assumptions of different worldviews" and "interpret and communicate the scripture from an Adventist perspective" imply that cosmological and ontological issues are examined. The anthropological concern is addressed in competencies like "understanding human development" and "explaining the processes of spiritual formation from theological, psychological, and sociological perspectives." These competencies infer the biblical concept that God made humankind in His image. "Value the salvation work of Christ as foundational for religious education" points to a metaphysical teleology of restoration based on redemptive education. Through these competencies, the faculty asserted the metaphysical realities of a Christian worldview relative to the origin of the universe, the

creation of humankind in God's image, and the Lord's plan to restore humanity to its original condition.

The axiological concepts of character development and service to God and others were also addressed in the six roles of a religious educator. The faculty asserted these philosophical views in at least two roles: Servant-Leader and Maturing Christian. In these roles, the Religious Education staff included the following competencies: "function as a servant leader," "contextualize content and methods of religious education," and "practice the harmonious development of the spiritual, mental, physical, and social aspects of one's life." This biblical approach to metaphysics and axiology was also carefully integrated with White's educational views in order to clarify the mission of the Religious Education program.

In the strengthened philosophical framework, the faculty kept the Bible as the primary epistemological source of God's revealed knowledge for the Christian. This was particularly described in the Christian Apologist and Pastor-Teacher roles. The competencies that required students to "interpret and communicate the Bible for contemporary needs" and "articulate and apply current theories of learning" exhibited this concept. The home, church, and school settings were also considered important agencies for the transmission of the biblical message.

The examination of the enhanced philosophical foundation indicates that the philosophy was carefully crafted by the Religious Education faculty. Each of its components fits together to give the Religious Education program at Andrews University a defined identity and a clear sense of mission. Furthermore, the expanded philosophy

provided credibility and integrity to the Religious Education program. The new framework was not a rejection of the old, but was a reconceptualization to meet current needs given the changes that had taken place since 1980.

After Matthews, Thayer, and Youngberg met to study the roles of a religious educator and ways to implement the program, Religious Education underwent another structural change. In 2000, the Teaching, Learning and Administration Department was renamed the Department of Graduate Studies in Curriculum, Administration and Religious Education (CARE) under the leadership of Judy Anderson.⁴³ The CARE Department served as the last home of the Religious Education program in the SED before it moved to the Seminary in July 2002. The new department presented an interesting scenario for Religious Education. The Curriculum and Instruction doctoral degree was the one that most seriously undermined the Religious Education program at Andrews.⁴⁴ Nonetheless, CARE proved to be a good departmental home for Religious Education. The synergy of the three programs, strange as it might seem, allowed Religious Education to maintain an identity and make a contribution in the SED.⁴⁵ Thayer's and Matthews's collaboration with the faculty of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Administration gave the Religious Education program a new lease on life.

⁴³ Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 184.

⁴⁴The role that Curriculum and Instruction played in undermining Religious Education is discussed on pp. 152, 153, 161, 162.

⁴⁵According to Thayer, this was a time of creativity during which the faculty enjoyed working together. Jane Thayer, "Written Responses to Jorge E. Rico," August 2006, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, in my possession.

Moving the Program to the Seminary

The Preliminary Meetings

As Thayer and Matthews came to a greater understanding of the role of Religious Education at Andrews University, redefined the mission, and clarified their own contributions to the program, questions about the location of Religious Education emerged. The landscape in which the Religious Education program developed in the 1960s and 1970s had changed considerably by 2000, and the changes demanded some clear analysis of the past and present in order to craft the future.

During the 1990s, the Religious Education program was strongly focused on Family Life Education as a result of Youngberg's work. The home setting of the biblical model for religious education had by default become the major focus of the program, causing a significant weakening of the identity of Religious Education as it lost its philosophical balance. But this was not the only challenge that the two faculty members faced by 2000.

In 1995, the SED had introduced a doctoral program in Leadership. The Leadership doctorate was offered in addition to the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees in Curriculum and Instruction and in Educational Administration. The mission of the new degree was to develop "Christian leaders who are able to integrate faith and learning in ways that prepare others for responsibilities and service."⁴⁶ The doctorate in Leadership was structured on twenty general competencies arranged in six groups: effective teacher/instructor, dynamic change agent, effective organizer, collaborating consultant,

⁴⁶ Andrews University, *Bulletin 1996-1997*, 136.

reflective researcher, and competent scholar. These competencies were considered minimal criteria for completion of the program.⁴⁷ The goal of the Leadership faculty was to train professionals who would serve as leaders in various fields. The similarity between the areas of competency in Leadership and the new roles of a religious educator was clear.

The doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction equipped students to provide curriculum change and instructional improvement in educational institutions as well as to become college teachers.⁴⁸ While the latter trained individuals to be excellent teachers, the former degree prepared individuals to be leaders, administrators, and consultants. The emphases made by these doctorates as well as the stress on Educational Administration were the initial focus of Religious Education through the school setting of its philosophical platform.⁴⁹ The situation seemed to indicate that the Seventh-day Adventist Church no longer needed general Ed.D. or Ph.D. degrees in Religious Education for denominational administrators or educators, but rather needed doctoral degrees in specialized areas which students now had the opportunity to earn.⁵⁰

An emphasis in Family Life Education and offering foundations courses as a

⁴⁷Ibid., 138.

⁴⁸The doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction is discussed on pp. 152, 153, 161, 162.

⁴⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 1974-1975*, 84, 97, 98; idem, *Bulletin 1975-1976*, 87-90.

⁵⁰Jane Thayer, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, transcript in the REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2.

service to the SED had become the central features and *raison d'être* of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. As Thayer and Matthews were trying to determine what role religious education could play in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and how the influence of the program could be broadened to meet its stated objectives, they requested Youngberg “to arrange a meeting on 21 or 22 April [1999] between the Religious Education faculty and the Seminary administration.”⁵¹ The topic of discussion would be collaboration in offering a Church Development certificate.⁵² After these initial meetings, the Religious Education faculty voted to set up meetings with Russell Burrill, the chair of the Christian Ministry Department of the SDATS, and Barry Gane, director of the Youth Ministries program.⁵³ The purpose of the meeting with Burrill was “to explore the possibility of doing a graduate certificate together with the Seminary faculty . . . on Church Vitality.”⁵⁴ This exploratory meeting took place on 9 May 2000.⁵⁵

Following this meeting, the two Religious Education faculty members met with “a small committee from the Christian Ministries Department to design a graduate certificate

⁵¹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 12 April 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 31 May 1999.

⁵²“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 22 September 1999.

⁵³*Ibid.*

⁵⁴“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 4 May 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 8 May 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Thayer, electronic letter to author, 1, 2.

⁵⁵“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 4 May 2000.

in church revitalization.”⁵⁶ The Religious Education faculty thought this certificate would benefit the Theological Seminary and the Religious Education program in three ways. First, it could be incorporated as an emphasis area into the M.Div. or D.Min. degrees. Second, it could be provided in connection with the SEEDS Conference offered every summer on the campus of Andrews University.⁵⁷ Third, the certificate might serve as a starting point for pastors who want to do research in the area of church growth or church vitality and lead ultimately to a Ph.D. in Religious Education.⁵⁸

The proposed program was not only part of the purpose and mission of religious education, but it had the potential to help the Religious Education program regain its earlier emphasis on the “tripartite” model by reintroducing a substantive curricular relationship with the Seminary. The focus of the program might once again include a genuine contribution to the church setting of the biblical model. Curricular collaboration might also facilitate the process of rebuilding formal ties with the Seminary that had defined the program in its early years, but that had to all intents and purposes been lost. Additionally, the Religious Education program might benefit from the resources available in the Seminary, and theology and religion might regain their position as integrated

⁵⁶Jane Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education to the Seminary,” revised document, Document #43, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 2 June 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 6 June 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁵⁷The SEEDS Conference is an annual event that offers seminars in church growth, church planting, and other areas of church evangelism.

⁵⁸“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 8 May 2000.

aspects of the Religious Education program. Through this certificate, the program would be making a contribution to the mission of Andrews University Theological Seminary and of the Seventh-day Adventist Church around the world.⁵⁹

The Religious Education faculty members also approached Gane “to explore possibilities for collaboration in certificate and degree programs in youth ministry, including possible collaboration with Baraka Muganda, director of the Youth Department of the General Conference.”⁶⁰ In both of these attempts to collaborate with the Theological Seminary, it was discovered that there was a genuine interest and willingness to work together, but that there were also challenging barriers to cross-campus collaboration.⁶¹

At Andrews University, each school is expected to be financially self-sufficient and return a percentage of its income to the University for administration and operation.⁶² When students want to take courses needed for their respective programs, but these courses are offered in other schools in the University, there is a loss of revenue for the

⁵⁹The mission statements of both the SDATS and the Adventist Church are provided on pp. 214, 215, 237.

⁶⁰“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 22 September 1999.

⁶¹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 26 April 1999; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 7 May 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁶²According to Ronald Herr, former controller at Andrews University, the University does not have an official policy that requires schools to be financially self-supporting. Neither is there a well-thought-through formula that determines the percentage of tuition revenue that goes for University overhead and for the operation of the program of each school. Ronald Herr, electronic letter to Jorge E. Rico, 5 June 2006, Burleson, TX, 1, in my possession.

program in which those students are enrolled.⁶³ As a result of these financial realities, it is difficult for programs to generate interest in developing cross-program or inter-school collaboration. Rather, this tuition arrangement encourages programs to create duplicate courses in an effort to retain the tuition revenue.⁶⁴ Course duplication helps schools at Andrews in two ways. First, it prevents students from enrolling in classes offered in other programs, enabling school administrators to plan future course offerings based on more definite enrollment predictions within their own programs. Second, it gives the school financial stability and the opportunity to project growth.⁶⁵ Ultimately, however, the system militates against a collaborative, integrated, and collegial academic program.

The obstacles encountered in the meetings between the Religious Education

⁶³Annette Gibson, interview by author, "Andrews University Financial Policy on Cross-School Collaboration," 31 August 2005, School of Business, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Thayer, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, 2. According to Gibson, dean of the School of Business until mid-2006, this system of finances has been in place since the 1980s when more schools were established at Andrews University. Also, it has been discussed several times in administrative meetings without results. She thought that it might require a new way of thinking at Andrews University in order to effect a tuition policy change that might be more conducive for schools to work jointly.

⁶⁴The course descriptions of some courses offered in the SED and the SDATS suggest that they were either duplicates or that they shared similar content. These courses include EDRE630 Personal Spiritual Formation and GSEM521 Spiritual Formation; EDRE665 Fostering Spiritual Growth and GSEM522 Advanced Spiritual Formation; EDRE657 Contemporary Family Issues/EDRE Family Dynamics and CHMN546 Marriage and Family; EDCI565 Improving Instruction and GSEM860 Teaching Religion in College; and EDFN530 Teaching Ministry of Jesus and CHMN610 Teaching Ministry. Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 191-198, 217, 219, 220, 228; Thayer, "Proposal to Move Religious Education," Document #43, 3; and "Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty," Document #62, 6.

⁶⁵Gibson, interview by author.

faculty and the Seminary were particularly related to the financial subsidy that M.Div. students receive for their program. Because of this fiscal benefit, M.Div. students do not pay regular tuition for their academic programs, but only a semester registration fee.⁶⁶ Conversely, the SED generally requires regular tuition for the classes it offers its students. Thus the courses that the Religious Education program could offer were appropriate for M.Div. students, but none of them would want to take courses in the SED if they must pay the full tuition.

As Burrill came to understand the monetary situation, he asked if anyone had ever considered where Religious Education at Andrews University belonged.⁶⁷ Raising this question was very significant because it came from someone outside the Religious Education program. Thayer's reply was, "Yes, we have thought about it for years. The question keeps recurring, but no one has explored it recently that I know of."⁶⁸ Then Burrill inquired if the Religious Education faculty would like to get Karen R. Graham, dean of the SED, and John K. McVay, dean of the SDATS, together to discuss the matter of the location for the program.⁶⁹

⁶⁶Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 42. The financial challenge of cooperating with the Seminary was that the M.Div. program was subsidized by the North American Division (NAD) of Seventh-day Adventists. The NAD does not finance any class taken outside of the Seminary.

⁶⁷Thayer, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, 2.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 26 April 1999; Jane Thayer, "Notes from a Meeting with Karen Graham," Document #15, 14 June 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; idem, "Proposal to Move Religious Education," Document #43, 1.

At the end of that meeting, it was agreed that Burrill would talk to McVay and Thayer would talk to Graham. After he spoke with McVay, Burrill called Thayer to notify her that McVay was willing to entertain conversations regarding the best placement for the Religious Education program. Thayer contacted Graham and she also agreed to the discussions.⁷⁰ As a consequence, the initial conversations regarding the relocation of the Religious Education program at Andrews University started in 2000.

The Involvement of the Deans

During that initial meeting, the two deans suggested to Thayer and Matthews that they prepare three proposals presenting the pros and cons of where the Religious Education program should be located.⁷¹ The first proposal was about the future of Religious Education if it were to stay in the SED. The next proposal considered the future of the program if it became an interschool program under the auspices of the School of Graduate Studies. The last proposal discussed the future of Religious

⁷⁰Graham was receptive to the initial discussions because of her leadership style. She believed that the power of higher education is in the faculty and their initiatives. According to the SED dean, the administrator's function "is not to dominate or define what will be done in the curriculum and programs, but the role of the administrator is to empower the faculty to work hard, commit energy for innovation, and to develop new and exciting ideas that put the university in new positions of vitality." Karen Graham, "Questionnaire for Karen Graham: Former Dean of the School of Education, June 2003," TM, Berrien Springs, MI, 2, in my possession.

⁷¹According to Graham, the question regarding the location of Religious Education came as a result of a "reexamination of the church's position in linking the two strongest educational pillars of our existence and historical development—teaching . . . and ministry." Karen R. Graham, to the ATS Visiting Site Team, 27 June 2002, transcript in the REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

Education at Andrews if it moved to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.⁷²

These proposals precipitated a series of meetings which involved representatives from both schools.⁷³ Throughout the meetings, both deans were open-minded regarding the future location of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Graham was amenable to the conversations because the Religious Education faculty was committed to finding new ways to serve the Adventist Church and the students applying to Andrews University for admission into the program. She believed that the Adventist Church around the world needed to revisit its priorities and its understanding of the fundamental reason for having a system of higher education. In Graham's judgment, the Adventist Church was built on two traditional and contemporary pillars, namely, education and theology. However, as the church matured, she observed that it had lost sight of the synergistic power of integrating these disciplines.⁷⁴

⁷²Thayer, "Proposal to Move Religious Education," Document #43, 1; and "Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary-Reled Collaboration-Interschool Option," Document #64, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. These three positions are discussed in more detail on pp. 221-35.

⁷³Among those representatives were Graham, Thayer, and Matthews from the SED, and McVay, Burrill, and Gane from the SDATS. By this time, Youngberg had already retired and Thayer was the director of the Religious Education program.

⁷⁴Graham, "Questionnaire for Graham," 2, 3. The lack of communication between the two disciplines (theology and education) was also reflected in two presentations made in the First International Conference on the Philosophy of Seventh-day Adventist Education held on the campus of Andrews University. One paper focused on the image of God in humankind. The concern of the paper was chiefly theological without an educational connection, though restoration of the image of God is central to an educational approach that sees education and redemption as one. The second paper emphasized the theme of the great controversy between good and evil. It depicted the great controversy as played out in the life of the individual teacher and student in the

The Seminary and the SED were working as two independent entities rather than joining efforts to help the Adventist Church fulfill its worldwide mission. Programs from those two schools were simply training individuals in their own areas of expertise. While the SED was preparing scholars in the field of education essentially without a theological component, the SDATS was preparing theologians and pastors without skills in the social sciences or pedagogical training.⁷⁵ The result was that graduates from both schools

classroom. The content of the paper was essentially educational without a theological association. The papers did nothing to bridge the gap between education and theology, they merely served to highlight the problem. Jon Paulien, "Adam, Jesus, and the Image of God," April 2001, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Herbert Douglas, "Spirit of Prophecy Perspective: Education's Grand Theme," April 2001, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁷⁵There is abundant evidence of this divide between the Seminary and the SED. One major example of this fragmentation rather than integration will be presented to support this assertion. In the scholarly work of dissertation writing, and in the conceptualization of theological and pedagogical issues by leading scholars, there often appears to be a distinct lack of understanding of issues beyond the narrow boundaries of theology on the one hand and social science and pedagogy on the other. Doctoral dissertations written in the Theological Seminary at Andrews University that focused on cultural, family, and socio-economic issues as well as strategies for church growth and evangelism show very little or no use of the social science research methodologies. Also, the work done by the researchers did not include ethnographic investigation of the people living in the area that was included in the research. Yet the conclusions attained and the models proposed were intended for implementation among these groups. An analysis of the doctoral curricula in the Seminary indicated that training in the social science research methodologies was not included as part of the doctoral programs. See, e.g., Gan-Theow Ng, "Religion, Culture, and Modernity: Some Missiological Implications of the Process of Secularization in East Asia" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1991); Elliot C. Osborne, "Development of a Coping Mechanism Seminar for Single Parents" (D.Min. diss., Andrews University, 1988); David M. Parks, "A Design for Contemporary Public Evangelism in the Upper Columbia Conference" (D.Min. diss., Andrews University, 1987); and Robert Norman Randall, "The Development and Implementation of a Marriage Support Group and Its Evaluation Using the DAS in the Thousand Oaks Seventh-day Adventist Church" (D.Min. diss., Andrews University, 1997). Similarly, a personal study of the doctoral curricula in the SED denoted that doctoral programs did not embrace religious/theological instruction. Doctoral dissertations written in the SED

serving the Seventh-day Adventist Church in various parts of the world lacked a proper foundation and often even basic knowledge in one of the two traditional pillars. Until the relationship with the Adventist Theological Seminary was severed, the Religious Education program had offered that educational and theological combination.

Graham's perception of the current state of affairs in the world church as well as on the campus of Andrews University led her to respond positively to the proposals being made by the Religious Education faculty. She concluded: "So when the [Religious Education] faculty were willing to put in all the work and academic foundation in order to re-emphasize that relationship (between schooling and theology/ministry), it appealed to both my administrative need to support their effort and my fundamental belief about the SDA Church itself—its identity and unique mission in the 21st century."⁷⁶

McVay also approached the proposal from an open-minded position. His openness led the SDATS to review its mission and philosophy at the same time that

that had a biblical or spiritual component/application to an educational issue included little or no theological foundation. The SED faculty had operated with such concepts as redemption and character development as part of their framework, but it was not significantly evidenced in the doctoral dissertations. See, e.g., Robert U. Kalua, "The Empirical Development of a Curriculum in Sports Acrobatics and Spiritual Witnessing" (Ed.D. diss., Andrews University, 1993); Hideyo Ogawa, "A Factorial Description of Tasks of the Family" (Ed.D. diss., Andrews University, 1980); Chek Yat Phoon, "A Correlational Study of Jungian Psychological Types and Nineteen Spiritual Gifts" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1986); Samir Selmanovic, "The Empirical Development of a Curriculum on Faith Development" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1996); Andrews University, *Bulletin 1998-1999*, 177-94; idem, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 181-99; and idem, *Bulletin 2005-2006*, 321-38.

⁷⁶Graham, "Questionnaire for Graham," 2. Graham did not perceive the idea of relocating the program in the Seminary as a risky or foolish enterprise, rather, she saw it as a move led by God.

Religious Education was negotiating its relocation to the Seminary. As dean of the Seminary, McVay recognized a need for a balance in the SDATS program between the practical/professional and the academic/scholarly.⁷⁷ Although Religious Education is an academic program, it seeks to integrate both academic and practical aspects of the profession.⁷⁸ The mission statement of the SDATS in 2000, prior to revision, was:

The Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary is commissioned by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to educate men and women from around the world to proclaim the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ in the setting of the 3-angels' messages of Revelation 14. Affirming the centrality of Scripture as authoritative propositional revelation from God, the Seminary is charged with preparing faithful and effective pastors, evangelists, religion teachers, scholars, administrators, and others for the furtherance of the Seventh-day Adventist mission to the entire world.⁷⁹

As the mission and philosophy of the Theological Seminary were being reviewed, two scriptural foundations were carefully examined: Rev 14:6-7 and Matt 28:19-20.⁸⁰

The text in Matthew was particularly significant for two reasons. First, the text formed the basis for the mission statement of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. This mission statement as presented in the Andrews University *Bulletin* in 2000 reads: "The Religious Education Program prepares men and women to fulfill the

⁷⁷John McVay, "Questionnaire for John McVay: Current Dean of the Seminary, June 2003," TM, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2, in my possession.

⁷⁸Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185; and Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 5, 6.

⁷⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 202.

⁸⁰"Strategic Plan—Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University: July 2003-June 2006," 2003, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2.

teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.”⁸¹ Teaching and discipling are pivotal concepts in Religious Education.

Second, the biblical passage gave Religious Education a chance to encourage a new awareness of these two key concepts of the gospel commission. Both ideas are later reflected in the new mission statement and six core values of the Seminary. The revised Seminary mission statement of the Theological Seminary reads as follows:

We are a learning and worshiping community of culturally diverse people, called to serve our Creator God, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, our congregations and our world by preparing faithful and effective leaders to *make disciples of all nations* and proclaim the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ in the setting of the three angels’ message of Revelation 14.⁸²

At the beginning of the discussions regarding the future location of the Religious Education program at Andrews University, McVay felt that his “principal role was to listen, clarify, and process the information and proposals put forward by the Religious Education faculty members.”⁸³ As the meetings progressed, he saw that the Religious Education program could contribute to the Seminary program in three areas.

First, Religious Education offered a broad interest in the church and its ministry, especially in discipleship and training, that could complement what the SDATS has

⁸¹ Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185.

⁸² “Strategic Plan,” 5; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2005-2006*, vol. 94 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2005), 291, emphasis added. The new mission statement and six core values of the Seminary were voted in 2003 and published for the first time in the Andrews University *Bulletin* in 2005. The core values were faithfulness with expectation, Christ-likeness with humility, respect with justice, community with joy, discipleship with wholeness, and service with passion. They formed the modified philosophical foundation of the SDATS.

⁸³ McVay, “Questionnaire for McVay,” 2.

traditionally done. This concern would help to broaden the focus of the Seminary from simply the pastor-church relationship to include the role of the pastor as a teacher. This was an important contribution for the Seminary. Ministry involves instruction. Both ministry and teaching are redemptive in nature. Therefore, the teaching role of a pastor seems to support the idea that individuals preparing for ministry should include in their respective programs some educational training.⁸⁴ As a result, graduates from the Seminary would be better prepared to help the Seventh-day Adventist Church fulfill its mission around the world. Second, Religious Education would bring excellence to curricular-based teaching and training. And finally, the Religious Education program offered expertise in social science research rather than theological and exegetical investigation.⁸⁵

These three areas were reflected in the revised philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program that Thayer and Matthews had been developing. Without rejecting the old philosophical structure based on the components of the biblical model, there was a distinctive focus on fulfillment of the gospel commission through the diverse ministries of the church. Thus Religious Education was returning to the biblical “tripartite” model, but with a recognition that the Religious Education program is about discipling in the home, church, and school. This recognition left matters of the formal

⁸⁴Graham, “Questionnaire for Graham,” 2; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185.

⁸⁵McVay, “Questionnaire for McVay,” 2. The necessity of integrating social science research in the Seminary program is discussed earlier in this section (see pp. 212-14). See also the contributions of Religious Education to the SDATS presented on pp. 237, 238.

curriculum to the C&I doctoral program and allowed for a shift in emphasis in Religious Education to focus more on the nonformal curriculum, better addressed from a Seminary perspective than from the formal educational perspective of the SED. This emphasis on discipling in the three settings of the biblical model had the potential of restoring the identity and mission of the Religious Education program and also contributing significantly to a broadened mission and vision for the Adventist Theological Seminary.

When McVay foresaw the contributions that Religious Education could make to the Seminary, he was willing to accept the program into the Seminary provided that a convincing rationale could be presented.⁸⁶ This rationale was documented and then presented to Graham and McVay in November 2000.

Rationale for the Location of Religious Education

Following the meetings which explored the three options for location of the Religious Education program, Matthews and Thayer were asked to decide what they thought would be the best location for the Religious Education program. In addition, they were encouraged to present a proposal that included their rationale for that location.⁸⁷ To this end, the two faculty members concentrated their attention on the preparation and fine-tuning of the requested proposal.⁸⁸

⁸⁶McVay, "Questionnaire for McVay," 2.

⁸⁷Thayer, "Proposal to Move Religious Education," Document #43, 1; idem, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, 2.

⁸⁸"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 21 September 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 4 October 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 12

Some important activities were conducted in the preparation of the proposal. Thayer and Matthews checked on the Seminary requirements and policies that would impact Religious Education. They examined the Seminary requirements for admission and completion of the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees⁸⁹ and consulted the program requirements from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) and the ATS guidelines for approval of new programs.⁹⁰ They also worked on a philosophy to undergird the specific curricula for each certificate and degree. In addition, Matthews developed a brief history of the Religious Education program at Andrews and, after considering the various options, the two faculty members eventually developed a rationale for why the program belonged in the SDATS.

