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PREFACE
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I am grateful to my professors. I learned so much from their wisdom and experience. Thanks especially to Dr. Pettegrew and Dr. Wilder. I had multiple classes with each of you, which afforded me multiple opportunities to glean valuable insights from your teaching and your lives. My leadership and ministry have benefitted and grown because of you two.

My wife and our family made significant sacrifices to allow for this learning. Thank you, Marcia. You are an incredible wife and mother.

Finally, I must thank my God. Most Christians are never allowed the opportunity to study and learn in this way. It is truly a gift from the Lord. Thank you, Father, for the strength to finish well. All glory to you.

Jeffrey R. Martell

Norton, Ohio

May 2011
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the effectiveness of a lecture-based pedagogical teaching philosophy versus a discussion-based andragogical teaching philosophy in Adult Bible Fellowships at The Chapel in Akron, Ohio.

Goals

Four goals for this project determined its effectiveness. The first goal was for the participating Adult Bible Fellowship (ABF) teachers to learn the tenets of andragogical teaching. This project sought to offer these teachers a theoretical rationale as well as tangible methodology for andragogical teaching for utilization in ABFs.

The second goal involved new ABF (and Home ABF) teachers adopting a more effective teaching philosophy and methodology from the beginning of their service in their groups, resulting in a more participatory style. Many current adult teachers at The Chapel choose to teach their Sunday ABF lessons in a lecture-based format, thus offering the learner two lectures (the Sunday sermon and the ABF lesson) on different topics each Sunday. Current literature suggests that this lecture format is not the most effective method among adult learners in a midsized or small-group setting (Patterson 1993, 125). Although difficult to change dramatically, the teaching styles of long-time lecture-style teachers, training and encouraging new teachers to utilize participatory
methods in their teaching was reasonable and attainable. Despite the challenge to shift the teaching style of a long-time lecturer, it proved worthwhile to instruct the teachers in the value of the andragogical method. The third goal of this project was to develop a teacher-training curriculum to equip all ongoing teachers of ABFs and Home ABFs at The Chapel to foster effective learning in their groups, inform them of the tenets of andragogical teaching, and encourage them to utilize it in their groups.

The final goal consisted of presenting the tenets of andragogy to the adult learners in the participating ABFs. The adult learners showed a greater understanding of the tenets of andragogy, and more highly valued dialogue and discussion, critical reflection, and active participation in the learning process. It is simpler for learners to observe passively in a lecture format, moving in and out of engagement with the teacher and material, especially when one has become accustomed to this method of instruction. It may be challenging for these learners to value the alternative andragogical method in the long term, in which they must more actively engage in the learning process.

**Ministry Context**

The Chapel is a mega church located in the greater Akron, Ohio, area. In the early 1930s, the Furnace Street Mission was active in Akron, bringing many people to the Lord. It soon became evident that there was a need for a strong, biblically based church that emphasized grace and the finished work of Christ. In 1934 The Chapel opened its doors in a small storefront on Five Points, and later in a new building on Brown Street and Vine Street, with Carl Burnham as senior pastor (the-chapel.org 2009).

The Lord greatly blessed the church, bringing many in the Akron area to know
Christ through the faithfulness and outreach of its members. As the church grew, it chose to reach out further into the community by having Bible studies in the homes of its members in various parts of the city. Soon came the need for a larger building in which to worship. In 1955 a new building was opened just a few blocks from the previous location. In 1963 Pastor Carl Burnham passed away, and his son, Pastor David Burnham, became the next senior pastor. God used the younger Burnham greatly in the church. By 1973, with nearly 4,500 people, The Chapel built a new worship center as an addition to its current building (the-chapel.org 2009).

In 1983 Burnham retired, and Pastor Knute Larson became the third senior pastor at The Chapel. Larson brought with him a new philosophy of ministry that centered around a model he called Adult Bible Fellowships, or ABFs. The home Bible studies soon transformed into mid-sized affinity based groups that met on the campus of the church on Sundays. This change resonated well with the needs of the people, and by 2002 The Chapel had grown to about 7000 people (the-chapel.org 2009).

With five worship services each Sunday, the need for change became apparent. The large building sat landlocked on a relatively small space in downtown Akron. Through much prayer and discussion, the leadership of The Chapel decided to build a second large campus ten miles south of its current building. The tagline, “One church, two locations,” was used in this endeavor, and a second campus was constructed in Green, Ohio. The goal was for one third of its members to attend the new campus, giving both campuses room to grow.

The Green Campus was initially a great success. It did, in fact, open room at the two campuses for growth. However, after an initial surge in Sunday attendance to
about 8,000 people, there was a plateau and even a decline in attendance and membership in the last few years. Also during this time there has been another transition in senior leadership. At age sixty-two, Larson made clear his intent to retire. He wanted the next senior pastor in place so that the two could serve together for a period and make the transition as painless as possible for the church.

In 2006 Pastor Paul Sartarelli was hired as the next senior pastor at The Chapel. There was a five-year transition plan in place in which both Larson and Sartarelli served together in senior leadership with Sartarelli’s role increasing and Larson’s decreasing until Larson’s retirement and Sartarelli’s appointment to the senior pastor position. Larson retired in May 2009. It was anticipated that the change in leadership would have an adverse effect on attendance and membership because Larson had been so well loved during his twenty-five year tenure at The Chapel. That concern has become reality.

Throughout this transition in senior leadership, the leadership team at The Chapel has embarked on a reevaluation effort of its mission, vision, values, and strategy. The Chapel is a large, program-based church, and the reevaluation process has been a healthy one, underscoring ministries The Chapel needs to persist in as well as revealing areas in which there has been drift from the vision.

As stated previously, The Chapel is currently “one church, two locations.” Both campuses lie in Summit County; however, the Green Campus is near Stark County. The Chapel also has a large camp facility in Portage County. The church draws people from Cuyahoga County, Medina County, and other counties in northeastern Ohio. This diversity makes acquiring demographical information a bit challenging. However, since
Summit County is the largest county, with demographical information very similar to Stark County, and since the majority of church members and attendees dwell in that area, the community statistical information that follows will focus on Summit County only. The following most recent statistical information is from the United States Census Bureau for 2005-2007 (factfinder.census.gov 2009).

The ages of the population in Summit County are across the spectrum, with the majority (42.2%) between 25 and 54. Those over 64 are only 13.9% of the population. The population has been stable, with a slight increase in the latest data. Most of the 220,000 households in Summit County consist of families (65%), with the average household having 2.4 people. Over one-third of the population lives alone or apart from any family. Summit County is a predominantly Caucasian population (83.3%). Of the remaining 17% of the population, the overwhelming majority is Black or African American (14.2%). The only other statistically significant race is Asian at 1.8%. Ninety-six percent of people living in Summit County are native to the US, and 76% were born in Ohio.

Eighty-nine percent of people in Summit County 25 years and older graduated from high school, and 29% of people have a bachelor’s degree or higher. As the center of the rubber industry, Summit County used to be a predominantly blue-collar area in decades past. Since the