Another step they took was to talk with professors and administrators from the Seminary and the SED, as well as former Religious Education faculty at Andrews, particularly Akers and Youngberg. Interviews with the SED and Seminary faculty and leaders were conducted to gain their opinions on the interrelationship of programs with

October 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 19 October 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 17 November 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

⁸⁹A comparison between the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Religious Education and the M.Div., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in Religion revealed similar admissions and course pre-requisites and requirements. This comparability of programs showed that policies and requirements were not an issue that would hinder the transfer of Religious Education to the SDATS. Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 173-76, 186, 206, 211, 214, 215.

⁹⁰ATS standards for Religious Education degrees are discussed later in this section.

Religious Education if it were housed in the SDATS. The purpose of the conversations with Akers and Youngberg was to collect pertinent information regarding the history of the program as well as to seek their advice on future plans.⁹¹ The people interviewed from the SDATS and the SED were the deans and the directors of the programs in the Seminary who would potentially be closely connected with the Religious Education program. Their support was important in this process.⁹²

Thayer and Matthews also felt it was important to study other religious education programs in various universities and seminaries⁹³ to compare and contrast the organizational structures and governance of similar programs in North America with the

⁹¹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 19 October 2000.

⁹²The persons interviewed from the SED were Graham (dean), and Anderson (director of the Department of Graduate Studies in Curriculum, Administration, and Religious Education). The individuals interviewed from the SDATS were McVay (dean), Gane (director of the Youth Ministries program), Burrill (chair of the Christian Ministry Department), Dennis Fortin (director of the M.Div. program), Skip Bell (director of the D.Min. program), and Randy Younker (director of the Ph.D. program). The interviews with the SDATS faculty revealed positive feelings about the possibility of moving the Religious Education program to the Seminary. These professors concurred that the Religious Education program should be incorporated into the Christian Ministry Department. “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 4 October 2000; “Notes on the Interviews,” 2; “Report on Meetings with Seminary Personnel: 23 October 2000,” Document #51, 23 October 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Thayer, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, 3.

⁹³Jane Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education to the Seminary,” Document #40, 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; idem, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 1. Some of the seminaries and universities studied for purposes of benchmarking were Andover Newton Theological School, Asbury Seminary, Bethel Seminary, Biola University, Columbia International University, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Huntington College, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Talbot School of Theology, Trinity International University, and Wheaton College.

Religious Education program at Andrews.⁹⁴ The benchmarking analysis was stimulated by an interest in showing comparability of Religious Education at Andrews with other religious education programs across the country. Demonstrating comparability would facilitate the process of obtaining accreditation from ATS.

Religious education programs at peer institutions included courses of study in church leadership or programs that might be similarly defined. The focus of these leadership programs, however, has been more in the context of ecclesiastical rather than educational institutions.

RELED/Christian Education as defined in most programs has to do with church leadership, that is, the discipling, shepherding and equipping of the laity (spiritual formation, worshiping community of believers, Sunday schools, and the individual and family unit within the church community). The focus on religious education within the context of an institutional educational setting has traditionally been much less emphasized in most Christian education programs.⁹⁵

The findings from the benchmarking provided the Religious Education faculty with background and information from which to develop a clear, distinctive, and relevant

⁹⁴“Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” Document #58, 9-10.

⁹⁵“Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Reled-Leadership Discussions on Church Leadership,” Document #72, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. The descriptions of other religious education programs in North America in 2000 support this view. Claremont School of Theology, “Doctor of Philosophy Degrees,” *PhD Degrees at CST*, 9 November 2000, www.cst.edu/phd.htm (accessed 9 November 2000); Fuller Theological Seminary, “School of Theology,” *School of Theology*, 9 November 2000, www.fuller.edu/sot/ (accessed 9 November 2000); North Park Theological Seminary, “The Master of Arts in Christian Education Degree,” *NPTS - Catalog - MACE*, 9 November 2000, www.northpark.edu/sem/academics/catalog_pdfs/mace.pdf (accessed 9 November 2000); and Talbot School of Theology, “Master of Arts in Christian Education,” *Talbot Programs*, 9 November 2000, www.talbot.edu/programs/mace/index.cfm (accessed 9 November 2000).

mission for the program at Andrews University.⁹⁶

The proposal was scheduled for completion by mid-October and then presented to the deans of both the Adventist Theological Seminary and the School of Education in November 2000.⁹⁷ Choosing the most suitable place for the Religious Education program at Andrews University was crucial for applying the revised philosophical foundation and fulfilling its mission.

The SED was the first option considered for housing the Religious Education program at Andrews. As a location, Matthews and Thayer presented an equal number of benefits and challenges for having an SED-based program.⁹⁸ Four of those advantages gave the Religious Education faculty good reasons to stay in the SED. First, professors with expertise in current and projected Religious Education courses were predominantly teaching in the SED.⁹⁹ Second, there were strong links to the educational aspects of Religious Education. Third, there was support of educational and social science research

⁹⁶Graham, "Questionnaire for Graham," 1, 3.

⁹⁷"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 21 September 2000.

⁹⁸The Religious Education faculty presented a document listing a total of thirteen benefits and thirteen challenges for keeping the program in the SED. This document is included in appendix E. See also "Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary-Reled Collaboration-SED Option," Document #73, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; "Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?: Present Realities," Document #57, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and Thayer, "Proposal to Move Religious Education," Document #40, 1.

⁹⁹In 2000, all the supporting professors for the M.A. and Ph.D. degree requirements in Religious Education, foundations, curriculum and instruction, and research were located in the SED. Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 186.

methodologies for graduate programs. Fourth, the Religious Education faculty enjoyed a strong collegial support group and good working relationship with professors in other programs in the CARE Department and the SED.

These benefits together ensured that Religious Education students received proper preparation in the educational classes in which they enrolled, and provided support and credibility to the school-based focus of the program. In conversations with both professors, Thayer and Matthews said that it was not easy for either one to consider moving Religious Education from the SED.¹⁰⁰

Another advantage of retaining the Religious Education program in the SED, as cited by Thayer and Matthews, was the stability that Family Life Education had in the educational setting of the SED. Family Life was the leading area of the Religious Education program at this time. Like the educational emphasis of the program, this area also benefited from the expertise of the Educational Counseling and Psychology Department because it furnished Religious Education with good teaching support in this concentration.

The Religious Education faculty also presented a benefit that was dependent on developing interschool collaboration with the Theological Seminary. If the program

¹⁰⁰The thought of having to move Religious Education was not easy for the SED faculty and administration either. Graham stated it in the following words: “This change WAS NOT EVER a fiscally good move or a collegial good riddance. In fact, the separation of religious education from the School of Education faculty was very difficult. We coveted the religious education faculty as colleagues and as friends and as hallway familiar faces. We missed them and mourned their leaving. The move of religious education to the Seminary was not, for the School of Education, an expedient nor comfortable thing to do. It was the right thing to do for curriculum, marketing, and SDA Church mission/vision.” Graham, “Questionnaire for Graham,” 2.

could develop a strong curricular relationship with the Seminary, then it would be possible to maintain the identity and mission of Religious Education based on the six roles of a religious educator and fulfilling the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission. But if the Seminary and Religious Education could not develop cross-school collaboration, it would be very difficult for the faculty to fulfill the reformulated mission of the program. The main hindrance for establishing mutual cooperation was the financial obstacle engendered by University policy.¹⁰¹

One last advantage listed by Thayer and Matthews, on further analysis, seemed minimally beneficial to Religious Education. Its faculty indicated that keeping the program in the SED would give the Religious Education program good access to potential educational employees and also to educational directors who controlled educational allowances for secondary teachers, deans, and chaplains. However, it seems more likely that prospective employees and directors would tend first to check other programs like Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Administration for training and employment as teachers and deans. The only areas that offered the Religious Education program any real advantage over other SED programs in the recruitment of students would have been family life, chaplaincy, and possibly student services careers.

The challenges outlined by Matthews and Thayer appear to suggest that they were not biased by their attachment to the SED. Rather, the objections appear to indicate that they were actually giving serious consideration to the whole situation and looking for the best possible scenario for the Religious Education program at Andrews. Despite their

¹⁰¹The fiscal obstacle is discussed on pp. 207-09.

appreciation for the SED, the Religious Education faculty were focused on the locality where the program could best fulfill its mission.

Although most of the challenges listed against having an SED-based Religious Education program showed some disadvantages for the program, four were specifically significant. First, Religious Education would not have ATS oversight. Without supervision by ATS, Religious Education would not be accountable to the professional organization for accreditation purposes. In addition, it meant that the professional entity could not give credibility to the program.¹⁰² Second, concerns relating to Christian education do not figure prominently in educational literature. The existence of Christian education “indicates a different set of philosophic assumptions and educational boundaries from those of the larger culture.”¹⁰³ The lack of discussion of religious

¹⁰²In contrast to NCATE, the ATS has clear guidelines and specific standards for degrees in religious education at the master’s and doctoral levels. “ATS Degree Program Standards,” Document #74, 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 8-11, 43-47; “Religious Education Competencies Categorized by ATS Accreditation Guidelines for Christian/Religious Education,” Document #75, 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document # 43, 5; idem, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document # 40, 3; “Benefits of a Seminary Location for Religious Education,” Document #56, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; “Review of the Religious Education Program,” Document #63, no date, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and “Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?,” 1.

¹⁰³Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, 186. See also Williams, “Christian Education,” *EDCE*, 132, 133. Christian education implies the development of a Christian worldview. Both secular and Christian educators may use similar methodologies, but this does not make them the same. As a result, educational literature hardly includes issues pertaining to religious education. See, e.g., James M. Civikly, ed., *Communicating in College Classrooms* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1986); Arthea J. S. Reed and Verna E. Bergemann, *In the Classroom: An Introduction to Education*, 2d ed. (Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group/Brown &

education issues would place limitations on the areas of research that Religious Education candidates could do within the SED. Students wishing to do research in areas outside educational topics would need to use the SDATS resources. A third concern was that there would be a tendency to allow the religion components of the Religious Education programs to be prerequisites rather than integral elements in the curriculum. As a result, the Religious Education graduates might be weak in competencies relating to religious and theological studies.

The fourth challenge served as “the major impetus to get [them] looking into the change.”¹⁰⁴ Matthews and Thayer stated that it would be more difficult to tap into the strengths of the SDATS program if Religious Education stayed in the SED.¹⁰⁵ According to Matthews, the two faculty members could not find a way to collaborate effectively with the Theological Seminary.¹⁰⁶ In addition to these four problems, the Religious Education faculty omitted an important challenge in their presentation. They did not include the absence of appropriate supervision and guidelines for the field of religious education on the part of NCATE. This problem could have posed some difficulty to the integrity of

Benchmark Publishers, 1995); Kevin Ryan and James M. Cooper, *Those Who Can, Teach*, 7th ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1995); Kathleen P. Bennett and Margaret D. LeCompte, *How Schools Work: A Sociological Analysis of Education* (New York: Longman, 1990); Guy R. Lefrancois, *Psychology for Teaching* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1985); and William R. Yount, *Created to Learn* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1996).

¹⁰⁴Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

¹⁰⁵“Andrews University–SED Option,” 1; and “Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?,” 1.

¹⁰⁶Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

Religious Education. The above five challenges could also be obstacles to the process of rebuilding the philosophical foundation of the program on the part of Matthews and Thayer. Moreover, it seems to the researcher that these challenges might eventually cause the demise of the program.

Thus, the above-mentioned opportunities and challenges did not make the SED the ideal place for Religious Education to fulfill its mission. Although there were advantages to keeping the program in the SED, the philosophy and identity of the program would likely remain diminished, and its role might end up as little more than offering foundations courses as a service to the SED. Furthermore, the program could not be a department in its own right as long as it remained with the current administrative structure of the SED. Instead, the current structure put pressure on Religious Education to blend with the other programs in the department.¹⁰⁷

The second alternative for the relocation of Religious Education was to develop an interschool program. Matthews and Thayer called it the “visionary option.”¹⁰⁸ It

¹⁰⁷One example of the problems relating to this structure was the Ph.D. course plan prepared in 1999 for the doctoral cohort of Montemorelos University and Antillian College. Students from this cohort were required to take a combination of courses from Religious Education as well as Curriculum and Instruction, Leadership, Educational and Counseling Psychology, and Research and Measurement. Although there was good collaboration from the various departments in the SED, this type of combination presented a serious problem. A closer look at the curriculum of the doctoral cohort shows that Religious Education had to make compromises on its course offerings to fit in with the cohort. These concessions resulted in some loss to the integrity of the Religious Education requirements. “Ph.D. Course Plan for Religious Education: Andrews University Doctoral Cohort at Montemorelos/Antillian,” Document #77, 24 May 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, 2; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

¹⁰⁸“Andrews University–Interschool Option,” 1.

offered three benefits and five challenges.¹⁰⁹ All three benefits were potentially very positive, providing that certain conditions were met. The most significant benefit given was intended to facilitate “genuine interdisciplinary/interschool collaboration, and challenge the university to make the structures and policies work in favor of this kind of collaboration.”¹¹⁰ Leaders of the Religious Education program would need to convince the administration of Andrews University to effect basic administrative structures and fiscal arrangements to ensure genuine cross-school collaboration. Religious Education would have to be set up as an independent department. Moreover, policies would have to be created to avoid competition between schools and course duplication.

The attainment of this vision would be very difficult. The Religious Education faculty expressed it in the following words: “Moving the university to rethink its structures will not only take the faith that moves mountains—it will require faith that works, like moving the mountain spade by spade!!”¹¹¹ If accomplished, the interschool option could give Religious Education the opportunity to strengthen its philosophical foundation and the ability to respond to the changing needs of its clientele.

Along with the benefits, Matthews and Thayer described some potential problems. An analysis of two obstacles reveals the enormous challenges in establishing an interschool Religious Education program. First, it appears that an interschool program

¹⁰⁹See appendix F for a list of the benefits and challenges of an interschool Religious Education program.

¹¹⁰“Andrews University–Interschool Option,” 1.

¹¹¹Ibid.

could result in setting the Religious Education program in isolation unless there was a genuine desire on the part of all those concerned to make it work. Unless the leaders of the various schools at Andrews University were willing to put a significant amount of energy into the venture, there would be no real cross-school collaboration. Lack of commitment to the project was a distinct possibility. The end result would be that Religious Education was a department in its own right, but that the program was isolated and unsupported, with limited academic strength and credibility.

Second, in an interdisciplinary program there would be issues of control and accountability as well as problems with departmental funding and analysis of cost effectiveness. This type of program would have to be placed under the supervision of the School of Graduate Studies. But the issues mentioned in connection with this challenge could pose a real problem to the daily administration of the Religious Education programs. The structural change might not increase demand for the program, and as an isolated cost center the program could easily be discontinued.

In their presentation, Thayer and Matthews did not mention the problem of getting Religious Education at Andrews properly accredited in connection with the option of having an interschool program. Lack of proper accreditation by a professional organization would result in loss of credibility. The Religious Education program would not have clear guidelines to structure its curriculum. In addition, the program would not be accountable to a recognized accrediting body. The challenges were great and, according to Thayer, this proposal was the weakest of the three.¹¹²

¹¹²Thayer, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, 3.

The Seminary was the third location considered. The proposal submitted by the Religious Education faculty included thirteen benefits and four challenges for having a Seminary-based Religious Education program.¹¹³ The large number of advantages suggest that it was more beneficial for Religious Education to be relocated in the SDATS. Thayer and Matthews addressed critical issues pertaining to the mission, credibility, enrollment, and fiscal aspects of the program, all areas in which the program had faced challenges during the 1980s and 1990s.¹¹⁴

As presented by Thayer and Matthews, the advantages of moving Religious Education to the Seminary point to the SDATS as the place where Religious Education could best fulfill its mission. For example, the first benefit states that there could be a shared and mutually enhanced vision of the role of religious education in the church by housing the program in the SDATS. Religious Education could prepare the educators and ministers who will train the laity to lead and support healthy congregations. Also, it could provide a discipling emphasis in congregations to complement the evangelistic emphasis stressed so much in ministerial preparation in the Adventist Church. These roles might help the Adventist denomination understand the function that Religious Education can play in the mission of the church.

Second, Religious Education could work more easily in collaboration with the Christian Ministry Department. It could strengthen the Family Life Education program by making classes accessible to ministers, especially as an emphasis in doctoral programs.

¹¹³The document listing all the benefits and challenges is included in appendix G.

¹¹⁴See chapter 3.

Also, the program could supply emphasis options in campus spiritual leadership and church revitalization.

Third, the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary could provide close collaboration with Seminary programs for certificates that the Religious Education program wanted to offer.¹¹⁵ For instance, the Religious Education faculty saw the need for a certificate in youth ministries and recognized that a collaborative effort with the Youth Ministries program in the Seminary would probably result in better training for youth leadership in various locations around the world.¹¹⁶

As a fourth advantage, the Seminary location could facilitate the development of the area of children's ministries because the SDATS had some courses already available in family ministries which could serve as a foundation for the development of the children's ministries emphasis.¹¹⁷ In addition, a concentration in children's ministries was offered in several American seminaries and was contemplated by the ATS

¹¹⁵One of the motivators for considering a move to the Seminary had been the difficulty in attempting to collaborate with the SDATS on certificate programs in youth ministry and church vitality. This is discussed on pp. 205, 206.

¹¹⁶The need to provide training in youth ministry is mentioned in various sources. Roger L. Dudley, *Why Teenagers Reject Religion* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1978), 152; idem, *Valuegenesis: Faith in the Balance* (Riverside, CA: La Sierra University Press, 1992), 180, 181, 285-95; Eugene C. Roehlkepartain et al., *Strategic Youth Ministry* (Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2000), 57, 58; and "Benefits of a Seminary Location," 1.

¹¹⁷Some of these classes were CHMN546 Marriage and Family, CHMN645 Seminar in Marriage and Family Problems, and CHMN717 Family Counseling. Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 219, 220.

accreditation guidelines.¹¹⁸ These four benefits emphasized the preparation of professionals to serve the Adventist Church in various areas of ministry, a goal that is close to the mission of the Religious Education program: preparation of individuals to “fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.”¹¹⁹

It is important to fulfill the mission of a program, but this cannot be achieved without academic credibility. Strong academic foundations were required to rebuild the identity and philosophical structures of Religious Education. Location in the Seminary would allow the Religious Education faculty the opportunity to address these issues. First, ATS would have oversight of the Religious Education degrees, and this would give the program the needed academic credibility by making it accountable to an appropriate professional organization. With oversight would come accreditation of the official degrees, which heightens the profile of the program and improves its marketability. Improved recognition of the program would benefit the Adventist Church and the clientele that it serves around the world.¹²⁰ The second benefit is linked to the first.

¹¹⁸Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, “Educational Ministries Department Course Descriptions,” *Academics: Educational Ministries Department*, 9 November 2000, www.tiu.edu/divinity/academics (accessed 9 November 2000); Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, “Educational Ministries,” *Degrees Offered*, 9 November 2000, www.swbts.edu/education/degrees.cfm (accessed 9 November 2000); Talbot School of Theology, 9 November 2000; and “Religious Education Competencies,” 1.

¹¹⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185.

¹²⁰Accreditation by ATS is governed by standards adopted by the member schools of the Commission on Accrediting. “These standards for degree programs are intended to ensure a common understanding of the kind and quantity of academic work involved in a degree program undertaken at member schools, and to provide common public meaning for a degree, regardless of the member school that grants it.” The Association of Theological Schools, “Standards of Accreditation,” *The Commission on Accrediting*, 26

Location in the Theological Seminary would conform the Religious Education program to the pattern of other religious education programs generally housed in seminaries rather than schools of education.¹²¹ Again, recognition and understanding of the program would be improved.

Student enrollment and potential employment opportunities were also addressed in the list of benefits provided by Thayer and Matthews. The Seminary locale would give Religious Education the necessary visibility to potential candidates and employers of Religious Education graduates. Most potential employers of Religious Education professionals are conference officials who have a closer relationship with the Seminary than with the SED.¹²² It is not likely that these Adventist administrators would look for

June 2006, www.ats.edu/accrediting/standards/overview.asp (accessed 26 June 2006).

¹²¹For example, Claremont School of Theology, “Doctor of Philosophy Degrees,” *PhD Degrees at CST*, 9 November 2000, www.cst.edu/phd.htm (accessed 9 November 2000); Fuller Theological Seminary, “School of Theology,” *School of Theology*, 9 November 2000, www.fuller.edu/sot/ (accessed 9 November 2000); North Park Theological Seminary, “The Master of Arts in Christian Education Degree,” *NPTS - Catalog - MACE*, 9 November 2000, www.northpark.edu/sem/academics/catalog_pdfs/mace.pdf (accessed 9 November 2000); and Talbot School of Theology, “Master of Arts in Christian Education,” *Talbot Programs*, 9 November 2000, www.talbot.edu/programs/mace/index.cfm (accessed 9 November 2000). A cursory survey of graduate-level Religious Education/Christian Education programs in North America reveals that few if any of these programs are housed in Schools of Education. According to Matthews, conformity to these programs is not an ideal, “but if conformity facilitates function and operation, it becomes an attractive option.” See appendix G for Matthews’s list of benefits of housing Religious Education in the Seminary.

¹²²The Seminary location could give the program an opportunity to network with Adventist conference and union officials who look to the Seminary for their employees. Potential employers of Religious Education graduates do not tend to look to the SED for employees. Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 3; “Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–Seminary Option,” Document #55, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews

workers educated to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission in the SED. A strong academic program combined with the benefit of greater exposure for job opportunities could make the Religious Education program more attractive to prospective students. In addition, the physical presence of Religious Education in the SDATS could give the faculty an opportunity to talk to students who come to the Seminary looking for programs to match their interests.¹²³

One last pivotal issue was finances. In fact, financial matters were the main reason for getting the deans of the SED and SDATS involved in the meetings.¹²⁴ By housing Religious Education in the Seminary, the financial interface between the Religious Education program and other Seminary programs would be easier. Instead of paying full tuition for taking courses outside the SDATS, M.Div. students could take Religious Education courses at the same cost as other individual elective courses and the fiscal result would be an internal matter.¹²⁵ This benefit would also be available to

University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; “Benefits of a Seminary Location,” 1; “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 2; and “Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?,” 1.

¹²³Besides the visibility and accessibility provided by its physical location in the Seminary, Religious Education could also be advertised to potential students under the SDATS program in the bulletin of the University and in the Seminary promotional materials and displays. Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 3; and “An Analysis of Financial Support,” Document #60, 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 4.

¹²⁴For more details on the fiscal issue, see pp. 207-09.

¹²⁵Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #40, 2; “Andrews University–Seminary Option,” 1; “Benefits of a Seminary Location,” 1; “Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?,” 1; “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 2; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 24 May 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University,

spouses of Seminary students who could take Religious Education courses at reduced rates.¹²⁶

Based on the observations made by Thayer and Matthews, working in close association with the SDATS could give the Religious Education program a double advantage. First, it could provide the opportunity to disciple individuals in various aspects of ministry like church development, youth and children's ministries, and spirituality. Second, it could facilitate the hiring of trained professionals to serve the Adventist Church. According to Thayer, the joint efforts of Religious Education at Andrews and the Seminary would ultimately contribute to fulfilling the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.¹²⁷

In contrast to the benefits, Thayer and Matthews also cited some challenges if the Religious Education program were to move to the Seminary. But these potential problems were mostly technical or organizational in nature and could be solved by developing appropriate program strategies or guidelines for governance and administration. Of particular concern was the possibility that the ATS requirements would increase the number of credits for completion of the M.A. degree. As it turned out, because the M.A. was approved as an academic rather than a professional degree, ATS

Berrien Springs, MI. It was never financially viable for M.Div. students to take Religious Education courses because the program was located in the SED and there was no tuition subsidy available to them for taking courses outside the SDATS. "An Analysis of Financial Support," 4; "Review of Religious Education," 1; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 44, 205.

¹²⁶ Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 43, 205.

¹²⁷ Thayer, "Proposal to Move Religious Education," Document #43, 4.

approval did not demand any augmentation of the number of credits.¹²⁸

Although the advantages that the Seminary could offer to Religious Education were many, the Religious Education program was not the only entity benefiting from the move. Two other entities would also profit from the relocation of the program.

The Contributions of Religious Education

In addition to the benefits received from the Seminary, Thayer and Matthews shared how the Religious Education program could help both the SDATS and the Adventist Church reach their mission. The contributions of Religious Education to both institutions are discussed in light of their respective mission statements. The first part of this discussion describes the benefits of the program to the Seminary.

The mission of the Seminary as stated in 2000 was “to educate men and women from around the world to proclaim the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ in the setting of the 3-angels’ messages of Revelation 14.”¹²⁹ In order to fulfill this mission, the Seminary offered several academic and professional programs based on its defined objectives. The process of developing a statement of core values, which was undertaken by the Seminary around the same time as the negotiations with Religious Education, exemplified the potential for mutual collaboration. The aim of the Religious Education program on teaching and discipling was eventually expressed in the revised mission and core values

¹²⁸A total of thirty-two semester credits were mandated to finish the M.A. in Religious Education before and after the program moved to the Seminary. Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 186; idem, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 304; and Matthews, “Written Responses to Rico.”

¹²⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 202.

of the SDATS.¹³⁰ According to Thayer and Matthews, the program could support the Seminary in the task of equipping pastors because of this shared concern for discipleship so central to the gospel commission.¹³¹ The gospel commission not only includes the preaching ministry that makes new converts, but also the teaching ministry that nurtures those new converts in the church (Matt 28:19-20). Teaching is a function that can be performed most effectively at the church and school levels. The Religious Education program would bring the necessary skills to train pastors for teaching in a non-formal setting, and enhance offerings in spiritual formation and discipling.

Another contribution is found in the area of the social sciences.¹³² Religious Education would bring an academic doctoral degree using social science research methodologies that could open areas of study needed to investigate the effectiveness of various methods of ministry in the church.¹³³ The Religious Education faculty argued that

¹³⁰“Strategic Plan,” 5.

¹³¹“Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 5. Christian Ministry offered courses in preaching, church leadership, pastoral care, evangelism, sacred music and worship, youth ministries, and Hispanic ministries.

¹³²McVay saw the area of social sciences as a benefit to the Seminary program. This observation is on pp. 216, 217.

¹³³Several researchers have used this type of investigation effectively for evangelism, church growth, discipling, small groups, missions, and retention of youth in the church. Dudley, *Why Teenagers Reject Religion and What to Do About It*; idem, *Valuegenesis: Faith in the Balance*, 1992; Roger Dudley and Des Cummings, Jr., *Adventures in Church Growth* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983); C. Peter Wagner, *Leading Your Church to Growth* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1984); idem, *Strategies for Church Growth: Tools for Effective Mission and Evangelism* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1987); Carl F. George, *Prepare Your Church for the Future* (Tarrytown, NY: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1991); and George Barna, *Transforming Children into Spiritual Champions* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books,

these methodologies could offer data that might enhance the psychological and sociological understanding of human nature and how people change.¹³⁴ For example, Seminary research has provided ample information about the philosophical and theological understanding of human nature. Uniting the psychological/sociological and philosophical/theological perspectives on human nature could be mutually beneficial.

Finally, the Religious Education faculty proposed that the program could help the church by creating in pastors a greater awareness of the importance of the teaching role in the local church and the church school.¹³⁵ The contributions that Religious Education could provide to the Theological Seminary could strengthen particularly the M.Div. program.

The second part of the discussion about the contributions of the Religious Education program relates to the benefits that the program could give to the Seventh-day Adventist Church around the world. “The mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is to proclaim to all peoples the everlasting gospel in the context of the three angels’ messages of Revelation 14:6-12, leading them to accept Jesus as personal Saviour and to

2003). However, as noted in fn. 75, pp. 212, 213, much of the scholarly endeavor using social science research—or what should have used social science research—has been poorly conceived and presented by students in the SDATS.

¹³⁴“Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 6.

¹³⁵Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #40, 2; “Andrews University–Seminary Option,” 1; “Benefits of a Seminary Location,” 1; “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 3; and “Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?,” 1.

unite with His church, and nurturing them in preparation for His soon return.”¹³⁶ To fulfill this mission, the leadership of the Adventist church included teaching as part of its strategy because they acknowledged that the “development of mind and character is essential to God’s redemptive plan.”¹³⁷ A comparison of the mission statement of both Religious Education and the Adventist Church shows a clear connection. This link was specially noticed in the emphasis of the Religious Education program on the discipling aspect of the gospel commission. Discipling indicates that the Religious Education program “prepares pastor-teachers for leadership roles in settings where religious, moral and spiritual nurture and growth are primary concerns.”¹³⁸ This training could aid congregations to assimilate new converts and to prepare them to be disciples.¹³⁹ To this end, the Religious Education faculty felt that the program could help the church reach its mission by training leaders in various aspects of ministry.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁶The General Conference Corporation of Seventh-day Adventists, *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook 2002* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2004), 8.

¹³⁷*Ibid.*

¹³⁸Andrews University, *Bulletin 2000-2001*, 185. The Religious Education program provides its graduates an understanding of Christian spiritual formation and nurture.

¹³⁹Discipleship might happen at home through the work of dedicated parents, in the school when teachers are trained to integrate faith and learning and use effective educational strategies for teaching Bible and religion, and at the workplace as lay members witness to those who are outside the church. Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #40, 2.

¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 186; Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 3; “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 2; and “Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 4.

First, the program could prepare pastors to fulfill their role in the relationship between the local church and the church school.¹⁴¹ Second, Religious Education could oversee the preparation of academy Bible and religion teachers. Third, it could provide training for denominational and lay leaders in family and children's ministries. Although this type of training has been available for several years in the SED, transferring the program to the Seminary would also open doors to spouses of seminarians who would want to be instructed in these areas by taking the necessary courses at reduced rates.¹⁴²

Bringing together the advantages that a Seminary locale might provide to Religious Education and the contributions that the program could make to the SDATS and the Adventist Church, it seemed that the transfer was mutually beneficial to all parties concerned. Not only would the program be able to fulfill its mission more effectively, but it could also play an active role in helping the Seminary and the Adventist Church in fulfilling their respective missions.¹⁴³

The Presentation of the Proposal

The proposal for transfer to the Seminary was completed and first presented to

¹⁴¹“Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 6.

¹⁴²Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 4; idem, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #40, 3; “Andrews University - Seminary Option,” 1; “Benefits of a Seminary Location,” 1; “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 3; “Where Should Religious Education Be Housed?,” 1; and “Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 6.

¹⁴³See Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 1; Graham, to ATS Visiting Team, 27 June 2002; “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 1; and “Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 6.

Graham, McVay, and a small group of Seminary faculty on 13 November 2000.¹⁴⁴

Thayer and Matthews structured the presentation in seven sections.¹⁴⁵ Some sections were particularly significant. The statistical section accurately showed the growth of the program, especially after the inception of the first doctoral degree.¹⁴⁶ The number of countries represented by its graduates and their various denominational careers demonstrated the worldwide influence of Religious Education in the Adventist denomination.¹⁴⁷ This section alone showed the significant contribution already made by Religious Education to the mission of the Adventist Church.

Narration of the history was focused on the doctoral program in Religious Education. The Religious Education faculty presented the history of the program from 1973 when the first doctorate was mandated by the North American Division Board of

¹⁴⁴“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 17 November 2000; and Thayer, “Proposal to Move Religious Education,” Document #43, 1.

¹⁴⁵The seven sections included statistical information, history of Religious Education at Andrews, link with the Seminary, proposed program overview, options for governance, resources needed, and responses. “Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 1-12.

¹⁴⁶The data did not reveal the number of M.A. graduates in Religious Education from 1960 to 1964. When asked, Matthews indicated that he was told that the Religious Education program had started in 1964, with the first graduates in 1965. The additional number of graduates since 1960 would have shown a larger growth in the program. “Religious Education Graduates: All Graduates (1965-1999),” Document #73, 1999, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-4; and “M.A. Graduates—Religious Education,” Document #19, 24 September 1984, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁴⁷See appendix H for a record of achievement of several retired and active graduates from Religious Education.

Higher Education, not from 1960 when the program was founded.¹⁴⁸ Apparently, Matthews and Thayer were more interested in presenting the strength of Religious Education after the creation of the Ed.D. degree, the conceptualization of its philosophical foundation, and how that strength diminished as the relationship with the Seminary weakened.

In the historical section of the presentation, the Religious Education faculty followed a logical outline to present the need to reestablish collaboration with the Seminary. Four key concepts were delineated in this section: development of the program, major challenges, erosion of its identity and mission, and redefinition of the mission of the program.¹⁴⁹ The need for collaboration is substantiated in the next two sections.

Thayer and Matthews explained the mission of the Religious Education program at Andrews and how the program could assist the Theological Seminary and the Seventh-day Adventist Church in reaching their mission as well. Through benchmarking studies,

¹⁴⁸As presented on pp. 101-11, investigation of the early history of Religious Education revealed that the program was founded in 1960 with a simple, but clear mission. From its genesis, it was led by a trained religious educator, F.E.J. Harder. This data showed the role that the program played in its early years in the Department of Education and how it contributed to helping the Adventist Church fulfill its worldwide mission. Such information reinforced the idea that moving Religious Education to the Seminary was not about the preservation of a name or program, but about meeting the needs of the Adventist Church around the world. The concept of helping to meet the needs of the church would have added more weight to the presentation of the two Religious Education faculty members.

¹⁴⁹The four concepts are expanded in previous chapters of this dissertation. The development of the program and its major challenges are explained on pp. 120-45. Then chapter 3 discussed the erosion of the identity of the program on pp. 166-72. Chapter 4 described the rebuilding of the mission of Religious Education, pp. 184-202.

they showed how the Seminary was the most appropriate place for the Religious Education program, and then suggested possible structural options for governance. The presentation concluded with two questions: “Does Religious Education fit within the mission of the Seminary?” and “Do you want Religious Education in the Seminary?”¹⁵⁰ The attendees at the presentation were invited to consider thoughtfully the Adventist Theological Seminary as the most favorable location for Religious Education.

The thoroughness of the presentation persuaded the faculty of the Adventist Theological Seminary that Religious Education really belonged with them.¹⁵¹ The impressions made by the presentation led McVay to request a second presentation of the same proposal to the full Seminary faculty in a more condensed form. The proposal was reduced to a twenty-minute PowerPoint presentation that took place on 1 December 2000.¹⁵² The December presentation persuaded the Seminary faculty that the Religious Education program should be part of the SDATS. A third presentation was scheduled for 10 January 2001 for the entire SED faculty.¹⁵³ At the end of this presentation, the SED

¹⁵⁰“Andrews University: Proposal for Relocation,” 12.

¹⁵¹Karen Graham, electronic letter to Jane Thayer and John Matthews, 15 November 2000, transcript in the REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁵²“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 17 November 2000; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 30 November 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; Graham, electronic letter to Thayer and Matthews, 15 November 2000, 2; Jane Thayer, letter to John McVay, 4 December 2000, transcript in the REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Thayer, electronic letter to author, 30 October 2005, 3.

¹⁵³“Andrews University: A Presentation to the SED Faculty,” 1. Conversations between the SDATS’s and the SED’s respective leaders continued throughout 2001.

faculty concurred with the thoughts of the Seminary faculty.

As a result of these presentations, the SED faculty voted to support the redesign and relocation of the program in the SDATS. The SED also stated its willingness to develop cross-school collaboration between the SED and the Seminary.¹⁵⁴ As noted in the petition to the ATS Commission on Accrediting, collaboration between the two schools would allow the Religious Education faculty to serve the Seminary by “developing leaders in Christian education for the church community and for family life (home) enrichment. By maintaining a connection with the SED through shared courses, Religious Education will continue to contribute to the development of scholars and leaders for the school community.”¹⁵⁵ The concepts presented in the document to the ATS demonstrate how the original philosophy of the Religious Education program, based on the biblical model, still guided the thinking of the faculty despite all the changes that had taken place.

The SED faculty encouraged mutual cooperation between the SED and the SDATS by making a commitment to give attention to Religious Education students in the education courses, by participating on the administrative and advisory committees established for the program in Religious Education, and by bringing a report to the

¹⁵⁴Graham was in full support of a cross-cultural collaboration between the two schools. In addition, both deans indicated to the administration and board of Andrews University that this collaboration might be a model for others to consider. Graham, to ATS Visiting Team, 27 June 2002.

¹⁵⁵“Petition to the ATS Commission on Accrediting: Proposed Programs in Religious Education,” Document #59, 2001, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2.

Program Faculty and Seminary Curriculum Committee.¹⁵⁶ This support showed the SED faculty's conviction that this was "the best decision for the students, the church mission, and Andrews University's supportive response to the mission of the SDA Church."¹⁵⁷

The rationale prepared by Matthews and Thayer presented a number of reasons that favored relocating the Religious Education program to the Seminary. The documents and sources consulted by the faculty members and the benchmarking they did were important because the process furnished information that gave "new insights into the discipline of religious education"¹⁵⁸ and aided them in the process of rebuilding the mission and philosophy of Religious Education at Andrews. The proposal to relocate the program in the Seminary presented Religious Education with the opportunity to function as a program in its own right and with its own identity.

The Process of Moving the Program

After support from the SED and Seminary was secured, the Religious Education faculty members proceeded with arrangements to transfer the program to the Seminary. In 2001, they began working with the Seminary administration in the preparation of the bulletin copy and a petition to the ATS for approval of the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Religious Education.¹⁵⁹ Then in 2002, the academic acronym of the program was

¹⁵⁶Graham to ATS Visiting Team, 27 June 2002.

¹⁵⁷Ibid.

¹⁵⁸Thayer to John McVay, 4 December 2000.

¹⁵⁹Ibid.; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 25 September 2001, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 30 October

changed from EDRE to RLED,¹⁶⁰ and the Religious Education budget and tuition were divided unevenly between the SED and SDATS.¹⁶¹ These important details, among a myriad of other items, facilitated the actual transition of the program to the SDATS.

As the official date for the transfer of the Religious Education program at Andrews University to the Adventist Theological Seminary drew near, the Seminary administration requested ATS to conduct a focus visit to the Seminary. The purpose of this visit was for ATS to approve the graduate degrees in religious education “in accordance with its policies and procedures for approving research doctoral degree

2001, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 22 January 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and John K. McVay, electronic letter to Jane Thayer and John Matthews, 12 December 2000, transcript in the REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁶⁰The change of acronym was possible with the approval of the SED to deactivate the former one. Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 307, 308; and Jane Thayer, “Transitional Matters,” Document #44, 2001, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁶¹One and one-half full-time equivalent faculty budgets were moved to the Seminary, and Religious Education was made a cost center. About 66 percent of the tuition from the students in the master’s program and about 70 to 76 percent of the doctoral students’ tuition also went to the Seminary. The administration of the SED and SDATS determined the percentage based on the number of credit hours taken in SED and SDATS courses. The remaining portion of the budget and tuition went to the School of Education. The reasons for this distribution of the budget were due to the working situation of the two Religious Education faculty members and the working relationship of the two schools. While Thayer was going to serve as a full-time faculty member of Religious Education in the Seminary, Matthews’s teaching responsibilities were going to be equally divided between the SED and the Seminary. “Report to the Association of Theological Schools,” Document #49, January 2003, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

programs.”¹⁶² The visit was authorized by the ATS Commission on Accrediting at its January 2002 meeting, and two members visited the Theological Seminary in June and July to determine “if resources, policies, procedures, planning, evaluation, and curriculum are in place that would allow the Seminary to offer the M.A. in Religious Education and the Ph.D. in Religious Education.”¹⁶³

During its visit, the committee reviewed all the materials provided by the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and the ATS office¹⁶⁴ and interviewed the dean of the Theological Seminary, the associate dean, the director of Religious Education

¹⁶²“Prospectus for a Focused Visit to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary of Andrews University,” Document #46, 2002, REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁶³Ibid.; “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 26 February 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and “Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 14 June 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. The two members who visited the Seminary were Jimmy Dukes, dean of the Extension Center System of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, and Charles Willard, staff member at ATS. This visit coincided with the official date for the transfer of the Religious Education program to the SDATS which took place on Monday, 1 July 2002. “Report of Visiting Committee,” Document #47, July 2002, REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and “July 1 Will Be a Big Day,” Document #45, 2002, REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI,” 1.

¹⁶⁴The ATS provided the two members of the visiting committee with a visitor roster, the accreditation history of the SDATS, a fact sheet computed from the institution’s 1999, 2000, and 2001 ATS annual report forms, the prospectus for the visit, the Seminary’s proposal for offering the M.A. and Ph.D. in Religious Education, and the Commission on Accrediting’s 14 February 2002 action letter, which authorized the visit. The SDATS furnished the visiting committee with the current catalog, the student handbook for the programs, sample syllabi prepared for the proposed programs, the competencies and guidelines for comprehensives, evaluative reviews of the program as offered by the SED, notification of any changes in the list of the faculty who would be teaching in the programs as noted in the proposal, and a financial plan and projections for the proposed degree programs, in support of the more general financial statements offered in the proposal. “Prospectus for a Focused Visit,” 1.

degree programs, and the Seminary librarian. The committee also interviewed the vice-president for academic administration, the vice-president for financial administration, the dean of Graduate Studies, the dean of the SED, and the Religious Education faculty members and students.¹⁶⁵

In July 2002, the site visit committee prepared a report for the Commission. The report stated that the M.A.: Religious Education¹⁶⁶ and Ph.D. in Religious Education were consistent “with the purpose statement of the Seminary, and serve to advance its mission.”¹⁶⁷ The goals of the graduate programs were based on the stated competencies of the SDATS and were in compliance with the ATS standards for M.A. and Ph.D. programs.¹⁶⁸

The goals of the M.A. degree were to prepare “both professional and lay pastor-teachers for leadership roles in settings where religious, moral, and spiritual nurture and growth are primary concerns.”¹⁶⁹ The goals for the doctorate were to train “men and women to be scholars, teachers and researchers in specialized teaching and discipling

¹⁶⁵Ibid., 2; and “Report of Visiting Committee,” 1.

¹⁶⁶According to ATS standards for programs in religious education, the M.A. in Religious Education is a forty-eight-credit professional degree and the M.A.: Religious Education [or M.A. (Religious Education)] is a thirty-two-credit academic degree. Because the Religious Education M.A. at Andrews was academic, the title was changed to reflect ATS standards for this type of degree. “ATS Degree Program Standards,” 8-11; “Report of Visiting Committee,” 1, 2; and “Response to ATS,” 1.

¹⁶⁷“Report of Visiting Committee,” 1.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., 3.

¹⁶⁹Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 304.

ministries of the church.”¹⁷⁰ These goals were clearly connected with the six roles of a religious educator through required courses assigned to each role.¹⁷¹ This association of goals and roles complied with the ATS standards for degree programs:

The goals an institution adopts for the research doctorate should include: a comprehensive knowledge of the disciplines of study; competence to engage in original research and writing that advance theological understanding for the sake of church, academy, and society; and a breadth of knowledge in theological and religious studies and in other academic disciplines. The program of study should also enable the student to develop a sense of and a commitment to the vocation of theological scholarship in its dimensions of teaching, learning, and research.¹⁷²

The evaluation made by ATS was very valuable. ATS approval gave Religious Education academic credibility and affirmed the initiatives taken to redefine and strengthen the program.

The report also included the committee’s concern about the strength of graduate preparation in theological studies. However, it expressed the committee’s satisfaction that the research, reflection, and integration required for the Ph.D. degree were met through the modular approach, using the summer sessions. Even though much of the academic work was being done through summer programs, the committee members recognized that the Religious Education faculty was providing quality education and ensuring that a collegial academic activity was part of the students’ experience. In

¹⁷⁰Ibid., 305.

¹⁷¹Ibid., 304, 306. The six competencies are discussed on pp. 190-94.

¹⁷²“ATS Degree Program Standards,” 43. Other generic standards published by ATS were religious heritage, cultural context, personal and spiritual formation, and educational practice. The goals and competencies of Religious Education were also in harmony with these standards. “Religious Education Competencies,” 1.

addition, the faculty met or exceeded the ATS standards for diversity, experience, scholarly research, and willingness to support students through guidance and advisement. Resources at the James White Library also provided sufficient support for the two graduate degree programs in Religious Education.¹⁷³

The visiting committee concluded their report by making four general recommendations to the ATS. In the first two, the Committee recommended granting preliminary approval for the M.A.: Religious Education and Ph.D. in Religious Education. The next recommendation was to request the Seminary to submit a follow-up report on the evaluation of Religious Education students after one year. In the last recommendation, they asked the Seminary to submit a follow-up report describing the strengthening of the theological component of the Ph.D. program in Religious Education.¹⁷⁴

In response to the committee's report, the Religious Education faculty recognized the weakness of the theological component of the program and explained that their intention in advising students was to ensure that student course plans included theological courses in the elective areas as necessary. "The reason for wishing to maintain this flexibility is that some students are admitted to the program with strong religion/theology

¹⁷³"Report of Visiting Committee," 3, 4; and "Library Resources and Services Needed by Religious Education Students," Document #61, 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁷⁴"Report of Visiting Committee," 5; and "Report to the Association," 1.

backgrounds, while others enter the program with weak backgrounds.”¹⁷⁵ The intent of the advisors would be to prepare the student course plans based on the student’s educational background. If the person’s background was strong in religion/theology, emphasis would be placed in the fields of education and religious education.¹⁷⁶

In order to meet the recommendations made by the ATS and retain the flexibility of the program at the same time, the faculty proposed that “a minimum of 12 [semester] graduate credits in religion, theology, and the theory/theology of religious education must be completed to meet graduation requirements”¹⁷⁷ for the M.A. degree while the Ph.D. program required a minimum of thirty semester graduate credits in these theological disciplines.¹⁷⁸

Once the response of the Religious Education faculty was received and reviewed, the ATS Commission on Accrediting voted in 2003 to “receive the report on the evaluation of graduate students and describing the strengthening of the theological studies component of the Ph.D. in Religious Education.”¹⁷⁹ This statement indicated that Religious Education at Andrews University was now provisionally approved and fully

¹⁷⁵“Response to the ATS Recommendations,” Document #48, 2002, REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

¹⁷⁶Ibid.; and The Association of Theological Schools, to John McVay, 5 February 2004, transcript in the REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

¹⁷⁷“Response to ATS,” 1. See also Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 304.

¹⁷⁸“Response to ATS,” 1, 2; “Report to the Association,” 1, 2; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 304, 305.

¹⁷⁹The Association to John McVay, 5 February 2004, 1.

accredited to serve the Adventist Church from the physical location of the Seminary.¹⁸⁰

Graduates in Religious Education were trained to provide leadership in the home, church, and school settings of the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church.¹⁸¹

Following its relocation to the Seminary on 1 July 2002, the Religious Education program was included in the Seminary section of the University bulletin for 2002-2003 as an academic program under the direction of Thayer.¹⁸² The bulletin also indicated that the program is now accredited by ATS instead of NCATE.¹⁸³ Both the master's and doctoral programs aimed to prepare graduates in the roles of a religious educator, with an area of emphasis and expertise in at least one of the three agencies of the biblical model (i.e., the home, the church, or the school).

The effects of this move on the students' records and progress in the Religious Education program were minimal. The SED maintained and monitored the records of those students who had entered Religious Education at Andrews University while it was under the administration of the School of Education, while the records of all new

¹⁸⁰New programs under ATS always begin with provisional approval. After several students have graduated from the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees, Religious Education leaders must provide assessment material to obtain standard approval.

¹⁸¹Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 305.

¹⁸²The Ed.D. and Ed.S. degrees in Religious Education were discontinued from the program. Jane Thayer and John Matthews, "Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary," Document #41, 13 November 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 285.

¹⁸³"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 8 August 2002, REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 304-06; and Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 6.

admissions would be administered in the SDATS.¹⁸⁴

In 2003, the emphasis in master's and doctoral programs was modified to include new areas of specialization. In addition to Family Life Education, the M.A.: Religious Education added two other areas of specialization: Campus Spiritual Leadership and Secondary Education. The Ph.D. in Religious Education was listed with four areas of specialization: Family Life Education, Campus Spiritual Leadership, Educational History, and Theological Curriculum and Instruction.¹⁸⁵ Ideally, students who graduate with M.A.

¹⁸⁴Thayer, "Questionnaire on Religious Education," 6.

¹⁸⁵"Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 24 May 2000; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 12 October 2000; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 19 October 2000; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 13 February 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 26 February 2002; "Minutes of Faculty Meeting," 5 March 2002, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 285. M.A. graduates will have a biblical knowledge base, an understanding of Christian spiritual formation and nurture, and pedagogical skills to serve in a specialized area of the teaching ministry for either the formal (school) or non-formal (church and family) settings. In addition to the areas of specialization, the Religious Education program also started graduate certificate programs in Family Life Education and Campus Spiritual Leadership. The Campus Spiritual Leadership certificate program has two tracks for training leaders in campus ministry. One is the Christian campus track and the other is the public campus track. The Christian campus track prepares professionals who are responsible for the spiritual growth of students on Adventist academy or college campuses or any other Christian campuses. The public campus track trains professionals who would like to minister to Seventh-day Adventists as well as other Christian students attending public colleges and universities. The graduate certificate in Family Life Education "is designed for pastors, family ministries directors, and lay leaders who want to help foster or support strong families in the church and in the community through teaching in seminars, classes, small groups, and retreats." Andrews University, *Bulletin 2003-2004*, vol. 89, no. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2003), 304, 305. The description of both certificates suggests a connection with the certificates in Church Vitality and Youth Ministry that the Religious Education faculty wanted to develop earlier in partnership with the Seminary. While the Campus Spiritual Leadership trains individuals to do youth ministry with students, the Family Life Education equips professionals to bring vitality to the church by strengthening family relationships.

or Ph.D. degrees will be prepared to serve the church in teaching and leadership ministries supported by the competencies identified under the roles of a religious educator. They will be fitted to work in any of the three settings of the biblical model for religious education: the home, the church, or the school. Their chosen emphasis area will determine in which setting they have developed the most expertise. The students will also be able to investigate contemporary religious education issues using social science research methodologies.¹⁸⁶

At present (2008), certain factors seem to suggest that the Religious Education program at Andrews University has regained some of its earlier strength and influence. The major factor relates to the philosophical structure of the program. The philosophical framework of Religious Education is structured in terms of the six roles of a religious educator. This helps to define the character of Religious Education graduates, and gives the program a distinctive identity and mission. In particular, graduates are trained to serve the Adventist Church in teaching and leadership ministries focused on the components of the biblical model for religious education: family, church, and school.¹⁸⁷

Arising from and supportive of this philosophical and conceptual redefinition are several other factors that have strengthened the program and that are worthy of specific mention. The first of these relates to program accreditation. Religious Education is

¹⁸⁶ Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 305.

¹⁸⁷ Andrews University, *Bulletin 2005-2006*, 310-12.

provisionally accredited by the ATS,¹⁸⁸ and for students pursuing doctoral degrees with the goal of teaching at the tertiary level, this accreditation is important. The strengthening of the theological requirement of the program is another positive factor important to reasserting the biblical model of religious education.¹⁸⁹ A third factor, the physical relocation of the program to the Seminary, has strengthened the collaboration between the SED and SDATS. As expressed by Graham, this mutual collaboration may help the Adventist Church regain the synergistic power of the two pillars on which the church is built: theology and education.¹⁹⁰

The last factor involves curricular revisions that the M.Div. program is currently (2007-08) completing. According to McVay, Thayer and Matthews have aided the ongoing M.Div. curriculum review and revision in two important ways. First, they “have provided valuable information, including insights into the learning process as well as examples drawn from the design of religious education programs that have proved very helpful and enlightening.”¹⁹¹ Second,

¹⁸⁸It is likely that the provisional status will be changed to regular status following the ATS accreditation visit in 2009.

¹⁸⁹“Minutes of Faculty Meeting,” 8 August 2002; “Response to ATS,” 1, 2; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2005-2006*, 313.

¹⁹⁰Graham, “Questionnaire for Graham,” 1; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2005-2006*, 311-13.

¹⁹¹John K. McVay, electronic letter to author, 27 June 2006, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, in my possession. Whereas Thayer’s presentations in these meetings have been verbal, without handouts or paper backup, Matthews has presented several documents. In those documents, Matthews provided valuable information for the M.Div. curricular foundation. In one document, he graphically illustrated the philosophical process to prepare the ideal graduate and to define the

having Religious Education as an integral part of the offerings of the Seminary has helped to sensitize us to the importance of an array of concerns that are receiving an enhanced level of attention in the redesign of the curriculum as a result. The areas of family life, teaching skills, and discipling come to mind as premiere examples of this additional way that the process has been informed by Religious Education.¹⁹²

Thayer's and Matthews's contributions to the M.Div. curriculum review show that Religious Education is already making a significant impact on the Seminary program.

The combination of all these factors seems to suggest that the Religious Education program might, in Youngberg's words, "prosper more in its mission to the world church from the vantage point of the Seminary than it would have if it had remained in the SED."¹⁹³

The Contribution of the Program to the Mission of the Church

The Seventh-day Adventist Church operates a worldwide educational system to

character of the graduate. In two other documents, he structured the philosophical framework of the M.Div. program in terms of roles and competencies. This model was drawn from the current philosophical base of Religious Education at Andrews. In the last document, Matthews connected the principles of God's kingdom with the home, church, and school settings of the biblical model. Then he tied these two with the mission of Andrews University and the core values of the Seminary. Toward the end of the document, Matthews provided a curriculum mapping for the M.Div. program based on the suggested competencies. John Matthews, "Denominational/Administrative/ Teacher-Level Philosophical Chart," March 2006, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; idem, "Master of Divinity Competencies with Comments," 28 March 2006, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-6; idem, "Master of Divinity Competencies," 28 March 2006, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-4; idem, "Ideological Flowchart: Identifying with the Source," March 2006, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1-7.

¹⁹²McVay to author, 27 June 2006, 1.

¹⁹³Youngberg, "Information on the Religious Education Program," 5, 6.

prepare “students for a useful and joy-filled life, fostering friendship with God, whole-person development, Bible-based values, and selfless service in accordance with the Seventh-day Adventist mission to the world.”¹⁹⁴ The Adventist Church is interested in the complete development of the individual, so Adventist education offers balanced religious, intellectual, vocational, and physical instruction. Adventist schools also train young people for service to the church and society. This training is grounded in the principles of the Bible as modeled by Jesus and established in harmony with the standards of the worldwide Adventist Church.¹⁹⁵

In the denominational handbook for ministerial and theological education, there are specific guidelines for the preparation of ministers, some of which correlate directly with the mission of the Religious Education program. The handbook states that the primary agencies by which the church

fosters a common understanding of its message and promotes its mission is through the ministry of its spiritual leaders—pastors, theologians, Bible/religion teachers, chaplains, and administrators. Thus the education and professional training of these individuals becomes of paramount importance if the church is to preserve its message and mission within its international diversity.¹⁹⁶

Religious Education can be a partner in fulfilling the mission of the Seventh-day

¹⁹⁴*Working Policy of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists*, 2005-2006 ed. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2005), 1.

¹⁹⁵*Ibid.*, 2, 3; and Andrews University, *Bulletin 2005-2006*, 291, 292. The stated interest of the University in the optimum development of the whole individual was already present when the first doctoral degree in Religious Education was introduced in 1974. See above, pp. 115, 116; and “Program for a Major in Religious Education,” 1, 2.

¹⁹⁶General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Ministerial and Theological Education* (Silver Spring, MD: International Board of Ministerial and Theological Education, 2001), i.

Adventist Church because its program intersects in a number of areas with the proposed ministerial and theological training of these leaders. Seventh-day Adventist ministers should be leaders who are skilled, among other things, in “discipling-training, motivating, equipping, counseling, mentoring, [and] retaining.”¹⁹⁷

To this end, pastoral training includes subjects in biblical studies, doctrinal and historical studies, pastoral and mission studies, and personal formation. Along with these studies, ministerial students should ideally take courses that deal with motivation and Christian education/teaching ministry. As a result of this training, graduates should be able to

develop and train lay leadership in all appropriate aspects of local church life and growth [and] apply the Seventh-day Adventist vision of Christian education in the work of discipling and retaining members. This should include persons of all ages in a variety of long and short term education programs through a range of church departments.¹⁹⁸

The denominational guidelines for the formation of religion/theology teachers who will function at the college/seminary/university level even more clearly emphasize the need for expertise in teaching and evaluation.¹⁹⁹

Clearly, the expectations for preparation of theologians and pastors as presented in the denominational guidelines identify a number of areas that are within the academic purview of religious education. This demonstrates the need for knowledge and skills that religious education specialists can contribute to the achievement of the worldwide

¹⁹⁷Ibid., 40.

¹⁹⁸Ibid., 43, 47.

¹⁹⁹Ibid., 54.

mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and underscores the importance of the Religious Education program as it has been redefined at Andrews University.²⁰⁰

In harmony with the ideals and interests of the church, the Religious Education program was established in the Department of Education at Andrews University.²⁰¹ It has educated students for “professional leadership in home, school, and church settings.”²⁰² Graduates of the program have taken positions in schools and colleges, and as departmental leaders at local, regional, national, and international levels of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Specific appointments have included the following: teachers, pastors, and administrators in schools and colleges; education, youth, and communication directors; Sabbath school, personal ministries, and family life directors; residence hall deans and campus chaplains; music leaders; and development directors.²⁰³

The redefined framework and focus of Religious Education should give the program the opportunity to make a greater contribution in the ministerial and theological education of future leaders. In this way the Religious Education program at Andrews will

²⁰⁰Religious Education is already contributing to fulfilling this guideline. GSEM860 Teaching Religion in College, though not a Religious Education course, is taught by Matthews. Thayer is teaching RLED610 Teaching for Discipleship and GSEM541 Spiritual Formation.

²⁰¹See above, pp. 101-11.

²⁰²Andrews University, *Bulletin 1978-1979*, 82; idem, *Bulletin 1982-1983*, 58, 59; idem, *Bulletin 1987-1988*, 98; idem, *Bulletin 1994-1995*, 171.

²⁰³See Andrews University, *Summer Bulletin 1984*, 3; “Department of Religious Education,” 4; “Mission of the Religious Education Department,” Document #4, no date, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1; “Petition to ATS,” 2; and appendix H for a record of the achievement of several religious educators from Andrews University.

not only fulfill its mission, but should help to fulfill the mission of the Adventist Theological Seminary and the Adventist Church around the world.

With graduates serving in many positions and places, “the Religious Education program have [*sic*] established an enviable reputation for producing dedicated, capable, and versatile scholars and leaders.”²⁰⁴ From the inception of the program, 244 Religious Education graduates from the master’s and doctoral programs at Andrews University have made a significant impact on the Adventist Church worldwide.²⁰⁵

Conclusions

The late 1990s was a transitional period for the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Youngberg, the long-time director of the program, retired in 1999 after twenty-five years of service. Thayer and Matthews joined Religious Education in 1996 and 1999, respectively. They arrived at a time when Family Life was the main focus of the program and, due to other degrees offered by the Seminary and SED that encroached on the Religious Education program, the viability of the program had been weakened. When the new faculty raised questions regarding the philosophical framework and mission of the program, the search for answers initiated a process that led to a redefinition of Religious Education at Andrews University, and ultimately to the

²⁰⁴“Petition to ATS,” 2.

²⁰⁵“M.A. Graduates—Religious Education,” 1-3; “Religious Education Graduates,” 1-4; and “Andrews University Graduated Students by Academic Year: Religious Ed Majors,” Document #76, 2 June 2006, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1, in my possession. See appendix H for a record of the achievement of religious educators from Andrews University.

relocation of the program from the SED to the Theological Seminary.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study has presented an overview of the philosophy and history of religious education from the biblical period until modern times. The main focus of this overview was an exploration of the philosophical foundations of religious instruction, which were analyzed from a theistic perspective. This exploration revealed that God provided a biblical model for religious education, which incorporated the home, temple/synagogue/church, and school as primary agencies for religious learning. The word of God in its oral and written forms is the main epistemological source for instruction.¹ Among these three agencies, the home was the first setting used for religious training and remained foundational for the other two.

¹The word of God was transmitted orally throughout the patriarchal era. After the Exodus from Egypt, God commanded Moses and other leaders to write His instructions in books that would serve as sources of learning for future generations (Exod 17:14; Josh 24:26; Jer 30:1, 2). During the Intertestamental period [425 BC-AD 27], synagogue leaders introduced the interpretation of the Jewish rabbis as another source of religious instruction to be used in the formal setting of the synagogue schools. The interpretation of these scholars was recorded in such sources as the Midrash, the Mishnah, and the Talmud. In the New Testament, Christ and the apostles discouraged the use of other sources such as tradition and classical philosophy as tools for religious education (Matt 15:1-3; 16:6, 12; 1 Cor 5:6, 7; Col 2:8, 20-23; Titus 1:10-14; 1 Tim 1:3, 4; 6:20). They feared that these unbiblical sources would turn believers away from sound doctrine.

In these three settings, God's people were educated to serve him, and through these agencies the covenant relationship between God and His people was transmitted and renewed from generation to generation. Each agency was established to complement the other, not to compete, and the agencies that were established later were not to replace the primary agency, the family. While education in the home and the temple/synagogue/church was imparted in an informal setting, instruction in the school was formal. This study focused on information needed to analyze the history of religious education: its development, initiatives, movements, and organizations. The research also established a context to evaluate the historical development and philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program at Andrews University in light of the main philosophical categories and biblical model.

The Bible describes the patriarchs, the children of Israel, and the early Christian church as employing the components of the biblical model for the religious instruction of God's people. Similarly, it acknowledges that there were periods when believers, leaders, and especially the kings of Israel and Judah departed from the model (e.g., Judg 2:10-17; 8:24-27, 30, 31; 14-16; 18-19; 1 Kgs 12:26-33; 16:30-31; 17-18; 2 Kgs 22; Gal 1:6-9; 3:1). Deviation from the model brought religious apostasy at times and distorted the covenant relationship of the people with God. This divergence also appears in the history of the Christian Church.

Through the first two centuries following the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, some prominent church leaders began to deviate from the scriptural model of religious education, and the biblical approach to education was to a significant degree abandoned

in many Christian circles. The scriptures were no longer considered the foundation of study, and religious leaders gave more emphasis to the relationship between Christianity and philosophy. The hermeneutic for understanding and interpreting the Bible became much more philosophical and allegorical.

The process of separation from the biblical pattern was considerably hastened by the emergence of the Catechetical schools. In these learning centers, pupils were introduced to the Greco-Roman classics, prominent philosophers, and secular academic disciplines. The Bible was no longer always considered normative and authoritative in matters of faith and practice. The loss of the Bible as the primary source for religious instruction affected the teaching ministry of the church. The home, church, and school settings for religious instruction were at times neglected or distorted. For example, an overemphasis on the importance of the Catechetical school of Alexandria in interpreting scripture detracted from the autonomy of local churches in their educational roles.

Changes in the biblical model became more pronounced over time with the rise of various religious initiatives, movements, and organizations. Though religious instruction was still provided in individual homes and churches, medieval efforts were mainly focused on the school setting of the model. At times, the school agency was the primary purveyor of religious education. The inclusion of the classical trivium and quadrivium in the school curriculum furthered the decline of the Bible as the foundation for religious instruction.² Consequently, religious education in the Middle Ages became less biblical and more philosophical in nature.

²Johnson-Miller, 455.

The period before and during the Protestant Reformation saw some positive changes in religious education. The scriptures were emphasized and new methods of biblical research were introduced.³ Protestant Reformers and a number of other church leaders stressed the centrality of the home, church, and school as primary institutions for religious learning.⁴ As a result, during this period, church leaders initiated a return to the biblical model for religious education. Within the broader Catholic Church arising out of the Catholic Reformation, the components of the biblical model were also active. Groups like the Jansenists recognized the importance of properly interpreting the Bible and the vital relationship of the home, church, and school to educate their believers. In the Jesuit educational system, leaders channeled a great deal of energy into the school agency and emphasized the tradition of the church over the scriptures.⁵

The family, church, and school institutions continued to function as partners in the education of the young in other post-Reformation movements like Pietism and Methodism.⁶ In these movements, the Bible was considered the main epistemological source of religious instruction, which meant that the biblical model of religious instruction had been restored in a significant sub-group of the Christian world.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, a new development arose that enhanced

³Walker, 294-96.

⁴Lamb, 586; and Pazmiño, 143, 144.

⁵Benson, 605; and Hägglund, 286.

⁶Allison, 301; and Reed and Prevost, 272. Pietism was particularly viewed as “a significant effort to reform the Protestant heritage.” Noll, 858.

the work of imparting religious education in the church: the Sunday school movement. Unlike previous efforts, this movement was not primarily religious in nature. The Sunday school started as a social endeavor. Due to its social beginnings, the biblical model for religious education was not initially implemented in the instructional program of the Sunday school.

After ecclesiastical support was granted, Sunday school leaders incorporated the Bible and the church as the main instruments for instruction. Attention to the home and school settings was minimal. Eventually, the Sunday school became an important institution for religious instruction in the Christian church and remained this way for the next two centuries. Despite its central role in religious education, the Sunday school movement and subsequent organizations did not always embrace all the elements of the biblical model.

The study of the historical background for religious education provides a meaningful context for evaluating the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Founded in 1960 as a master's level program, Religious Education at Andrews can be divided into four distinct periods, each with influential contributors.

During the first phase, the program was created with a defined mission and philosophical foundation. The mission and philosophy of the Department of Education and of the Seventh-day Adventist Church shaped the mission and philosophical foundation of the Religious Education program.⁷ The Adventist philosophy of education

⁷The Seventh-day Adventist educational philosophy is discussed on pp. 83-92 and the mission of the Department of Education is presented on pp. 101, 102.

views the home, church, and school as pivotal centers for religious instruction, and the Bible is considered the primary source for religious learning. These concepts were prominent in the mission and philosophy of the Department of Education. Throughout this early period, Frederick Harder helped to mold and develop the mission and identity of the program in harmony with the educational philosophy of the Adventist Church and Department of Education.

The second stage began in 1974 and spanned a period of significant growth in the program. During this era, the main contributors were George Akers and John Youngberg, who enhanced the mission and strengthened the identity of Religious Education. Through their leadership, the Religious Education program came to offer three graduate degrees: M.A., Ed.D., and Ph.D. During this time, new ideas were developed that enhanced the philosophical foundation of the program. First, the religious education faculty included what they described as four hallmarks of religious education at Andrews. Second, the degrees were designed to prepare students for professional leadership in at least one of the home, church, and school settings of the biblical model within the worldwide Adventist Church.⁸ The centrality of the Bible was also re-affirmed. Third, the arrival of Roy Naden made the philosophical foundation of Religious Education fully operative. The program now had three full-time faculty, each professor providing direction to one of the components of the biblical model. Akers gave leadership to the school setting, Youngberg focused on the home setting, and Naden coordinated the church setting.

The third phase in the history of the Religious Education program began in 1982.

⁸ Andrews University, *Bulletin 1976-1977*, 93.

Events in this phase reveal a time of crisis for the program. Several factors challenged the stability of the program and eventually caused the erosion of its identity and mission. The ability to implement the biblical model weakened as a result of these challenges. The first development was the creation of three new doctorates at Andrews University.⁹ These three degrees undermined the enrollment and mission of Religious Education. The philosophical foundation of the two doctoral degrees in Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) showed a clear overlap with the philosophical basis of Religious Education, and they also offered more widely recognized academic credentials, at least in the public sector. As a consequence, the C&I program attracted students with a background in education who might previously have applied to the Religious Education program. Through the Ph.D. in Religion, the Seminary offered students with an academic background in religion the opportunity to earn an academic doctoral degree in their main area of interest. The Ph.D. in Religion also promised a much shorter completion time than did the Th.D., and the length of the Th.D. had been a strong motivating factor for some students with a background in religion to opt for Religious Education. As a number of prospective students enrolled in the new doctorates, enrollment in Religious Education decreased and the implementation of the church and school components of the biblical model became problematic.

The second development was structural in nature. In 1982, the administration of Andrews University initiated some changes in governance for all graduate programs and

⁹The three degrees were Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (1981), Ph.D. in Religion (1982), and Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (1984).

schools within the institution. This brought confusion to the administrative structure of Religious Education and the oversight of its degrees. The supervision of the three Religious Education degrees was divided between the SED and the School of Graduate Studies. Akers perceived this restructuring as an attempt on the part of the School of Graduate Studies and the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary to eliminate the Religious Education Ed.D. and Ph.D. Tensions between leaders of Religious Education and the SDATS culminated in a separation between the two entities. As a result, the religion component of the curriculum was relegated to the status of little more than a prerequisite. The academic quality of the program was diminished, and the “tripartite” biblical structure was undercut.

Another structural challenge that affected the Religious Education program was the appointment of Akers as dean of the SED, which left Youngberg and Naden as the only full-time faculty in the program. Subsequent changes further marginalized Religious Education as a credible academic program, but the work and vision of Youngberg helped to maintain its integrity and viability. Youngberg’s efforts to preserve the program were further sabotaged when Naden retired and the SED administration decided not to replace him due to financial cuts. The consequences of Naden’s departure were inevitable. Youngberg was left as the only full-time professor and the program was diminished to such a degree that it was hardly viable. It was impossible to do justice to each of the settings of the “tripartite” model, and the natural result was a further weakening of the identity and mission of the program.

The fourth phase is the period of redefinition. Events in this period saved

Religious Education from complete elimination. The arrival of Thayer in 1996 and Matthews in 1999 became the turning point in this latter part of the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews. With them, the process of redefining Religious Education at Andrews University started.¹⁰ This process commenced with the development and inclusion of what they identified as the six roles of a religious educator in the curricular foundation of the program.¹¹ These roles did not replace the biblical model or the elements of the philosophical foundation of Religious Education. Rather, they enhanced the philosophy and identity of Religious Education. In addition, the roles enabled the Religious Education faculty to begin identifying the contribution and place of Religious Education in the SED.

Defining the roles of a religious educator led naturally to questions about how these roles meshed with the mission of the SED. As a consequence, the location of the Religious Education program was the next issue to be addressed in the restructuring of the program. Finding the proper location would enable the program to fulfill its mission better and to strengthen its identity. After a series of meetings with deans and faculties of the SED and SDATS, Thayer and Matthews concluded that Religious Education belonged in the Seminary. The outcome of these meetings was significant for Religious

¹⁰Thayer felt that “Religious Education, if it is going to thrive, will have to be conceptualized to fit the mission and culture of the SDA Church.” Thayer, “Questionnaire on Religious Education,” 7. According to Ferris, the renewal of religious education “correlates with the orientation to the training needs of a constituent church.” Robert W. Ferris, *Renewal in Theological Education: Strategies for Change* (Wheaton, IL: Billy Graham Center, Wheaton College, 1990), 129.

¹¹“Assessment Results,” 2.

Education at Andrews. The move to the Seminary gave Religious Education the opportunity to function again as a program in its own right, and the setting in which to fulfill its mission in service to the church around the world.

The Religious Education program was finally relocated to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary on 1 July 2002. After the transfer, the ATS Commission on Accrediting voted to approve and fully accredit the program to serve the Adventist denomination from the locality of the Theological Seminary. Graduates in Religious Education continue to be trained to provide leadership in the home, church, and school settings of the Adventist Church.¹² The Bible remains central to the program. In addition, professionals are prepared “for leadership roles in settings where religious, moral, and spiritual nurture and growth are primary concerns.”¹³

Through the process of redefining Religious Education, Thayer and Matthews reestablished three important elements into the identity of the program: purpose, function, and structure. Though this process is not fully complete,¹⁴ the presence of the Religious Education program in the Seminary provides an opportunity to both Religious Education and Seminary faculties to, in Graham’s words, “talk to each other and cooperate more

¹²Andrews University, *Bulletin 2002-2003*, 305.

¹³Andrews University, *Bulletin 2003-2004*, 304.

¹⁴Thayer believes that the redefinition of the philosophy and mission of the Religious Education program at Andrews University “is in the right track.” Thayer, “Questionnaire on Religious Education,” 7. Knight suggests that as circumstances in the educational environment may change with time and location, religious educators need to “remain flexible in applying the educational principles that grow out of their world view.” Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, 186.

with each other and support each other's work every day."¹⁵

Conclusions

This historical research and philosophical analysis of religious education in general, and the program in Religious Education at Andrews University in particular, yielded several findings. Some results pertain to the study of religious education during the biblical period and the history of the Christian church. A number of outcomes are connected to the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews University. Finally, there are some observations that relate to the future of Religious Education.

During the biblical period, according to believers, God provided for His people the necessary means to transmit the covenant relationship to subsequent generations of believers. The agencies God established for this purpose were the home, the church, and the school. The word of God was the primary epistemological source in all three settings. These four elements served as a biblical model for imparting religious education among the people of God. The model is also a guide for analyzing and evaluating past, present, and future initiatives, movements, organizations, or institutions of religious education.

The history of religious education in the Christian Church reveals a tension regarding the centrality of the biblical model in religious instruction. At times religious educators have adhered to the principles of the scriptural model, and at other times these principles have been neglected. Emphasis on one component of the biblical model over the others during various periods of history has distorted the implementation of the model

¹⁵Graham, "Questionnaire for Graham," 3.

and affected the teaching ministry of the Christian church.

Research into the history of the Religious Education program at Andrews also reveals a tension regarding the implementation of the biblical model in the program. From its inception, the philosophical foundation of Religious Education was based on the components of the model and addressed the major philosophical categories. The program grew while circumstances facilitated the implementation of the biblical model. For various reasons, some elements of the model were neglected and, as a result, the mission weakened, enrollment fell, and the identity and viability of Religious Education diminished. This decreased the ability of the Religious Education program to contribute to the fulfillment of the worldwide mission of the Adventist Church.

The findings of this study provide some basic guidelines to analyze the future development of the Religious Education program. The philosophical foundation of the program needs to be periodically reviewed and adjusted to meet the changing needs of the Adventist Church and of potential students. A revision could also help to avoid future periods of crisis. The initial philosophy of the program was revised and enhanced by Akers and Youngberg. This revision helped Religious Education to continue growing. When changes in the academic structure of Andrews and in offerings of other programs within the SED arose, the Religious Education faculty made valiant attempts to meet those changes and the needs of the Religious Education clientele.¹⁶ But circumstances and the creation of new programs in the SED and SDATS militated against the success of a religious education program in the context of the SED. Consequently, the identity and

¹⁶The changes and their implementation are discussed on pp. 167-76.

mission of the Religious Education program were severely affected.

The work of Thayer and Matthews made an important contribution to the program. They started the process of rebuilding the philosophical foundation. This work included a restoration of the program identity, efforts to understand and implement the biblical model, and attempts to redefine and enhance the mission of Religious Education at Andrews so as to serve more adequately in fulfilling the mission of the Adventist Church around the world.

Recommendations for Further Study

A number of recommendations arise from this study and the conclusions drawn. Two of these suggestions emerge from the current state of religious education in North America. First, the identity of religious education in the twenty-first century in North America is provided by three main organizations: the REA, APRRE, and NAPCE. Although these entities have similar goals, they differ in how they view religious education. There is a need to analyze the philosophical foundations of each organization to determine whether their differences are conducive to developing a clear definition and understanding of religious education.

Second, membership in the REA and APRRE includes representatives from non-Christian religious groups. The religious education systems of these groups are founded on different views of reality. A study should be conducted about the different worldviews represented and how these groups are implementing religious education in their respective organizations.

The next recommendation relates to the creation and development of the SED. No systematic documentation and examination has been made of the School of Education at Andrews University. An analysis of its historical development and philosophical foundation will provide important insights regarding the creation and evolution of educational programs. Such study will aid administrators and faculty to evaluate current degrees and develop future programs to meet the needs of the SED's clientele. Particularly, this study will be valuable for Religious Education because it will offer additional significant background data for understanding administrative and structural changes that affected the program while it was housed in the SED.

The last recommendations pertain to the mission of the Religious Education program and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Because Religious Education at Andrews University is an interdisciplinary program that offers considerable flexibility, the program can prepare professionals who are interested in various areas of denominational service. The six roles of the religious educator could help students focus their training in enhancing their skills to serve in pastoral as well as educational areas of leadership and administration.¹⁷ Seventh-day Adventist Conferences can particularly benefit from professionals whose preparation in religious education allows them to serve in ministerial as well as educational areas. The contributions of such individuals can be much more significant to the mission of the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church.

¹⁷The competencies for each role were revised on August 2005. Religious Education faculty deleted some outcomes and added others. However, these changes did not alter the philosophical foundation of the program or its focus. "Competencies for the Religious Educator-PhD Level," Document #82, 6 August 2005, REDF, SDATS, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1.

The following are some recommendations for consideration.

First, Religious Education leaders and conference administrators in North America should get together to devise ways whereby more pastors and teachers can be encouraged and even sponsored to pursue a Religious Education degree at Andrews.¹⁸ Second, some potential Religious Education students may find it difficult to relocate or even attend the summer intensive Religious Education courses offered in the Theological Seminary at Andrews. Religious Education leaders should explore the possibility of developing cohorts of students in different unions around the country. In order to facilitate the training of these groups, the department might consider offering intensive courses on campuses of local union colleges throughout North America. Qualified graduates could be asked to teach some courses in order to alleviate the workload of the 2.5 FTE faculty.

Third, the Religious Education faculty has numerous responsibilities such as class preparation and teaching, grading of class work, administration, dissertation advising, and making presentations in professional meetings. Though these duties are equally important, they can overwhelm the faculty, affect the quality of the program, or diminish the service that students deserve. The instructors of the program should consider creating a list of competent Religious Education graduates who are capable and willing to provide advice to candidates who are writing their dissertations. Assistance in this area will

¹⁸As a Seventh-day Adventist pastor and educator, I have a B.A. in Theology, an M.Div., and a D.Min. However, my training in Religious Education has given me additional skills to serve the Adventist Church in other pastoral and educational areas. Some of these areas include personal ministries, youth, ministerial secretary, education superintendent, and church and school administration at various levels.

significantly reduce the amount of stress on the faculty and help them focus more on the needs of students.

Fourth, faculty members should also explore the possibility of offering Religious Education degrees in Adventist unions outside of North America where there is an interest in the program. An example of a world church field that may benefit from the Religious Education program is the Colombian Union of Seventh-day Adventists. In order to offer accredited degrees, the Universidad Adventista de Colombia (UNAC)¹⁹ is required by the government to train pastors in two areas: theology and education. As a result, Colombian pastors are employed to work as pastors, teachers, school administrators, or a combination of the pastoral-teaching function.²⁰ The Colombian Union has an interest in helping pastors and educators pursue graduate degrees.²¹ It is very difficult for Colombian Adventist pastors or teachers to obtain a visa to continue their education in America. Similar situations in various countries, and the danger of the brain-drain to North America, make it advisable, perhaps even necessary, that graduate Religious Education degrees be offered to students in their national settings.

¹⁹The English translation of the name of the institution is Colombian Adventist University.

²⁰I attended the UNAC in 1982 and 1983. The process of getting the institution accredited by the government was completed in 1983. Some of my former classmates are currently working in conferences as pastor-school administrators.

²¹While working for Atlantic Union College (AUC) as vice-president of Enrollment, I contacted UNAC leaders in 1999 for the purpose of offering the M.A. in Education. I made two trips to Colombia and met with university and Union administrators. They were very interested, but safety issues in Colombia at the time prevented AUC from offering the program.

These four suggestions could help the Religious Education program in several ways to fulfill its mission and the mission of the Adventist Church around the world. Implementation of these suggestions, and an on-going self-study to ensure that Religious Education at Andrews University is meeting the needs of the world church, are likely to increase enrollment in the program, which would accomplish two major results: first, financial viability would be assured; and second, the profile of religious education would be enhanced in the eyes of the world church. With regard to the latter, it is my opinion that, if the Adventist Church becomes fully aware of what Religious Education has to offer and how Religious Education can help the church achieve its mission, the strength of the program will be assured until the time of the eschaton.

APPENDIX A

MAJOR CURRICULAR EMPHASES OF THE RELIGIOUS
EDUCATION DEGREES

Table 1. Major Curricular Emphases of the Master of Arts Degree in Religious Education

	1974	1978	1981
Core Requirements	<p>Religion 12 [8]¹ crs. Religious Education 12 [8] crs. Foundations 12 [8] crs. Research 6-8 [4-5] crs. Electives 4-12 [3-8] crs. Thesis 4-8 [3-5] crs.</p>	<p>Religion 12 [8] crs. Rel. Ed. & Foundations 12 [8] crs. Research 4 [3] crs. Electives 12-16 [8-11] crs. Thesis 4 or 8 [3 or 5] crs.</p>	<p>Religion 12 [8] crs. Rel. Ed. & Foundations 12 [8] crs. Research 8 [5] crs. Electives 4-12 [3-8] crs. Thesis 4 or 8 [3 or 5] crs.</p>
Total Credits Required	Required a minimum of 48 [32] quarter hours beyond the bachelor's degree.	Required a minimum of 48 [32] quarter hours beyond the bachelor's degree.	Required a minimum of 48 [32] quarter hours beyond the bachelor's degree.
Philosophy and Mission	<p>Prepared students as: - Instructors in religion and religious education. - Administrators, planners, and coordinators of youth programs, church programs, and Christian witnessing.</p>	<p>Prepared individuals for professional leadership in the home, church, and school settings. Preparation included classroom ministries, activities in congregational settings, and family-life ministries.</p>	<p>Prepared individuals for professional leadership in the home, church, and school settings. Preparation included classroom ministries, activities in congregational settings, and family-life ministries.</p>

Table 1–Continued.

	1974	1978	1981
Possible Emphases	Emphasis on the hallmarks of religious education.	Emphases on the hallmarks of religious education and the factors in the transmission of a religious heritage.	Emphases on the hallmarks of religious education and the factors in the transmission of a religious heritage.
Comments on Changes	The program was educational in thrust. It also had a church-orientation.	The program was based on the “tripartite model” with an educational thrust.	The program was based on the “tripartite model” with an educational thrust.
	1988	1993	2001
Core Requirements	Religion 12 [8] crs. Rel. Ed. & Foundations 12 [8] crs. Research 8 [5] crs. Electives 4-12 [3-8] crs. Thesis 4 or 8 [3 or 5] crs.	Rel. Ed. & Foundations 12 [8] crs. Research 4 [3] crs. Focus Area 32 [21] crs.	Christian Apologist 5-6 crs. Pastor-Teacher 8 crs. Servant-Leader 3 crs. Reflective Researcher 3 crs. Maturing Christian 1 cr. Lifelong Scholar 1 cr. Area of Emphasis 10-11 crs.
Total Credits Required	Required a minimum of 48 [32] quarter hours beyond the bachelor’s degree.	Required a minimum of 48 [32] quarter hours beyond the bachelor’s degree.	Required a minimum of 32 semester hours beyond the bachelor’s degree.

Table 1–Continued.

	1988	1993	2001
Philosophy and Mission	Prepared individuals for professional leadership in the home, church, and school settings. Preparation included classroom ministries, activities in congregational settings, and family-life ministries.	Prepared students to operate in the educational world as professionals focusing on the home, church, and school areas.	Prepared men and women to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.
Possible Emphases	Emphases on the factors in the transmission of a religious heritage, in the increasing urgency in light of the approaching eschaton, and the family-life program. The Bible and Jesus Christ are the unifying theme and thrust of the program.	Emphases on family life and the preparation of professionals with specific strengths in spiritual nurture, character development, empirical development of seminars, and the transmission of religious heritage. The Bible and Jesus Christ are the unifying theme and thrust of the program.	Emphases on the six roles of a religious educator and the student’s chosen area of special emphasis.
Comments on Changes	Emphasis on family life, and the Bible and Jesus as a unifying theme are included in the emphases of the program.	Emphasis on family life, character, spirituality, and research development. Religion was removed as a core requirement.	Emphasis on the roles of a religious educator.

¹Quarter academic credits were converted into semester credits and rounded to whole numbers to facilitate the comparison of core requirements. The numbers in brackets represent semester credits.

Table 1–Continued.

2006	
Core Requirements	<p>Christian Apologist 5-7 crs.</p> <p>Pastor-Teacher 5 crs.</p> <p>Servant-Leader 3 crs.</p> <p>Researcher-Evaluator 3-6 crs.</p> <p>Maturing Christian 2 cr.</p> <p>Lifelong Scholar 0 cr.</p> <p>Area of Emphasis 12-14 crs.</p>
Total Credits Required	Required a minimum of 32 semester hours beyond the bachelor’s degree.
Philosophy and Mission	Prepared men and women to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.
Possible Emphases	Emphases on the six roles of a religious educator and the student’s chosen area of special emphasis.
Comments on Changes	Emphasis on the roles of a religious educator. The number of credits on the Pastor-Teacher and Lifelong Scholar roles were reduced and added to the Area of Emphasis.

Table 2. Major Curricular Emphases of the Doctor of Education Degree in Religious Education

	1974	1978	1981
Core Requirements	<p>Religion 40 [27] crs. Religious Edu. 4 [23] crs. Research 15 [10] crs. General 16 [11] crs. Electives 3 [2] crs. Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Religion 40 [27] crs. Religious Education 34 [23] crs. Research 15 [10] crs. Electives 16-21 [11-14] crs. Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Religion 40 [27] crs. Religious Edu. 42 [28] crs. Research 15 [10] crs. Electives 23 [15] crs. Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>
Total Credits Required	<p>Required a minimum of three years of study beyond the Bachelor's degree, exclusive of dissertation.</p>	<p>Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master's degree, exclusive of dissertation.</p>	<p>Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master's degree, exclusive of dissertation.</p>
Philosophy and Mission	<p>To prepare religious educators to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instructors in religion and religious education. - Administrators, planners, and coordinators of youth activities in church, Christian witnessing, and adult education. 	<p>To prepare individuals for professional leadership in the home, church, and school settings. Included classroom activities in congregational setting, and family life education.</p>	<p>To prepare individuals for professional leadership in the home, church, and school settings. Included classroom ministries, activities in congregational setting, and family life education.</p>

Table 2—Continued.

	1974	1978	1981
Possible Emphases	Emphases on the development of character building and to the spiritual foundation in the lives of the youth.	Emphases on the factors in the transmission of a religious heritage and the hallmarks of religious education.	Emphases on the factors in the transmission of a religious heritage and the hallmarks of religious education.
Comments on Changes	The program had an educational thrust and a church orientation.	The program was based on the “tripartite model” with an educational thrust.	No changes in the emphasis of the program.
Core Requirements	<p>Religion 26 [17] crs.</p> <p>Religious Edu. 33 [22] crs.</p> <p>Specialization & Research 61 [41] crs.</p> <p>Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Religion 26 [17] crs.</p> <p>Religious Edu. 22-29 [15-19] crs.</p> <p>Research 16-24 [11-16] crs.</p> <p>Foundations 16 [11] crs.</p> <p>Electives 0-42 [0-28] crs.</p> <p>Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Christian Apologist 18 crs.</p> <p>Pastor-Teacher 18 crs.</p> <p>Servant-Leader 6 crs.</p> <p>Reflective Researcher 29 crs.</p> <p>Maturing Christian 1 cr.</p> <p>Lifelong Scholar 4 crs.</p> <p>Area of Emphasis 16 crs.</p>
Total Credits Required	Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master’s degree, exclusive of dissertation.	Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master’s degree, exclusive of dissertation.	Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master’s degree, exclusive of dissertation.

Table 2—Continued.

	1988	1993	2001
Philosophy and Mission	Prepared individuals for professional leadership in the home, church, and school settings. It included classroom ministries, activities in congregational setting, and family life education.	Prepared students to operate in the educational world as professionals focusing on the home, church, and school areas.	Prepared men and women to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.
Possible Emphases	Emphases on the factors in the transmission of a religious heritage, in the increasing urgency in light of the approaching eschaton, and family life.	Emphases on family life and the preparation of professionals with specific strengths in spiritual nurture, character development, empirical development of seminars, and the transmission of religious heritage.	Emphases on the six roles of a religious educator and the student's chosen area of special emphasis.
Comments on Changes	Emphasis on family life was included in the emphases of the program.	Emphasis on family life. There was also an accent on spirituality, and character and research development.	Emphasis on the roles of a religious educator.

Table 3. Major Curricular Emphases of the Philosophy of Doctor Degree in Religious Education

	1988	1993	2001
Core Requirements	<p>Religion 26 [17] crs. Religious Edu. 33 [22] crs. Specializations 61 [41] crs. Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Religion 26 [17] crs. Religious Edu. 26-33 [17-22] crs. Foundations 15-16 [10-11] crs. Research 16-24 [11-16] crs. Electives 0-42 [0-28] crs. Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Christian Apologist 18 crs. Pastor-Teacher 18 crs. Servant-Leader 6 crs. Reflective Researcher 29 crs. Maturing Christian 1 cr. Lifelong Scholar 4 crs. Area of Emphasis 16 crs.</p>
Total Credits Required	<p>Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master's degree, exclusive of dissertation.</p>	<p>Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master's degree, exclusive of dissertation.]</p>	<p>Required a minimum of one and one-half years of continuous study beyond the Master's degree, exclusive of dissertation.</p>
Philosophy and Mission	<p>Focused on any of the three social structures which provide major support to the maturing Christian—the family, the church, and the school.</p>	<p>Focused on any of the three social structures which provide major support to the maturing Christian—the family, the church, and the school.</p>	<p>Focused on preparing men and women to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.</p>

Table 3—Continued.

	1988	1993	2001
Possible Emphases	<p>Provided a high-level interdisciplinary approach for teacher-scholars in church operated colleges and universities. It also focused on educational moral, social, or ethical issues. Special emphasis on family-life ministries.</p>	<p>Provided a high-level interdisciplinary approach for teacher-scholars in church operated colleges and universities. It also focused on educational moral, social, or ethical issues. The Bible and Jesus Christ were the unifying theme and primary thrust of the family-life program.</p>	<p>Provided an emphasis on the six roles of a religious educator.</p>
Comments on Changes	<p>Based on the elements of the biblical model for religious education.</p>	<p>Based on the elements of the biblical model for religious education with special emphasis on the family-life program.</p>	<p>Based on the biblical model for religious education with a special emphasis on the roles of a religious educator.</p>

Table 3—Continued.

2006	
Core Requirements	<p>Christian Apologist 5-6 crs.</p> <p>Pastor-Teacher 5-6 crs.</p> <p>Servant-Leader 3 crs.</p> <p>Researcher-Evaluator 24 crs.</p> <p>Maturing Christian 2 cr.</p> <p>Lifelong Scholar 3 cr.</p> <p>Area of Concentration 21 crs.</p>
Total Credits Required	Required a minimum of 64 semester hours beyond the master's degree, exclusive of dissertation.
Philosophy and Mission	Prepared men and women to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.
Possible Emphases	Emphases on the six roles of a religious educator and the student's chosen area of special emphasis.
Comments on Changes	Based on the biblical model for religious education with special emphasis on the roles of a religious educator. The number of credits on all roles was reduced and added to the Area of Concentration.

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF REQUIREMENTS BETWEEN DOCTORAL
PROGRAMS

Table 4. Comparison of Requirements Between Doctoral Programs in Religious Education and the Seminary

	Th.D. in the Seminary	Ph.D. in Religion	Ed.D. in Religious Education	Ph.D. in Religious Education
1974	<p>Two fields of study: Biblical Studies - Languages and Literature - Archeology and History - Exegesis and Theology Theological Studies - Historical Theology - Systematic Theology</p>		<p>Religion 40 [27] crs. - Biblical & Theological - Philosophical, Historical & Functional - Electives Religious Ed. 34 [23] crs. Research 15 [10] crs. - (Ed 500, 518, 730, G 601) General 16 [11] crs. - Religion, Education or other Electives 3 [2] crs. Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	
	<p>Required two years of course work and 72 [48] quarter credits beyond the M.Div. degree, which was 135 [90] quarter credits.</p>		<p>Required one and one-half years of course work beyond the MA degree, which was 48 [32] quarter credits.</p>	

Table 4—Continued.

Th.D. in the Seminary	Ph.D. in Religion	Ed.D. in Religious Education	Ph.D. in Religious Education
<p>1982 Two fields of study:</p> <p>Biblical Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Languages and Literature - Archeology and History - Exegesis and Theology <p>Theological Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historical Theology - Systematic Theology 	<p>Areas of Study:</p> <p>New Testament Studies</p> <p>Old Testament Studies</p> <p>Theological Studies</p> <p>Adventist studies</p> <p>Cognate Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Old Testament - New Testament - Theology - Church History - Religious Education - Biblical Archeology - Church and Ministry - Mission 	<p>Relig. 40-63 [27-42] crs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biblical Studies - Theological Studies - Church History - Those preparing to teach Bible must demonstrate proficiency in Greek <p>Rel. Ed. 42-65 [28-44] crs.</p>	<p>Relig. 40-60 [27-40] crs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biblical Studies - Theological Studies - Church History - Those preparing to teach Bible must demonstrate Greek proficiency <p>Religious Ed. 42 [28] crs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Student declares setting of specialization (home, church or school)
<p>Required two years of course work and 72 [48] quarter credits beyond the M.Div. degree, which was 135 [90] quarter credits.</p>	<p>Required two years of course work and 72 [48] quarter credits beyond the MA or M.Div. degree, which was 50 or 135 [34 or 90] quarter credits, respectively.</p>	<p>Research 15 [10] crs. -(EDRM505, 506, 518, 730)</p> <p>Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p>	<p>Dissertation 24 [16] crs.</p> <p>Required one and one-half years of course work beyond the MA degree, which was 48 [32] quarter credits.</p>

APPENDIX C

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE GROWTH OF THE
ADVENTIST CHURCH

Table 6. Comparative Table of the Worldwide Growth of the Adventist Church from 1883-2006¹

Year	Membership	Churches	Pastors	Missionaries
1883	17,436	660	300	Unavailable
1888	26,112	901	400	Unavailable
1893	37,400	1,151	460	Unavailable
1898	59,447	1,654	706	Unavailable
1903	77,554	2,120	936	662
1935	422,968	8,026	3,569	3,428
1942	535,134	9,212	4,940	5,430
1960	1,245,125	12,975	7,939	11,575
1968	1,845,183	15,749	10,614	20,894
1974	2,521,452	17,841	12,272	25,599
1980	3,480,518	21,666	12,853	31,150
1990	6,661,482	31,654	16,661	33,381
2000	11,687,229	49,987	20,046	31,177
2006	15,115,806	61,818	22,451	34,477

Table 6—Continued.

Year	Church Schools	Colleges and Secondary	Bible Instructors ²
1883	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable
1888	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable
1893	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable
1898	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable
1903	430 Schools 467 Teachers 8,159 Enrollment	34 Schools 220 Teachers 2,986 Enrollment	Unavailable
1935	2,357 Schools 3,074 Teachers 81,052 Enrollment	214 Schools 2,459 Teachers 25,117 Enrollment	Unavailable
1942	2,922 Schools 3,973 Teachers 103,898 Enrollment	134 Schools 1,330 Teachers 15,302 Enrollment ³	186
1960	4,453 Schools 8,437 Teachers 230,446 Enrollment	370 Schools 3,921 Teachers 59,554 Enrollment	557
1968	4,537 Schools 10,756 Teachers 311,061 Enrollment	435 Schools 6,813 Teachers 81,909 Enrollment	597
1974	3,797 Schools 11,317 Teachers 325,478 Enrollment	479 Schools 8,165 Teachers 107,812 Enrollment	946
1980	3,849 Schools 16,079 Teachers 331,894 Enrollment	882 Schools 9,785 Teachers 144,809 Enrollment	585
1990	4,267 Schools 27,258 Teachers 541,641 Enrollment	997 Schools 14,069 Teachers 196,015 Enrollment	555
2000	4,809 Schools 33,367 Teachers 732,698 Enrollment	1,255 Schools 22,539 Teachers 332,394 Enrollment	2,750

Table 6–Continued.

Year	Church Schools	Colleges and Secondary	Bible Instructors ²
2006	5,666 Schools 40,345 Teachers 944,243 Enrollment	1,618 Schools 34,838 Teachers 492,047 Enrollment	6,889

¹Figures for this comparative table are taken from the annual statistical reports of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Seventh-day Adventist Church, “Annual Statistical Reports,” *Online Document Archives*, 19 March 2008, www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=11&SortBy=2&ShowDateOrder=True (accessed 19 March 2008).

²In 1942, Bible instructors were introduced for the first time in a separate category.

³The 1942 statistical report included schools, teachers, and enrollment figures only for North America.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF ROLES AND COMPETENCIES

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD) PROGRAM PLAN¹

Religious Education

This PhD Program Plan provides an overview of the program and serves as a worksheet for designing your specific academic program. Because required courses are kept to a minimum, you have maximum selection of courses and learning experiences that will lead you to competency in the basic outcomes for a religious educator and in the outcomes of the concentration you have chosen. As a religious educator, you will be able to demonstrate competency in six major roles. These religious educator roles with their competencies are presented below.

Christian Apologist

1. Critique from a Christian perspective the assumptions of different worldviews whenever they are expressed.
2. Be aware of the historical development of education or one of its associated disciplines.
3. Communicate effectively in written, oral, and non-verbal forms at a level appropriate for varied audiences including, but not limited to professional peers.
4. From a Seventh-day Adventist perspective, interpret and communicate Scripture for contemporary needs.
5. Value the salvation work of Christ as the foundation and rationale for religious education.
6. Know the founding theorists and contemporary leaders of religious education.
7. Articulate a philosophy of religious education.

Pastor-Teacher

8. Understand human development.
9. Articulate and apply current theories of learning.
10. Implement strategies for individual change.
11. Articulate and evaluate seminal, traditional, and contemporary approaches to religious education.
12. Design and evaluate curriculum materials.

¹“Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Program Plan: Religious Education,” Document #70, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

13. Use appropriate learning strategies to disciple Christians throughout their life span.
14. Facilitate the training of trainers.
15. Explain the processes of spiritual formation from theological, psychological, and sociological perspectives.

Servant Leader

16. Facilitate change in groups and organizations.
17. Relate effectively with various cultural, racial and special interest groups.
18. Function as a servant leader.
19. Demonstrate ability to apply principles of leadership in the church or school setting.
20. Contextualize content and methods of religious education to reach the culture in which he/she is ministering.
21. Effectively recruit, train, and support the laity for ministry.

Reflective Researcher

22. Read and evaluate research.
23. Conduct research.
24. Report research findings.
25. Assess spiritual gifts and indicators of spiritual maturity.
26. Evaluate programs.

Maturing Christians

27. Practice the harmonious development of the spiritual, mental, physical, and social aspects of their lives.
28. Consistently engage in spiritual disciplines for growth and transformation by the Holy Spirit.

Lifelong Scholar

29. Demonstrate personal and professional development.
30. Effectively use technology tools for professional communication, teaching, and research.
31. Practice critical self-evaluation.

Area of Emphasis

32. Demonstrate the ability to apply all relevant core competencies to the area of emphasis.

APPENDIX E

BENEFITS OF HAVING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE SED

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM¹

Seminary–Religious Education Collaboration

Introduction: SED Option

This option would mean that Religious Education remains as a part of the CARE Department of the SED, retaining its current vision and mission, but working toward interschool collaboration in order to achieve its mission.

Benefits of SED-based Religious Education Program

1. Retains current program identity and mission.
2. Teachers with expertise in current/projected Religious Education courses are predominantly in SED (ECP, CARE, TL).
3. Fits well with Adventist educational philosophy and school program.
4. SED provides context for rapid innovation and change to keep pace with trends and meet constituency needs.
5. Strong links to the educational aspects of Religious Education.
6. No ATS oversight allows for a 1-yr masters program.
7. Support of educational and social science research methodologies for graduate programs.
8. Naturally broadened perspective on “ministry.”

¹“Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–SED Option,” Document #73, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. This is a document produced by the Religious Education faculty, and remains unedited.

9. Comfortable fit of family life program in educational setting, with support of Educational Counseling & Psychology Dept. Good teacher support in SED from all programs for Religious Education.
10. Good access to potential educational employees, and educational directors who control educational allowances for secondary teachers, deans, and chaplains.
11. Religious Education gives strength to and gains strength from the educational foundations program of SED.
12. *[Challenge in right column can be met by policy change]*
13. A strong collegial support group and good working relationship with CARE in particular and SED in general.
 - Shared courses with C&I, EDAL, & Research.
 - Scheduling collaboration with SED programs.
 - Many courses in 2-week modules with WebCT support.
 - Shared doctoral cohorts & classes.
 - Excellent SED support for technological innovation.

Challenges of SED-based Religious Education Program

1. Limited exposure to potential degree candidates and to students inclined to take Religious Education courses as electives. General SED recruitment doesn't aim at "church-based Religious Education types."
2. Religious Education candidates are not generally drawn from UG or grad programs in SED (in advising, it is usually more difficult to find education than religion prerequisites).
3. Is not in harmony with the placement of "Christian Education" in seminary settings as is generally the case in other institutions of higher learning.
4. In the mainstream professional dialog in education, concerns relating to Christian education do not figure prominently in the literature .
5. Out of the "ministry" loop.
6. No ATS oversight, i.e., no professional organization 1) to which Religious Education is accountable 2) gives Religious Education credibility.
7. Distanced from research interests of seminary setting.

8. Tendency to allow the religion components of Religious Education degrees to be prerequisites rather than an element in the core. Masters graduates may be weak in religion.
9. More of a challenge to develop the focus areas remaining for Religious Education (campus spiritual leadership, church vitality, & children's ministries) considering how the "pie has been cut" in the SED (i.e., legitimate expansion of Curric & Instruction, Ed Admin Program, & Leadership into areas formerly serviced by Religious Education).
10. Limited access to potential ministerial employees.
11. More difficult to tap into strengths of the seminary program.
12. Current policies/admin mitigate against seminary students electing Religious Education classes, e.g., financial incentives for Seminary spouses, & MDiv & DMin students, to take Seminary, not other classes.
13. - - -
 - Difficulty in sharing courses with Seminary.
 - Difficulty in coordinating with Seminary offerings.
14. Interschool setting: who will be colleagues? Seminary setting: collegiality/identity/cooperation to be developed.
 - Difficulty in sharing courses with Seminary.
 - Difficulty in coordinating with Seminary offerings.
 - *Would the scheduling of courses for off-campus students be more difficult?*
 - *Would collaboration in SED doctoral cohorts be more problematic?*
 - *Would the support for technology be as good outside of the SED?*

(John Matthews' perspective on SED option)

School of Education

Reaching Religious Education's Mission

1. Close and collegial collaboration with faculty who are the experts in curriculum and instruction.
2. Easy access to social sciences research courses.
3. Opportunity to teach future students how to integrate faith and learning in the classroom.
4. Strong administrative support.

Promoting the School of Education's Mission

1. Help provide a religious/spiritual perspective to various SED issues.
2. Teach foundation courses.
3. Provide the electives for students who want courses in integration of faith and learning, teaching ministry, spiritual formation.

(Jane Thayer's perspective on SED option)

APPENDIX F

BENEFITS OF HAVING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AS AN
INTERSCHOOL PROGRAM

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM¹

Seminary–Religious Education Collaboration

Introduction

This is the visionary option. The vision is a grand one, and really rather simple. But the challenges are probably the greatest of the 3 major options we have (SED/Sem/Inter).

Benefits of Interschool Religious Education Program

1. Retains and enhances the distinct identity of Religious Education.
2. Facilitates genuine interdisciplinary/interschool collaboration, and challenges the university to make the structures and policies work in favor of this kind of collaboration.
3. With structures set up to enhance collaboration, access to a wide variety of expertise that allows for an extremely flexible course PDP (personal development plan built around competencies), yet retains the strength of a course-based program (also enhances possibilities for fieldwork/internships in various disciplines).

Challenges of Interschool Religious Education Program

1. Could result in setting Religious Education in “splendid isolation” unless there is a genuine will from all parties concerned to make interschool collaboration work.
2. Moving the university to rethink its structures will not only take the faith that moves mountains—it will require faith that works, like moving the mountain spade by spade!!
 - departmental funding of an interdisciplinary program. Who pays the bills? How is cost effectiveness analyzed? [Can be done, but is there the will to do it?].

¹“Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–Interschool Option,” Document #64, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. This is a document produced by the Religious Education faculty, and remains unedited.

- control and accountability issues.
 - technical issues are a problem, but technical issues should not hinder progress. Progress builds on vision. Can the vision be sold/shared?
3. Is Religious Education the right program to offer as a school-wide interdisciplinary program? It fits the mission of the university, but does it fit the felt needs of the clientele? Would a name change as well as structural change increase demand for the program? [PhD in Christian Studies, as a wild idea for starting discussion).
 4. Where the program is physically housed it gives visible identity and, consequently, probably also essential identity.
 5. Would not solve the problem of subsidized tuition when courses are chosen as electives by Seminary students (unless there is cross-listing of courses, that is, use different course prefixes but meet together in one class).

(John Matthews' perspective on Inter-school option)¹

¹Jane Thayer did not have comments on an inter-school program.

APPENDIX G

BENEFITS OF HAVING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE
SEMINARY

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM¹

Seminary–Religious Education Collaboration: The Benefits of Housing Religious Education in the Seminary

1. A shared and mutually-enhanced vision of the role of religious education in the church: viz., educating the educators and ministers who will equip the laity to lead and support healthy congregations (church vitality/revitalization emphasis).
2. Strengthening family life ministries by making classes more easily accessible to ministers in training, particularly as an emphasis in doctoral programs (family life emphasis).
3. Facilitate the equipping of ministers who plan roles in campus chaplaincy or other spiritual leadership roles in educational settings, or who wish to pursue vocations as Bible teachers (campus spiritual leadership emphasis).
4. Facilitate for the development of the area of children’s ministries.
5. Conform to the pattern of other Religious Education/Christian Education programs which are generally housed in seminaries rather than school of education (not that conformity is an ideal, but if conformity facilitates function and operation, it becomes an attractive option).
6. Allow for Religious Education faculty to be “in the loop” and involved in plans, projects, and educational endeavors that are generally considered within the purview of religious education, but from which Reled at AU has to some extent been unintentionally excluded because of its location in the School of Education.
7. SUMMARY: Locates Religious Education where it is most easily accessible to a large

¹“Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–Seminary Option,” Document #55, 2000, REDF, SED, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. This is a document produced by the Religious Education faculty, and remains unedited.

proportion of potential students with an interest in Religious Education's redefined programs of study and its mission.

Noted by Jane Thayer in handout at previous meeting:

8. Could work more easily in collaboration with the Christian Ministry Department.
9. Most employers of religious education graduates are conference officials who have closer contact with the Seminary than with the SED.
10. Religious Education programs would have oversight of ATS (benefits & challenges).
11. Religious Education would strengthen particularly the doctoral programs in the seminary by adding the social science research methodologies (if a Religious Education doctoral track was maintained as an option).
12. Field-based and distance learning experience of Religious Education/SED.
13. Spouses of Seminary students could take Religious Education courses at reduced rates

Challenges

1. Loss of the identity of Religious Education, and the significant role it has to play in the future of the Adventist Church (as an element in a program rather than a program itself, Religious Education could be overshadowed and ultimately consumed by the legitimately broader perspectives of church ministries. The concern here is not to maintain a name or a program, but to retain important insights into the way we think about "doing church").
2. In seeking to retain these insights, emphasis areas may be an important issue. Currently the electives allowed for an emphasis are legitimately used for completing prerequisites. Could prerequisites be prerequisites, allowing for all students to pursue a focus area? This would give a sense of identity not only to Religious education if it were located in the Seminary, but to the many Seminary programs as well. And also strengthen the ministerial educational process?
3. Collaboration and scheduling with the School of Education for delivery of research methodology classes.
4. ATS requirements would increase the credits for completion of an MA.

(John Matthews' perspective on Seminary option: just one side of the story)

Seminary Location

What is Religious Education? Before you can understand our rationale, you need to know how we define Religious Education.

Our Mission Statement

The Religious Education program prepares men and women to fulfill the teaching and discipling mandates of the gospel commission.

What Is Our Uniqueness?

We see Religious Education as an overseer of lifelong discipleship.

1. New converts—preparing congregations to assimilate them into the church and to disciple them.
2. Our own children (Youth ministry deals with the older children and youth).
3. Families Deut 6:6-9.
4. Laity—to use their places of employment and special ministries to take Christian witness to those outside of the church.
5. School system: integration of faith and learning; strategies for teaching Bible and religion; campus spiritual masterplanning.

Reaching Religious Education's mission

1. Religious Education needs to be seen as a partner in preparing the church to fulfill the Gospel commission. This partnership can be best accomplished if we are located in the Seminary.
 - a. At annual NAPCE conference in October, the professional organization for college and seminary teachers of religious education, the main plenary speaker challenged the Religious Educators to be “partners in the mission and guardians of the omission.” That is, the evangelical church has been quite focused on “going and proclaiming and making converts,” but has largely omitted an intentional strategy to “teach all that I have commanded.” Religious education is an overseer of the teaching ministry that needs to occur in the local church and in our schools.
 - b. Many of our local SDA churches are unaware of this need or unaware of how to set up teaching/discipling processes.

2. Collaboration between the Seminary and the School of Education would be easier if Religious Education were in the Seminary:
 - a. Because of some financial arrangements.
 - b. Because sometimes when the Seminary needs one of the courses offered in the SED, it simply creates its own version and does not often come across campus. (Not unique to the Seminary, but does seem harder to deal with).
 - c. Because we could provide some “service” courses to other programs.
 - d. We would be aware of events and new initiatives by the Seminary and other church entities that are appropriate for us to be part of. You often don’t think of how we could be involved; we aren’t informed; and we learn about things too late.

3. Potential students of Religious Education and potential employers of our graduates tend to look to the Seminary and not to the School of Education when they are looking for people with the competencies we develop.
 - a. We need a visible presence that would remind the Seminary faculty that we exist and would help them understand what we do.
 - b. We need a visible presence to get in contact with the conference and union officials who look to the Seminary for their employees.
 - c. We need a visible presence in the Seminary Bulletin where students look for programs to match their gifts and calling.
 - d. We need to recruit in places where you recruit.

Reaching the Seminary’s mission

1. A Seminary without Religious Education is incomplete. We believe that Religious Education can help the Seminary to provide wholistic theological education for the church. In all the other evangelical Seminaries we have looked at, Religious Education (usually called Christian Education or Educational Studies) is located in the Seminary. Even in the two cases we found where the Seminary is attached to a university that has a School of Education. [List Seminaries]

2. Support the Seminary in developing equipping pastors. From prior discussions with some of you, we have learned that the Seminary is focusing on the equipping pastor, and that involves the education of the laity. Religious Education can bring to this task the skills of teaching in the nonformal setting and the perspective of the laity who are to be equipped.

3. We bring a psychological and sociological understanding of the human beings we are attempting—in partnership with God—to change.
 - a. The Seminary provides very well the philosophical and theological

- understanding of human beings and how they change.
- b. Religious Education would bring or at least reinforce the psychological and sociological understanding of human beings and how they change.
 - c. By bringing the social sciences research methodologies to the Seminary, we would open areas of research that are needed to investigate such things as effectiveness of various methodologies for evangelism, church growth, discipling, small groups, missions, improving ethical behavior, methods for keeping our young people—all the types of research that Roger Dudley conducts. Even the effectiveness of our own teaching strategies—all the types of research that Roger Dudley conducts. Carol Tasker

Denomination's mission

1. *Religious Education can help prepare pastors to fulfill their vital role in the relationship between the local church and the church school; between the conference and the academy.*

Pastors play a vital role in the relationship between the local church and its church school. Our presence—in various ways—could bring that role to their attention and to their understanding. (Adventists have an understanding of the teaching ministry of the church that is not considered in the textbooks that I am familiar with. Church school not included.) Our absence in the Seminary perpetuates the lack of understanding and valuing of the role of teaching in the local church and even in the church school.

2. *Religious Education could oversee the preparation of academy Bible and religion teachers.*

Oversee the training of secondary religion-Bible teachers. If we wanted to promote the idea that the only way to prepare secondary religion-Bible teachers is to have them get an M.A. in Religious Education, we would not need to be located in the Seminary. However, we see routes that would use the M.Div. or the M.A. in Religion. We need to collaborate with faculty in those programs to provide the necessary oversight. (The last sheet in our handout explains.)

3. *Religious Education could provide training for denominational and lay leaders in family and children's ministries.*

We are already providing training in Family Life for both pastors and lay leaders. Moving to the Seminary would open these two certificates to the spouses (primarily wives) of seminarians. Although you have cautioned us that it might be possible for a limited number of conferences, we think that conferences might be more willing

to partially subsidize the training of lay leaders if the training were housed in the Seminary.

4. Reaching a goal of Andrews University. *Eliminate the duplication of some courses.* With present structural obstacles, (as I have said earlier) the Seminary often creates its own version of a course rather than cross campus to departments that offer similar courses. We have a few courses in religious education that could be eliminated, and we like to investigate the possibility of developing curriculum that would combine the Seminary's marriage and family courses and the SED's Family Life Education courses.

In summary, I think support for our decision that the Seminary is the better location for the Religious Education program comes from our accrediting agencies. Both Schools are under the jurisdiction of the regional accrediting association, North Central Association. In addition the SED has and needs NCATE accreditation (National Council of Teacher Education). NCATE has no specific standards for Religious Education. The Seminary has and needs the accreditation of ATS (Association of Theological Schools). ATS has program standards for religious education on both the master's and doctoral levels. While it is easier to be without oversight, it is not wise.

(Jane Thayer's perspective on Seminary option)

APPENDIX H

RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATORS

Table 5. Record of Achievement of Several Religious Educators from Andrews University

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Alban, Norma E.	Loma Linda, California.	2002	Ed.D.
Alicea, Edwin	Pastor/Chaplain of the Antillian Adventist University in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico.	In progress	Ph.D.
Ashworth, Warren S.	Professor Emeritus of Religion at Pacific Union College in Angwin, California.	1986	Ph.D.
Bailey, Rikard A.	Adventist Church pastor in the Texas Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Lufkin, Texas.	1998	Ph.D.
Bauer, David H.	Hendersonville, North Carolina.	1982	Ed.D.
Beagles, Kathleen A.	Assistant Professor of Religious Education in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	In progress	Ph.D.
Bhola, Alvinus D.	Deceased	1982	Ed.D.
Bingham, James T.	Beltsville, Maryland.	1984	Ph.D.
Bissell, Ronald D.	Lacombe, AB, Canada.	1990	Ph.D.
Blanton, R. Kenneth	Deceased	1981	Ed.D.
Booth, Walter M.	Retired. Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1989	Ph.D.
Bourget, José R.	Samara, Dominican Republic.	1998	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Brown, Jeffrey O.	President of the Bahamas Conference of SDA in Nassau, Bahamas.	1993	Ph.D.
Case, Steve W.	President of Piece of the Pie Youth Ministry in Carmichael, California.	1987	Ph.D.
Castillo, Ismael O.	President of the Montemorelos Adventist University in Montemorelos, México.	In progress	Ph.D.
Castrejón, Jaime	President of the Interamerican Adventist Theological Seminary in Miami, Florida.	1986	Ph.D.
Chioma, Silvanus N.	Associate Professor of Religious Education and Church Ministry at Babcock Adventist University in Iketa Lagos, Nigeria.	1983	Ed.D.
Chiomenti, Lyndelle B.	Assistant Director and Curriculum Specialist for the Sabbath School and Personal Ministries Department of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Silver Spring, Maryland.	2007	Ed.D.
Cho, Choung S.	Assistant Professor, Defense Language School in Monterey Bay, California.	2006	Ph.D.
Cho, Myung S.	Silver Spring, Maryland.	1990	Ph.D.
Choi, Soo D.	Seoul, South Korea.	1993	Ph.D.
Chuah, Daniel G.	Chaplain in the Hong Kong Adventist Hospital in Hong Kong, China.	1992	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Colón, May-Ellen M.	Assistant Director for the Sabbath School and Personal Ministries Department of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and Director of Adventist Community Services International in Silver Spring, Maryland.	2004	Ph.D.
Cottrell, Adrian	Executive Secretary of the Jamaican Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Kingston, Jamaica.	In progress	Ph.D.
Cummings, Desmond D.	Seventh-day Adventist hospital system in Celebration, Florida.	1983	Ph.D.
Currie, Alexander S.	Retired. Galston, New South Wales, Australia.	1977	Ed.D.
Daniel, Eugene F.	Christiansted, Virginia.	1980	Ed.D.
David, Vincent A.	Unavailable	1999	Ph.D.
De la Cruz, Crisolito V.	Avon Park, Florida.	1988	Ed.D.
Del Pozo, Luis A.	Seminario Advenista Union in Lima, Perú	1988	Ed.D.
DePaiva, Ruth	Professor Emerita of the MA program in Family Relations at Montemorelos Adventist University in Montemorelos, México.	1988	Ph.D.
Devnich, Donald D.	Oshawa, Ontario, Canada.	1978	Ed.D.
Díaz, Javier	Associate Professor of Religion at the Antillean Adventist University in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico.	In progress	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Dower, Edward L.	Gold River, California.	1980	Ed.D.
Durán, Francý D.	Professor of Religion at Atlantic Union College in South Lancaster, Massachusetts.	1996	Ph.D.
Ebling, José C.	Unavailable	1979	Ed.D.
Ellis, Dirk R.	Adjunct Professor in an Evangelical College in Massachusetts.	In progress	Ph.D.
Escobar, Edgar J.	Professor Emeritus of Religion at the Antillian Adventist University in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico.	1986	Ed.D.
Ewing, Theodore J.	Redlands, California.	1996	Ph.D.
Farah, Raja D.	Professor of Religion at the Middle East Adventist University in Jdeidet El Metn, Lebanon.	1996	Ph.D.
Ferris, Roger H.	Seattle, Washington.	1986	Ed.D.
Flowers, Karen	Associate Director of the Family Ministry Department of the General Conference of SDA in Silver Spring, Maryland.	In progress	Ph.D.
Fowler, John M.	Associate Director of Education at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Silver Spring, Maryland.	1977	Ed.D.
Francis, Anthon C.	Unavailable	1984	Ed.D.
Fredericks, Richard L.	Christian pastor in Monrovia, Maryland.	1988	Ph.D.
Freed, Allan W.	Retired. Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1995	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
García-Marenko, Emilio	Director of Admissions at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1978	Ed.D.
Gomez, José D.	Adventist Church pastor in Río Piedras, Puerto Rico.	In progress	Ed.D.
Gonzalez, Tirsia R.	School Teacher in New Jersey.	1999	Ed.S.
Gregor, Helena R.	Contract Teaching in the Religion Department at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1996	Ph.D.
Gustavsen, Gunnar A.	Mysen, Norway.	1981	Ed.D.
Haakmat, Johan R.	Professor of Education at the West Indies Adventist College in Mandeville, Jamaica.	1995	Ed.D.
Hernández, Angel M.	Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at Pacific Union College in Angwin, California.	2003	Ph.D.
Hessel, Wolfgang H.	Grand Forks, British Columbia, Canada.	1994	Ed.S.
Hook, Milton R.	Unavailable	1978	Ed.D.
Horning, Randy C.	Angwing, California.	1991	Ed.D.
Howse, Kevin J.	Deceased	1982	Ed.D.
Huerfano, Pablo E.	School Teacher in Florida.	2001	Ph.D.
Itin, Rolando A.	Retired pastor. Assistant editor of Casa Editora Suramericana in Entre Rios, Argentina.	1979	Ed.D.
Jimenez, Obed	Associate Professor of Religion at the Antillean Adventist University in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico.	In progress	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Joachim, Roland L.	Loma Linda, California.	1985	Ph.D.
Joseph, Peter	Adventist Church pastor in Bahamas.	In progress	Ph.D.
Kafeero, Israel M.	Religious Education student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	In progress	Ph.D.
Kalua, Robert U.	Inchelium, Washington.	1993	Ed.D.
Kilmer, James R.	Church growth coordinator of the Upper Columbia Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Spokane, Washington.	1988	Ph.D.
Kim, Gyung-Gu	Seoul, South Korea.	2001	Ph.D.
Kromann, Lawrence G.	Laurel, Maryland.	1983	Ed.D.
Lankheet, Janet L.	Fennville, Michigan.	1988	Ph.D.
Laurent, Carl R.	Vice-President for College Relations and Professor of Religion and Bible at Bethel College in Mishawaka, Indiana.	1986	Ph.D.
Lekic, Mike M.	Director of Education at the Southern Asia-Pacific Division of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Philippines.	2005	Ph.D.
Lepke, Wolfgang	Adventist Church pastor in Abtwil, Switzerland.	2001	Ph.D.
Lindsay, Allan G.	Professor of History at Avondale Adventist College in Avondale, Australia.	1982	Ed.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Lozano, Raúl	Director of Education and Communication for the South Mexican Union in Merida, Yucatan, México.	In progress	Ph.D.
Luke, Handel H.	Deceased	1983	Ed.D.
Luna, Luis M.	Chair of the Religion Department at the Adventist Seminary in Hong Kong, China.	1992	Ph.D.
Maitland, Fitzroy S.	Professor of Education at the Southern Caribbean University in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.	1990	Ed.D.
Malones, Albert A.	Berrien Springs, Michigan.	In progress	Ed.S.
Mangena, Edmore	School counselor in Alaska.	In progress	Ph.D.
Marroquin, Medardo E.	Calexico, California.	2001	Ph.D.
Matak, Dragutin	Marusevec, Croatia.	1992	Ph.D.
Matthews, John V. G.	Professor of Educational Administration and Religious Education at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1988	Ph.D.
McClintock, David J.	Murwillumbah, New South Wales, Australia.	1995	Ph.D.
McCormick, Sherman L.	Pastor in the Minnesota Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Duluth, Minnesota.	1992	Ph.D.
McGarrell, Roy I.	Professor of Religion at the Caribbean Union College in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.	1990	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
McQueen, John P.	Unavailable	1993	Ed.S.
Menegusso, Eliseu N.	Unavailable	1980	Ed.D.
Miranda, Armando	General Vice-President of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Silver Spring, Maryland.	In progress	Ed.D.
Molina, Carlos A.	Teacher at the Bella Vista Adventist Academy in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico.	In progress	Ph.D.
Muganda, Baraka G.	Youth Ministries Director for the General Conference of SDAs in Silver Spring, Maryland.	1983	Ed.D.
Nainggolan, Rajoaman	Indonesian Adventist University, Bandung, Indonesia.	1985	Ed.D.
Napper, Byron P.	Unavailable	1983	Ph.D.
Navarro, Juan	Retired. Madrid, Spain.	1979	Ed.D.
Neall, Beatrice M.	Professor Emerita of Religion at Union College in Lincoln, Nebraska.	1982	Ph.D.
Nkou, Joseph	Bible teacher at College Adventiste in Kribi, Cameroun.	1980	Ed.D.
Norton, Edward M.	Boring, Oregon.	1985	Ed.D.
Obas, Etzer	President of the Haitian Adventist Union of Seventh-day Adventists in Port-au-Prince, Haiti.	1997	Ph.D.
Ott, Helmut K.	Collegedale, Tennessee.	1983	Ed.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Penn, Deborah K.	Chair of the Department of Professional Studies, Director of the Christian Ministries Program, and Bible teacher at Vennard College in University Park, Iowa.	In progress	Ph.D.
Pfeifer, Andrew A.	Director of Distance Learning in the School of Education at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	In progress	Ph.D.
Phaeton, Yves C.	Adventist pastor in the Greater New York Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in New York, New York.	In progress	Ed.D.
Phillips, L. Edgel	Unavailable	1992	Ph.D.
Phoon, Chek-Yat	Director of Education for the Northern Asia Pacific Division, South Korea.	1987	Ph.D.
Ponniah, Melchizedek M.	Assistant Professor of Communication at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1986	Ph.D.
Quiyono, Estaban	Associate Professor of Religion at the Montemorelos Adventist University in Montemorelos, México.	In progress	Ph.D.
Rico, Jorge E.	Associate Professor of Religion at the Southwestern Adventist University in Keene, Texas.	2008	Ph.D.
Rogers, Clifton E.	Unavailable	In progress	Ph.D.
Ruskjer, Ronald E.	Corcoran, California.	1980	Ed.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Scarone, Daniel	Hispanic Coordinator for the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Lansing, Michigan.	In progress	Ph.D.
Selmanovic, Samir	Program Director for Faith House in Manhattan, New York.	1996	Ph.D.
Serban, Laurentiu A.	Religious Education student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	In progress	Ph.D.
Shell, Penny Sue	Retired. Former hospital chaplain and Director of the Women's Resource Center at La Sierra University in Riverside, California.	1984	Ed.D.
Sheppard, Eustace M.	Land O Lakes, Florida.	1986	Ed.D.
Snorrason, Erling B.	Associate Director of Student Success at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	2005	Ph.D.
Stefani, Wolfgang H.	Oakden, Australia.	1994	Ph.D.
Storie, Dannie G.	Lakeland Medical Center at Niles, Michigan.	In progress	Ed.D.
Taggart, William C.	Unavailable	1999	Ph.D.
Tait, Calvin	Adventist Church pastor in the Lake Region Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Detroit, Michigan.	2003	Ed.S.
Tasker, Carol M.	Dean School of Theology at Pacific Adventist University in PMB Boroko NCD, Papua New Guinea.	2002	Ph.D.

Table 5—Continued.

Name	Denominational Service	Degree Date	Degree Type
Valentine, Gilbert M.	Provost at Mission Adventist College in Muak Lek, Thailand.	1982	Ph.D.
Vyhmeister, Nancy J.	Professor Emerita of Missions at the Adventist Theological Seminary in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	1978	Ed.D.
Wade, Loron T.	Professor Emeritus of Religion at Montemorelos Adventist University in Montemorelos, México.	1981	Ed.D.
Wakaba, Velile S.	Retired Union officer, South African Union. Bloemfontein, South Africa.	1982	Ed.D.
Walker, Meric D.	Adventist Church pastor in Kingston, Jamaica.	In progress	Ph.D.
Wallace, Elizabeth A.	Chaplain at Saint Helena Hospital in Saint Helena, California.	In progress	Ph.D.
Wiggins, Kembleton S.	Retired. Cleburne, Texas.	1979	Ed.D.
Wong, David S.	Retired. San José, California.	1979	Ed.D.
Zork, Susan P.	Assistant Professor of Religion at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.	In progress	Ph.D.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Sources

“Accreditation Action Report: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.” Document #78. April 1997. School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

“A Comparative Chart of Graduate Studies–AU.” Document #79. March 1978. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

Akers, George H. “Conference Called by President Smoot to Discuss Relationship of Ed.D. Program in Religious Education with Two Doctoral Programs Offered in the Seminary.” Document #25. 15 June 1977. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. “The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University.” Answers given by the author. Cassette 1. Berrien Springs, MI, 2002. In my possession.

_____, letter to G. Smoot, R. Graham, R. Schwarz, R. Williams, and M. Dyer, 10 July 1981. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to Grady Smoot, Gordon Madgwick, and T.S. Geraty, 31 October 1975. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to J. G. Smoot, 24 February 1977. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to Religious Education Area Faculty, 8 November 1976. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to Richard Schwarz, 29 August 1985. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to Roy Naden, 20 November 1978. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to W. Richard Leshner, 11 June 1985. Transcript in the School of Education files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

“An Analysis of Financial Support.” Document #60. 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

Andreasen, Neils-Erik, e-mail message to author. 14 June 2005.

_____, letter to John V. G. Matthews, 15 September 1998. Transcript in the School of Education files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____, letter to O. Jane Thayer, 27 March 1996. Transcript in the School of Education files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

“Andrews University: Courses Taken by Religious Education Students.” Document #54. 26 August 2005. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.

“Andrews University Doctoral Graduates in Religious Education.” Document #13. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

“Andrews University Doctoral Graduates in Religious Education.” Document #33. 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

“Andrews University Graduated Students by Academic Year: Religious Ed Majors.” Document #76. 2 June 2006. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1. In my possession.

“Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Doctoral Comprehensive Preparation Guidelines.” Document #71. 6 November 2001. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Family Life Discussions.” 27 October 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary.” Document #58. 13 November 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education: Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary: A Presentation to the SED Faculty.” Document #62. 10 January 2001. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Reled–Leadership Discussions on Church Leadership.” Document #72. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–Interschool Option.” Document #64. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–SED Option.” Document #73. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Andrews University School of Education Religious Education Program: Seminary–Reled Collaboration–Seminary Option.” Document #55. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “An Idea Whose Time Has Come.” *Focus Supplement No. 28*. June–July 1975. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Asbury Theological Seminary. “M.A. in Christian Education.” *Master of Art in Christian Education*. www.asburyseminary.edu/programs/academic/mace.htm (accessed 21 October 2004).

- _____. "M.A. in Christian Education." *Master of Art in Christian Education*.
www.asburyseminary.edu/programs/academic/mace.htm (accessed 28 January 2008).
- Ashworth, Warren. Answers to a Questionnaire from Jorge E. Rico, 9 July 2004, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- "Assessment Results." Document #42. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- The Association of Theological Schools, letter to John McVay. 5 February 2004. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. "Standards of Accreditation." *The Commission on Accrediting*.
www.ats.edu/accrediting/standards/overview.asp (accessed 26 June 2006).
- "ATS Degree Program Standards." Document #74. 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Benefits of a Seminary Location for Religious Education." Document #56. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Brantley, Paul. "Some Random Thoughts About Foundations." 1997. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Bryson, Jeanette Wright. "Factors Influencing Enrollment Trends in Seventh-day Boarding Schools in North America." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2006.
- Burgess, Harold W. "An Analysis of Selected Theoretical Approaches to Religious Education in the Twentieth Century." Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1974.
- Chace, E. Stanley, letter to W. Richard Leshner, 18 March 1986. Transcript in the School of Education files, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Claremont School of Theology. "Doctor of Philosophy Degrees." *PhD degrees at CST*.
www.cst.edu/phd.htm (accessed 9 November 2000).
- Claremont School of Theology. "Theology and Personality." *PhD degrees at CST*.
www.cst.edu/phd.htm (accessed 21 October 2004).

- “Competencies for the Religious Educator-PhD Level.” Document #82. 6 August 2005. Religious Education Department files, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Concerning Theological Emphases in Religious Education.” Document #8. 31 January 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations: Master Plan for the North Central Association Self-Study Report.” Document #30. 19 April 1988. Religious Education Department Files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations: Tentative 1986-1988 Bulletin.” Document #53. October 1986. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Departmental Mission.” Document #7. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Design of Professional Education: NCATE Institutional Self-Study Report, 1999.” Document #50. February 1999. School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Program Plan: Religious Education.” Document #70. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Doctorate in Religious Education: The Curriculum.” Document #26. Eighth draft. 9 November 1981. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Douglas, Herbert. “Spirit of Prophecy Perspective: Education’s Grand Theme.” April 2001. Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Fink, Jerrell Newton. “Perceptions of Seventh-day Adventist Church Ministers Toward Seventh-day Adventist Schools.” Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1989.
- Focus on the Family. “Press Biographies.” *Press Room*. www.focusonthefamily.com/press/focusvoices/ (accessed 27 December 2007).

- Fuller Theological Seminary. "School of Theology." *School of Theology*.
www.fuller.edu/sot/ (accessed 9 November 2000).
- Furst, Lyndon G., e-mail message to author. 10 March 2004.
- Gardner, Robert. "Follow-up on Religious Education." Typed manuscript. 19 December 2007. In my possession.
- Gibson, Annette. Interview by author. *Andrews University Financial Policy on Cross-School Collaboration*. 31 August 2005. School of Business, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Gilliam, Randy. Interview by author. *Some Challenges in the Adventist Educational System*. 7 January 2008. Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX.
- Graham, Karen R., electronic letter to Jane Thayer and John Matthews. 15 November 2000. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____, electronic letter to Jane Thayer and John Matthews. 21 November 2000. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____, letter to the ATS Visiting Site Team. 27 June 2002. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. "Questionnaire for Dr. Karen Graham: Former Dean of the School of Education, June 2003." TM. Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- Gray, Keith. Interview by author. *Challenges Facing Religious Education in the Adventist Church*. 7 January 2008. Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX.
- Guy, Fritz. "Doctor of Philosophy in Religious Education: Preliminary Draft." Document #67. 21 March 1984. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Heppenstall, Edward. "A Functional Approach to the Study of Religious Education in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges." Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1951.
- Herr, Ronald, e-mail message to author. 5 June 2006.

- Huitt, W. "Conation as an Important Factor of Mind." chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/regsys/conation.html (accessed 28 March 2008).
- Jeffery, James R., e-mail message to author. 12 June 2005.
- Judd, W. "Religious Education at Andrews University." Document #21. 13 February 1973. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "July 1 Will Be a Big Day." Document #45. 2002. Religious Education Department files, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Kalua, Robert U. "The Empirical Development of a Curriculum in Sports Acrobatics and Spiritual Witnessing." Ed.D. diss., Andrews University, 1993.
- Kilgore, William. Interview by author. *Challenges Facing Religious Education in the Adventist Church*. 7 January 2008. Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX.
- Knight, George R. "Tape for Jorge Rico Regarding the Questionnaire on the Establishment of the Religious Education Program at Andrews University." Answers to a questionnaire by the author. Transcription. Cassette 1. Berrien Springs, MI, 2002.
- Kromann, Lawrence Gilbert. "A Study of Parental Attitudes Regarding Secondary Boarding Schools of the Mid-America Union of Seventh-day Adventists." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1983.
- Lekic, Mike Mile. "Perceptions and Attitudes of Selected Adventist and Non-Adventist Parents of School-Age Children Toward Adventist Schools in Canada." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2005.
- "Library Resources and Services Needed by Religious Education Students." Document #61. 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "M.A. Graduates—Religious Education." Document #19. 24 September 1984. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Marroquin, Medardo Esaú. "The Historical Development of the Religion Curriculum at Battle Creek College 1874-1901." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2001.

- “Master Plan: Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations.” Document #31. 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Matthews, John V. G. “Alexander Hegius (ca. 1433-98): His Life, Philosophy, and Pedagogy.” Vol. 1. Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1988.
- _____. “Andrews University School of Education Program in Religious Education.” Document #39. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. “Denominational/Administrative/Teacher-Level Philosophical Chart.” March 2006. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. “Ideological Flowchart: Identifying with the Source.” March 2006. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. “Journey Toward an Owned Conceptual Framework: A Narrative and Documents Illustrating Our NCATE Preparation Experiences.” 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. “Master of Divinity Competencies.” 28 March 2006. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. “Master of Divinity Competencies with Comments.” 28 March 2006. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. “Written Responses to Jorge E. Rico.” March 2006. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- McVay, John K., electronic letter to Jane Thayer and John Matthews. 12 December 2000. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____, electronic letter to author. 27 June 2006. Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- _____. “Questionnaire for Dr. John McVay: Current Dean of the Seminary, June 2003” TM. Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.

- Melchert, Charles F., and Randy G. Litchfield. "Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education." *APRRE History*.
www.religiouseducation.net/oldwebsite/org/aprre/aprre_history_future.html
(accessed 2 January 2008).
- "Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting." 13 April 1984. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting." 13 September 1985. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting." 5 September 1986. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Doctoral (Ph.D.) Program Committee Meeting." 26 September 1986. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 10 November 1974. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 17 January 1975. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 23 May 1975. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 6 November 1975. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 9 April 1976. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 15 November 1976. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Minutes of Faculty Meeting." 24 October 1978. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 19 April 1979. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 17 April 1984. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 21 November 1985. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 26 November 1985. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 15 January 1986. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 20 October 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the Faculty Meeting.” 1 December 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 26 January 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 31 January 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 3 November 1994. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 2 December 1994. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 27 January 1995. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 29 November 1995. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 8 October 1996. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 2 February 1997. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 28 January 1998. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 5 April 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 12 April 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 26 April 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 30 April 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 7 May 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 31 May 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 22 September 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 21 October 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 27 October 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 4 May 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 8 May 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 24 May 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 2 June 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 6 June 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 21 September 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 4 October 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 12 October 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 19 October 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 17 November 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 30 November 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 25 September 2001. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 30 October 2001. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 22 January 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 13 February 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 26 February 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 5 March 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 14 June 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 8 August 2002. Religious Education Department files, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Faculty Meeting.” 7 January 2003. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Foundations of Education Faculty Meeting.” 7 May 1997. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting.” 28 February 1986. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting.” 1 February 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting.” 12 January 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting.” 30 November 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting.” 25 October 1990. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate School Faculty Meeting.” 11 May 1969. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate School Faculty Meeting.” 16 April 1973. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of Graduate School Faculty Meeting.” 12 March 1991. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Minutes of the Doctor of Education Steering Committee Meeting.” 16 July 1973. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the Executive Committee–Religious Education Area Faculty.” 15 November 1976. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the General Conference Advisory Committee on Bible Teaching.” 6-8 May 1968. Department of Education, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Silver Spring, MD.
- “Minutes of the Graduate Academic Policies and Curricula Committee Meeting.” 12 January 1989. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting.” 7 December 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting.” 10 February 1995. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting.” 12 January 1999. School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Minutes of the School of Education Faculty Meeting.” 10 March 1999. School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Mission and Future of the Religious Education Program.” Document #9. 6 December 1994. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Mission and Future of the Religious Education Program.” Document #10. 8 February 1995. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Mission, Objectives, and Ideals.” Document #3. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Mission of the Department of Religious Education and Educational Foundations.” Document #5. 20 October 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Mission of the Religious Education Department.” Document #4. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Naden, Roy. “Naden’s Answers to the Questionnaire.” TMs. 4 May 2004. In my possession.
- National Council on Family Relations. “NCFR’s Mission.” *About Us*. www.ncfr.org/about_us/index.asp (accessed 15 May 2006).
- Neall, Beatrice. Answers to a Questionnaire from Jorge E. Rico. 23 June 2004. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- Ng, Gan-Theow. “Religion, Culture, and Modernity: Some Missiological Implications of the Process of Secularization in East Asia.” Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1991.
- “Ninety-Eighth Annual Statistical Report of Seventh-day Adventists.” 31 December 1960. General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Takoma Park-Washington, DC.
- North American Professors of Christian Education. “An Historical Perspective on NACPE.” *NAPCE History*. www.napce.org/history.html (accessed 22 May 2003).
- _____. “Welcome Christian Educators!” *Home*. www.napce.org (accessed 2 January 2008).
- North Park Theological Seminary. “The Master of Arts in Christian Education Degree.” *NPTS - Catalog - MACE*. www.northpark.edu/sem/academics/catalog_pdfs/mace.pdf (accessed 9 November 2000).
- _____. “The Master of Arts in Christian Education Degree.” *NPTS–Catalog–MACE*. www.northpark.edu/sem/academics/catalog_pdfs/mace.pdf (accessed 21 October 2004).
- _____. “The Master of Arts in Christian Education Degree.” *NPTS–Catalog–MACE*. www.northpark.edu/sem/academics/catalog_pdfs/mace.pdf (accessed 28 January 2008).

- “Notes on the Interviews.” Document #52. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Ogawa, Hideyo. “A Factorial Description of Tasks of the Family.” Ed.D. diss., Andrews University, 1980.
- Osborne, Elliot C. “Development of a Coping Mechanism Seminar for Single Parents.” D.Min. diss., Andrews University, 1988.
- Parks, David M. “A Design for Contemporary Public Evangelism in the Upper Columbia Conference.” D.Min. diss., Andrews University, 1987.
- Paulien, Jon. “Adam, Jesus, and the Image of God.” April 2001. Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Petition to the ATS Commission on Accrediting: Proposed Programs in Religious Education.” Document #59. 2001. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Ph.D. Course Plan for Religious Education: Andrews University Doctoral Cohort at Montemorelos/Antillian.” Document #77. 24 May 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Ph.D. Program in Religious Education: Summary of Developments.” Document #32. 28 April 1988. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Phoon, Chek Yat. “A Correlational Study of Jungian Psychological Types and Nineteen Spiritual Gifts.” Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1986.
- “Program for a Major in Religious Education.” Document #23. 16 July 1973. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Program of Religious Education and Educational Foundations Mission Statement.” Document #36. 9 January 1994. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “A Proposed Master of Arts Program with a Concentration in Religious Education.” Document #17. No date. Religious Education Department Files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Prospectus for a Focused Visit to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary of Andrews University.” Document #46. 2002. Religious Education Department files, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Randall, Robert Norman. “The Development and Implementation of a Marriage Support Group and Its Evaluation Using the DAS in the Thousand Oaks Seventh-day Adventist Church.” D.Min. diss., Andrews University, 1997.
- Rao, Abhijit. “Recognition of Conative and Affective Behavior in Web Learning Using Digital Gestures.” www.unb.ca/naweb/proceedings/2001/po3Rao.html (accessed 28 March 2008).
- “Regular Review: Programs in Religious Education and Educational Foundations Self-Study Document.” Document #34. March 1990. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Religion Courses Recommended for the Ed.D. in Religious Education.” Document #80. January 1975. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Religious Education, Area Faculty.” Document #24. November 1974. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- The Religious Education Association. “About Us.” *About REA*. www.religiouseducation.net/org/AboutREA.htm (accessed 30 December 2007).
- _____. “Association of Professors and Researchers in Religious Education.” *History of APRRE*. www.religiouseducation.net/oldwebsite/org/aprre/aprre_history_future.htm (accessed 30 December 2007).
- _____. “History of the Religious Education Association.” *REA History*. www.religiouseducation.net/org/rea/reahistory.htm (accessed 2 January 2008).
- “Religious Education Chart.” Document #1. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Religious Education Competencies Categorized by ATS Accreditation Guidelines for Christian/Religious Education.” Document #75. 2002. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- “Religious Education Curriculum Revision—Cont’d with Resultant S.G.S. 77-78 *Bulletin* Copy Changes.” Document #81. 9 April 1976. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Religious Education Graduates: All Graduates (1965-1999).” Document #73. 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Religious Educator.” Document #65. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Report of Visiting Committee.” Document #47. July 2002. Religious Education Department files, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Report on Meetings with Seminary Personnel: 23 October 2000.” Document #51. 23 October 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Report to the Association of Theological Schools.” Document #49. January 2003. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Response to the ATS Recommendations.” Document #48. 2002. Religious Education Department files, Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- “Review of the Religious Education Program.” Document #63. No date. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Rigacci, Osvaldo. Interview by author. *Issues Regarding Membership Attendance in the Adventist Church*. 9 January 2008. Keene Seventh-day Adventist Church, Keene, TX.
- Scoggin, Pharis Emerson. “A History of the Evangelical Christian School Movement in America from 1800 to the Present.” Ph.D. diss., Bob Jones University, Greensborough, S.C., 1974. Microform.
- Selmanovic, Samir. “The Empirical Development of a Curriculum on Faith Development.” Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1996.

- Seventh-day Adventist Church. "Annual Statistical Reports." *Online Document Archives*. www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=11&SortBy=2&ShowDateOrder=True (accessed 19 March 2008).
- _____. "Seventh-day Adventist World Church Statistics." *Facts and Figures*. www.adventist.org/world_church/facts_and_figures/index.html (accessed 28 January 2008).
- Seventh-day Adventist Church Department of Education. "Mission and Scope." *Department of Education Home*. www.education.gc.adventist.org (accessed 8 April 2007).
- Snorrason, Erling Bernhard. "The Aims of Education in the Writings of Ellen White." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 2005.
- Sorke, Ingo. Interview by author. *Some Challenges in the Adventist Educational System*. 7 January 2008. Southwestern Adventist University, Keene, TX.
- Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. "Educational Ministries." *Degrees Offered*. www.swbts.edu/education/degrees.cfm (accessed 9 November 2000).
- "A Statement on the Undergirding and Integrating Function of Foundations Within the School of Education: Andrews University." Document #69. November 1996. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- "Statistical Report of Seventh-day Adventist Conferences, Missions, and Institutions in North America (Including Summaries from World Field)." Eightieth Annual Report. Takoma Park, Washington, DC: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1942.
- "Strategic Plan—Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University: July 2003-June 2006." Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 2003.
- Talbot School of Theology. "Master of Arts in Christian Education." *Talbot Programs*. www.talbot.edu/programs/mace/index.cfm (accessed 9 November 2000).
- _____. "Master of Arts in Christian Education." *Talbot Programs*. www.talbot.edu/programs/mace/index.cfm (accessed 21 October 2004).
- _____. "Master of Arts in Christian Education." *Talbot Programs*. www.talbot.edu/programs/mace/index.cfm (accessed 28 January 2008).

Thayer, Jane, electronic letter to author. 30 October 2005. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. letter to John McVay. 4 December 2000. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Notes from a Meeting with Karen Graham." Document #15. 14 June 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Proposal to Move Religious Education to the Seminary." Document #40. 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Proposal to Move Religious Education to the Seminary." Revised document. Document #43. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Questionnaire on the Religious Education Program: Questions Posed by Jorge Rico—Answers Provided by Jane Thayer, December 2002 to January 2003." TM. Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.

_____. "Transitional Matters." Document #44. 2001. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Written Responses to Jorge E. Rico." August 2006. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.

Thayer, Jane, and John Matthews. "Proposal for Relocation of Religious Education to the Seminary." Document #41. 13 November 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

Thompson, Norma Hoyt. "Contemporary Trends in Philosophy of Protestant Religious Education." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1960.

"Toward an Understanding of Religious Education." Document #38. 1 June 1999. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. "Educational Ministries Department Course Descriptions." *Academics: Educational Ministries Department*. www.tiu.edu/divinity/academics (accessed 9 November 2000).
- Vyhmeister, Nancy. Answers to a Questionnaire from Jorge E. Rico. 21 June 2004. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- "Where Should Religious Education Be Housed? Present Realities." Document #57. 2000. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Wise, Arthur E., letter to Neils-Erik A. Andreasen, 24 April 1997. Transcript in the School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- World Council of Churches. "History." *Who Are We?* www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/who/history.html (accessed 3 June 2004).
- _____. "WCC Programme Work." *What Do We Do?* www.wcc-coe.org/www/what/index-e.html (accessed 29 January 2007).
- Youngberg, John B. "The Current Ph.D. in Religious Education." Document #27. 23 September 1983. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. "Dialogue." Document #68. 1991. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. "Information on the Religious Education Program at AU for Jorge Rico, October 28, 2002." TM. Berrien Springs, MI. In my possession.
- _____, letter to Richard W. Leshner, 20 October 1987. Transcript in the Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____, letter to Stanley Chace, 14 July 1986. Transcript in Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- _____. "Notes Taken on the Ph.D. in Religious Education Committee Held on November 21, 1983." Document #66. 21 November 1983. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Some Ideas on the Proposed Religious Education Program." Document #22. 14 February 1973. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "Some of the Issues Involved in Foundations of Education." 7 May 1997. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

_____. "A Statement Concerning Graduate Programs in Religious Education as They Relate to the Overall Graduate Structure of Andrews University." Document #29. 19 May 1986. Religious Education Department files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

Published Sources

Allison, Richard E. "August Hermann Franke." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.

Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Translated by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Anderson, Clifford V. "The Practice of Evangelical Christian Education Since World War II." In *Changing Patterns of Religious Education*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984.

Andrews University. *Bulletin 1960-1961*. Vol. 23, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1960.

_____. *Bulletin 1961-1962*. Vol. 24, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1961.

_____. *Bulletin 1962-1963*. Vol. 25, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1962.

_____. *Bulletin 1963-1964*. Vol. 52, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1963.

_____. *Bulletin 1964-1965*. Vol. 53, no. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1964.

_____. *Bulletin 1965-1966*. Vol. 54, no. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1965.

- _____. *Bulletin 1968-1969*. Vol. 57, no. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1968.
- _____. *Bulletin 1974-1975*. Vol. 63, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1974.
- _____. *Bulletin 1974-1975*. Vol. 63, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1974.
- _____. *Bulletin 1975-1976*. Vol. 64, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1975.
- _____. *Bulletin 1976-1977*. Vol. 65, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1976.
- _____. *Bulletin 1978-1979*. Vol. 67, no. 4. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1978.
- _____. *Bulletin 1981-1982*. Vol. 70, no. 7. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1981.
- _____. *Bulletin 1982-1983*. Vol. 71, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: The Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1982.
- _____. *Bulletin 1982-1983*. Vol. 71, no. 4. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1982.
- _____. *Bulletin 1983-1984*. Vol. 72, no. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Graduate Studies, 1983.
- _____. *Bulletin 1984-1986*. Vol. 73, no. 1. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1984.
- _____. *Bulletin 1986-1988*. Vol. 74, no. 1. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1986.
- _____. *Bulletin 1987-1988*. Vol. 76, no. 7. Berrien Springs, MI: Graduate Programs, 1987.
- _____. *Bulletin 1989-1990*. Vol. 78, no. 7. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1989.

- _____. *Bulletin 1990-1991*. Vol. 80, no. 8. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1990.
- _____. *Bulletin 1994-1995*. Vol. 83, no. 8. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1994.
- _____. *Bulletin 1995-1996*. Vol. 84, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1995.
- _____. *Bulletin 1996-1997*. Vol. 85, no. 9. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1996.
- _____. *Bulletin 1998-1999*. Vol. 87, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1998.
- _____. *Bulletin 1999-2000*. Vol. 88, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1999.
- _____. *Bulletin 2000-2001*. Vol. 89, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2000.
- _____. *Bulletin 2002-2003*. Vol. 89, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2002.
- _____. *Bulletin 2003-2004*. Vol. 89, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: The Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 2003.
- _____. *Bulletin 2005-2006*. Vol. 94. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2005.
- _____. *Bulletin 2008-2009*. Vol. 97. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2008.
- _____. *Summer Bulletin 1984*. Berrien Springs, MI: School of Education, 1984.
- Anthony, Michael J. "Christian Humanism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- _____. "Monasticism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- _____. "Scholasticism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.

- _____. "Synagogue Schools." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Archibald, Helen Allan. "Originating Visions and Visionaries of the REA." *Religious Education* 98, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 414-25.
- Astly, Jeff. *The Philosophy of Christian Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1994.
- Bailey, Kenneth P. *Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education*. 2nd ed. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1973.
- Barclay, William. *The Educational Ideals in the Ancient World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1974.
- Barna, George. *Transforming Children into Spiritual Champions*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 2003.
- Barnard, Howard Clive. *The Little Schools of Port-Royal*. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.
- Barth, Karl. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Bennett, Kathleen P., and Margaret D. LeCompte. *How Schools Work: A Sociological Analysis of Education*. New York: Longman, 1990.
- Benson, Warren S. "Roman Catholic Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Berkouwer, G. C. "Providence as Government." In *Readings in Christian Theology*. Vol. 1, ed. Millard J. Erickson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Betts, George H. "What Does Religious Education Mean to the Church?" *Religious Education* 15 (February 1920 - December 1920): 161-66.
- Biehler, Robert F. *Psychology Applied to Teaching*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.
- Blazier, Kenneth D., and Evelyn M. Huber. *Planning Christian Education in Your Church*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1974.

- Bloom, Benjamin S. *Human Characteristics and School Learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.
- Borchert, D. C. "Sunday School." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig B. Cully. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990.
- Bowen, C. A. *Child and Church: A History of Methodist Church-School Curriculum*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Boylan, Anne M. *Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution, 1790-1880*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Brereton, Virginia. *Training God's Army: The American Bible School: 1880-1940*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Brown, C. "The Enlightenment." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Browning, Robert L. *The Pastor as Religious Educator*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1989.
- Buswell, J. Oliver. *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Butler, J. Donald. *Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion*. Rev. ed. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- _____. *Religious Education: The Foundations and Practice of Nurture*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.
- Byrne, H. W. *Christian Education for the Local Church: An Evangelical and Functional Approach*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1973.
- Cadwallader, Edward Miles. *A History of Seventh-day Education*. Lincoln, NE: n.p., 1958.
- Calvin, John. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. 1559. Vol. 1. Reprint, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Cannon, William Ragsdale. *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.

- Chamberlain, J. Gordon. *Freedom and Faith: New Approaches to Christian Education*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Childs, Brevards S. *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Choun, Robert J. "John Wesley." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Civikly, James M., ed. *Communicating in College Classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1986.
- Clouse, Robert G. "Celibacy, Clerical." *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- _____. "Christian Humanism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- _____. "Pietism." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- _____. "Scholasticism." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Coe, George A. "The Religious Education Movement—A Retrospect." *Religious Education* 39, no. 4 (July–August 1944): 220-28.
- Coenen, L. "Church, Synagogue." *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Vol. 1, ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.
- Comenius, John Amos. *The Great Didactic*. 1657. Translated by M. W. Keatinge. Reprint, London: A. & C. Black, 1910.
- Cope, Henry Frederick. *The Evolution of the Sunday School*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1911.
- _____. "Introductory." *Religious Education* 1, no. 1 (April 1906): 1-2.

- Cram, Ronald H. "The Origins and Purpose of the Philadelphia Sunday School and Adult School Union." *Christian Education Journal* 10, no. 3 (Spring 1990): 47-55.
- Cubberley, Ellwood P. *The History of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948.
- Cully, Iris V., and Kendig B. Cully, eds. "Religious Education Association." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990.
- Cully, Kendig Brubacker. "Religious Education Association." *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Kendig Brubacker Cully. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Daly, Lowrie J. *The Medieval University: 1200-1400*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Darcy-Bérubé, Françoise. "The Challenge Ahead of Us." In *Foundations of Religious Education*, ed. Padraic O'Hare. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- De Blois, Austen Kennedy, and Donald R. Gorham. *Christian Religious Education: Principles and Practice*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1939.
- Dederen, Raoul. "The Revelation-Inspiration Phenomenon According to the Bible Writers." In *Issues in Revelation and Inspiration*, ed. Frank Holbrook and Leo Van Dolson. Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1992.
- DeMott, Nancy L. "Minister of Christian Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. ca. 100. In *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2d ed., ed. Henry Bettenson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Dudley, Roger L. *Valuegenesis: Faith in the Balance*. Riverside, CA: La Sierra University Press, 1992.
- _____. *Why Teenagers Reject Religion and What to Do About It*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1978.
- Dudley, Roger L., and Des Cummings, Jr. *Adventures in Church Growth*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983.

- Dyrness, William. *Themes in Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1979.
- Eavey, C. B. *History of Christian Education*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1964.
- Edersheim, Alfred. *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*. Updated ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
- Edge, Findley B. "Church-Home Cooperation." *Religious Education* 52, no. 2 (March–April 1957): 110-18.
- Eichrodt, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Elias, John L. *A History of Christian Education: Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox Perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company, 2002.
- Emmanuel Missionary College. *Bulletin 1960-1961*. Vol. 49, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: College of Liberal Arts, 1960.
- _____. *Bulletin 1961-1962*. Vol. 50, no. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: College of Liberal Arts, 1961.
- _____. *Bulletin 1962-1964*. Vol. 51, no. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Undergraduate College of Andrews University, 1962.
- Erickson, Millard J. "How God Is Known: Editor's Introduction." In *Readings in Christian Theology*. Vol. 1, ed. Millard J. Erickson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Estep, James Riley. "Biblical Foundations of Christian Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- _____. "Liberal Theology." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- _____. "Neoorthodoxy." In *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. 324. Translated by Isaac Boyle. Reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1987.

- Falkner, William F. "Johann Amos Comenius." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Fallow, Wesner. "The Role of the Home in Religious Nurture." In *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Farley, Edward. *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Ferris, Robert W. *Renewal in Theological Education: Strategies for Change*. Wheaton, IL: Billy Graham Center, Wheaton College, 1990.
- Foltz, Nancy T., ed. *Handbook of Adult Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, n.d.
- Forrey, Jeffery S. "Building a Christian Philosophy of Education." *Christian Education Journal*, n.s., 4, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 111-24.
- Fowler, James W. *Becoming Adult, Becoming Christian*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1984.
- Fraser, Derek. *The Evolution of the British Welfare State: A History of Social Policy Since the Industrial Revolution*. 3d ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Frost, S. E., Jr., and Kenneth P. Bailey. *Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education*. 2d ed. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1973.
- Gangel, Gerald L., and Warren Benson. *Christian Education: Its History and Philosophy*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.
- Gardner, William E. "The Approach of the Church to the Home." *Religious Education* 12 (February 1917–December 1917): 351-56.
- Garland, Ken. "Sunday School Movement." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. *Church Manual*. 16th ed. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2000.
- _____. *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Ministerial and Theological Education*. Silver Spring, MD: International Board of Ministerial and Theological Education, 2001.

- _____. *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook 2002*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2002.
- George, Carl F. *Prepare Your Church for the Future*. Tarrytown, NY: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1991.
- German, T. J. "Scholasticism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Gibbs, Eugene S. *A Reader in Christian Education: Foundations and Basic Perspectives*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Gilson, Etienne. *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Graendorf, Werner C., ed. *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1972.
- Graves, Frank Pierrepont. *A History of Education During the Middle Ages and the Transition to Modern Times*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1910.
- Grenz, Stanley J., and Roger E. Olson. *20th Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- Groome, Thomas H. *Christian Religious Education: Sharing Our Story and Vision*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981.
- Hägglund, Bengt. *History of Theology*. Translated by Gene J. Lund. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.
- Hall, G. Stanley. "The Place of Formal Instruction in Religious and Moral Education." In *The Aims of Religious Education: The Proceedings of the Third Annual Convention of The Religious Education Association*. Chicago: Executive Office of the Association, 1905.
- Handy, Robert T. *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities*. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

- Harkness, Georgia. "An underlying Philosophy for Religious Education." In *Studies in Religious Education*, ed. Philip Henry Lotz and L. W. Crawford. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931.
- Harper, William Rainey. "The Scope and Purpose of the New Organization." In *The Religious Education Association: Proceedings of the First Annual Convention*. Chicago: Executive Office of the Association, 1903.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Harrison, R. L. "The Reformation." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig Brubaker Cully. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1990.
- Harvey, Van A. *A Handbook of Theological Terms*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1964.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. *Covenant in Blood*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1982.
- Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Rise of the Universities*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Hedin, Norma. "The Bible as a Curriculum." In *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*, ed. Daryl Eldridge. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1995.
- Heron, Alasdair I. C. *A Century of Protestant Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- Hilliard, Frederick. "The Training of Teachers of Religious Education: The University Departments of Education." *Religious Education: 1944-1984*, ed. A. G. Wedderspoon. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966.
- Hites, Laird T. "The Religious Education Association." In *Studies in Religious Education*, ed. Philip Henry Lotz and L. W. Crawford. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931.
- Hordern, William. *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology*. Rev. ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1968.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. *Religion in America*. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1987.

- Hulley, Lincoln. "Religious Education in the Home." *Religious Education* 2 (April 1907–February 1908): 13-16.
- Hutcheon, Robert J. "The Family: What the Home Should Contribute to Religion." *Religious Education* 16 (February 1921–December 1921): 249-53.
- Johnson-Miller, Beverly. "Medieval Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Johnston, R. K. "Liberal Evangelicalism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Ellwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Jones-Gray, Meredith. *As We Set Forth: Battle Creek College and Emmanuel Missionary College*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2002.
- Justin. *Apology*. In *Documents of the Christian Church*. 2d ed. Edited by Henry Bettenson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Kaiser, Christopher B. *The Doctrine of God*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1982.
- Kaiser, Walter C. *Toward an Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Kantzer, Kenneth S. "The Authority of the Bible." In *Readings in Christian Theology*. Vol. 1, ed. Millard J. Erickson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Kathan, Boardman W., ed. "Pioneers of Religious Education in the 20th Century." *Religious Education* 73, no. 5-S (September–October 1978): S-7--S-14.
- _____. "Religious Education Association." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig B. Cully. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990.
- Kinloch, T. F. *Pioneers of Religious Education*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.
- Knight, George R. *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*. 3d ed. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1989.
- _____. "Seventh-day Adventist Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.

- Knight, George R., ed. *Early Adventist Educators*. Berrien, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.
- Knoff, G. E. "Sunday School Movement." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig B. Cully. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990.
- Koranteng-Pipim, Samuel. *Receiving the Word: How New Approaches to the Bible Impact Our Biblical Faith and Lifestyle*. Berrien Springs, MI: Berean Books, 1996.
- Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book 2 Affective Domain*. New York: Longman, 1964.
- Kuhn, Harold. "Creation." In *Readings in Christian Theology*. Vol. 1, ed. Millard J. Erickson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Lamb, Robert L. "The Reformation." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Laux, John. *Church History*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930.
- Lawrence, Mary. "Children and the Church." *Religious Education* 12 (February 1917–December 1917): 365-69.
- Lefrancois, Guy R. *Psychology for Teaching*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1985.
- Levi, Harry. "Parents as Educators." *Religious Education* 12 (February 1917–December 1917): 357-60.
- Lightner, Robert P. *Evangelical Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986.
- Linder, Robert D. "The Reformation." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Lines, Timothy A. *Systemic Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1987.
- Livingston, James C. *Modern Christian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Vatican II*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1971.

- Lohse, Eduard. *The New Testament Environment*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- Luther, Martin. "Luther to Peter Lupinus and Andrew Carlstadt." 1519. In *Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters*, trans. and ed. Preserve Smith. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1913.
- _____. "On the Councils and the Church." 1539. In *Luther's Works*. Vol. 41. Translated by Charles M. Jacobs and edited by Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Lynn, Robert W., and Elliott Wright. *The Big Little School: Two Hundred Years of the Sunday School*. 2d ed. rev. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1980.
- Manschreck, Clyde L. *A History of Christianity: Readings in the History of the Church*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986.
- Marías, Julián. *History of Philosophy*. Translated by Stanley Appelbaum and Clarence C. Stowbridge. New York: Dover Publications, 1967.
- Marshall, C. T. "Monasticism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Martin, J. E. Harvey. "Catechumenate." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Mason, Harold Calton. "The History of Christian Education." In *An Introduction to Evangelical Christian Education*, ed. J. Edwards Hakes. Chicago: Moody Press, 1964.
- Mayer, Marlene, ed. *Modern Masters of Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1983.
- Maynard, John A. *A Survey of Hebrew Education*. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company, 1924.
- McAllister, L. G. "History of Christian Education." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig B. Cully. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990.
- McDonald, H. D. *The Christian View of Man*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1981.

- Meir, J. Kenneth. "Sunday School Movement." *A Dictionary of Religious Education*, ed. John M. Sutcliffe. London: SCM Press, 1984.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*. Translated and edited by Clyde L. Manschreck. Reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Melchert, Charles F. "What Is Religious Education?" In *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education*, ed. Jeff Astly and Leslie J. Francis. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1994.
- Merrill, George R. *The Development of the Sunday-School: 1780-1905*. Boston: The Executive Committee of the International Sunday-School Association, 1905.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. 2d ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983.
- Mickey, P.A. "Methodism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Miller, Donald E. *Story and Context: An Introduction to Christian Education*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987.
- Miller, Randolph Crump. *The Clue to Christian Education*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- _____. *The Theory of Christian Education Practice: How Theology Affects Christian Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1980.
- Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. *Seventh-day Adventists Believe: An Exposition of the Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church*. Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 2005.
- _____. *Seventh-day Adventist Minister's Handbook*. Silver Spring, MD: Ministerial Association, 1997.
- Moody, Ernest Addison. *Truth and Consequence in Medieval Logic: Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1953.
- Moran, Gabriel. "Where Now, What Next?" In *Foundations of Religious Education*, ed. Padraic O'Hare. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.

- Morris, Leon. *I Believe in Revelation*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1976.
- Mulhern, James. *A History of Education: A Social Interpretation*. 2d ed. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1959.
- Mulholland, D. A. C. "Catechetical School of Alexandria." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Murch, James Deforest. *Christian Education and the Local Church: History, Principles, Practice*. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1943.
- Naglee, David I. *From Font to Faith: John Wesley on Infant Baptism and the Nurture of Children*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Natale, Samuel N. "A Family Systems Approach to Religious Education and Development." *Religious Education* 74, no. 3 (May–June 1979): 245-53.
- Nettles, Tom J. "Evangelicalism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Newton, Gary C. "Philosophy of Christian Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- _____. "Sunday School, Early Origins." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Ng, David, and Virginia Thomas. *Children of the Worshiping Community*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- Noll, M. A. "Pietism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Oberman, Heiko Augustinus. *Masters of the Reformation: The Emergence of a New Intellectual Climate in Europe*. Translated by Dennis Martin. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Oliver, Jr., O. G. "Celibacy." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Olsen, V. Norskov. *Man, the Image of God*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1988.

- Origen. "A Letter from Origen to Gregory." 235. Sec. 1 in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 4. Reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1950.
- Ozment, Steven. "Humanism, Scholasticism, and the Intellectual Origins of the Reformation." In *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History*, ed. F. Forrester Church and Timothy George. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, no. 19. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- Ozmon, Howard A., and Samuel M. Craver. *Philosophical Foundations of Education*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1999.
- Parnaby, Mary. "The Training of Teachers of Religious Education: Training Colleges and Colleges of Education." In *Religious Education: 1944-1984*, ed. A. G. Wedderspoon. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966.
- Pazmiño, Robert W. *Foundational Issues in Christian Education*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1997.
- Pierard, R. V. "Evangelicalism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- _____. "Theological Liberalism." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Piggin, F. S. "Counter-Reformation." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Pinborg, Jan. "Speculative Grammar." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jon Pinborg. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Pinnock, Clark H. *Biblical Revelation: The Foundation of Christian Theology*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1985.
- Ponds, Norman John Greville. *The Culture of the English People: Iron Age to the Industrial Revolution*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Powers, Bruce P. "History of the Christian Education Profession." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Price, J. M., et al., ed. *A Survey of Religious Education*. 2d ed. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.

- Price, J. M., L. L. Carpenter, and J. H. Chapman, eds. *Introduction to Religious Education*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932.
- Ramm, Bernard. "The Principle and Pattern of Authority in Christianity." In *Readings in Christian Theology*. Vol. 1, ed. Millard J. Erickson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Reed, Arthea J. S., and Verna E. Bergemann. *In the Classroom: An Introduction to Education*. 2d ed. Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group/Brown & Benchmark Publishers, 1995.
- Reed, James E., and Ronnie Prevost. *A History of Christian Education*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1993.
- Rice, Edwin Wilbur. *The Sunday-School Movement and the American Sunday-School Union: 1780-1927*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Union Press, 1927.
- Rice, Richard. *God's Foreknowledge and Man's Free Will*. Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1985.
- Richards, Lawrence O. *A Theology of Christian Education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. *The Christian Doctrine of Man*. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T and T. Clark, 1926.
- Rodger, Alex R. *Education and Faith in an Open Society*. London: Handsel Press, 1982.
- Roehlkepartain, Eugene C., et al. *Strategic Youth Ministry*. Loveland, CO: Group Publishing Inc., 2000.
- Roetzel, Calvin J. *The World That Shaped the New Testament*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Rusk, Robert R. *The Doctrines of the Great Educators*. 3d ed. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Ryan, Kevin, and James M. Cooper. *Those Who Can, Teach*. 7th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1995.
- Schmidt, Stephen A. "Religious Education Association (REA)." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.

- Schnucker, R. V. "Neo-orthodoxy." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Ellwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Schrage, W. "Synagōgē." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Abridged in 1 vol. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Schwarz, R. W., and Floyd Greenleaf. *Light Bearers to the Remnant*. Rev. and updated ed. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 2000.
- Sefton, Henry R. "Cathedral." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Seymour, Jack. *From Sunday School to Church School: Continuities in Protestant Church Education in the United States, 1860-1929*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982.
- Seymour, Jack, and Donald Miller. *Contemporary Approaches to Christian Education*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982.
- Sherrill, Lewis J. *The Rise of Christian Education*. New York: Macmillan Press, 1944.
- Smart, James D. *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.
- Smith, William A. "The Church's Role in Teaching." In *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*, ed. Daryl Eldridge. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1995.
- _____. "The Family's Role in Teaching." In *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*, ed. Daryl Eldridge. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1995.
- Southworth, Franklin C. "The Church as an Educator: Is Education a New Function of the Church?" *Religious Education* 11 (February 1916–December 1916): 477-82.
- Spinka, Matthew. "Jan Amos Comenius (Komensky)." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Spitz, Lewis William. *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1971.

- Steinmetz, David C. "Jansenism." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Sternheim, Emanuel. "The function of the Home." *Religious Education* 13 (February 1918–December 1918): 33-35.
- Stewart, Donald G. "History of Christian Education." *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Kendig Brubaker Cully. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Stolz, Karl R. "Historical Development of Religious Education in America." In *Studies in Religious Education*, ed. Philip Henry Lotz and L. W. Crawford. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931.
- Sullivan, William. *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Sweeney, Douglas A. "Jesuits and the Counter Reformation." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Taylor, Marvin J. *Foundations for Christian Education in an Era of Change*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- _____. "A Historical Introduction to Religious Education." In *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- _____. "Introduction." In *An Introduction to Christian Education*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- _____. *Religious and Moral Education*. New York: Center for the Applied Research in Education, 1965.
- Tenney, Merrill C. *New Testament Survey*. Revised by Walter M. Dunnnett. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Tertullian. *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*. 203. In *Documents of the Christian Church*. 2d ed., ed. Henry Bettenson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.

- _____. "The Role of Theology in Religious Education: An Introduction." In *Religious Education and Theology*, ed. Norma Hoyt Thompson. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1982.
- Thompson, Norma Hoyt. "The Role of Theology in Religious Education: An Introduction." In *Religious Education and Theology*, ed. Norma Hoyt Thompson. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1982.
- Thwing, Charles Franklin. "The Family as an Agency for Religious Education." *Religious Education* 10 (February 1915–December 1915): 279-82.
- Toon, P. "Catechumen." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Towns, Elmer, ed. *A History of Religious Educators*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1975.
- Tuttle, Jr., R. G. "John Wesley." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Ulich, Robert. *A History of Religious Education: Documents and Interpretations from the Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. New York: New York University Press, 1968.
- Ure, Andrew. *The Philosophy of Manufactures*. 3d ed. London: Bohn Publishers, 1961.
- van Gelder, Hermann Arend Enno. *The Two Reformations in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of the Religious Aspects and Consequences of Humanism*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1961.
- VanderMolen, R. J. "Philipp Jakob Spener." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Vande Vere, Emmett K. *The Wisdom Seekers*. Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1972.
- Vieth, Paul H. *The Church and Christian Education*. St. Louis, MO: Bethany Press, 1947.
- Wagner, C. Peter. *Leading Your Church to Growth*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1984.
- _____. *Strategies for Church Growth: Tools for Effective Mission and Evangelism*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1987.

- Walker, Williston. *A History of the Christian Church*. 3d ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
- Wamble, Hugh. *History of Christian Thought*. Nashville: Seminary Extension Department of Southern Baptist Seminaries, 1969.
- Wegenast, K. "Didaskalos." *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Vol. 3, ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.
- White, Ellen G. *Child Guidance*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982.
- _____. *Counsels on Education*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1968.
- _____. *Counsels on Sabbath School Work*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1938.
- _____. *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1913.
- _____. *Education*. Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1952.
- _____. *Fundamentals of Christian Education*. Nashville: Southern Publishing, 1923.
- _____. *Patriarchs and Prophets*. Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1958.
- _____. *Testimonies for the Church*. Vol. 3. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948.
- _____. *Testimonies for the Church*. Vol. 5. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948.
- Williams, Dennis E. "Christian Education." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Williamson, William Bedford. *Language and Concepts in Christian Education*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- Willis, Wesley R. "History of the Sunday School." *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, ed. Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2001.

- Winchester, Benjamin S. "The Task of Religious Education." *Religious Education* 5, no. 3 (August 1910): 227-31.
- Wood, A. Skevington. "John Wesley." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Working Policy of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists*. 2005-2006 ed. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2005.
- Wornom, Herman E. "The Religious Education Association." In *Religious Education* 53, no. 5 (September–October 1963): 443-52.
- _____. "The Religious Education Association." In *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Wright, D. F. "Monasticism." *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas and Earle E. Cairns. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- _____. "Protestant Reformation." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter E. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Wyckoff, D. Campbell. "Religious Education as a Discipline." *Religious Education* 62, no. 5 (September 1967–October 1967): 387-94.
- _____. *The Task of Christian Education*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.
- Youngberg, John B. "Seventh-day Adventist Education." *Harper's Encyclopedia of Religious Education*, ed. Iris V. Cully and Kendig B. Cully. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990.
- Yount, William R. *Created to Learn*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1996.

VITA

VITA

I was born to Jorge E. Rico and María N. Muñoz on 8 April 1961, in Cali, Colombia. I attended grammar and junior high school in Colombia. On 3 July 1977, at the age of 16, my father brought me to New Jersey where I attended Passaic High School and received my diploma in 1980. In February 1979, during my junior year in high school, Pastor Juan Chavez baptized me into the Passaic Seventh-day Adventist Church. The summer following my high school graduation, I enrolled in a computer programming course at The Plaza School in Paramus, New Jersey. A diploma in computer programming was conferred upon completion of the program. On 7 June 1981, Elizabeth Prado and I were married in Passaic, New Jersey. Then the two of us returned to Colombia in January 1982 where I pursued a theology degree at the Colombia-Venezuela Union College.

Two years later, my wife and I returned to New Jersey. We had decided that I would complete my ministerial training at Columbia Union College in Takoma Park, Maryland. Contacts with the New Jersey Conference culminated with my being hired as a minister immediately after my graduation in May 1986. Four months later the conference administration sponsored me to pursue the Master of Divinity degree at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in Berrien Springs, Michigan. While in Michigan, my wife gave birth to our first child, Michelle E., on 15 March 1987. I

completed my M.Div. degree in 1989 and returned to the New Jersey Conference to serve as a district pastor. It was in New Jersey where Jorge E. III was born to us on 4 April 1989.

In June 1991, I was ordained to the gospel ministry in New Jersey. Two years later, in 1993, I received an invitation from the president of the Texico Conference to pastor the Corrales Seventh-day Adventist Church and to teach Bible at Sandia View Academy (SVA) in Corrales, New Mexico. In 1995, the administration of the Oregon Conference contacted me with the purpose of starting the Hispanic ministry in Southern Oregon. While in Oregon, in August 1997, I earned my D.Min. degree with an emphasis on Pastoral Ministry. The title of my dissertation was “A Seminar on the Dynamics, Prevention, and Legal Implications of Clergy Sexual Misconduct.” After almost five years of ministry in Oregon, the administration of Atlantic Union College invited me to be the Vice-President for Enrollment Services. While serving the college, the chair of the Religion Department asked me to teach some courses in religion.

In June 2001, the administration of the Texico Conference invited me back to serve as a pastor in Albuquerque, NM. In addition to pastoring, I was asked by the Conference administration to be the ministerial secretary. The principal of SVA also asked me to teach Bible. After five years of service in Texico, in January 2006, the administration of Southwestern Adventist University invited me to teach in the Religion Department. My family and I are happy to be in this part of the country. We are delighted to serve the Lord and look forward to serving Him until He comes back to take us to our heavenly home.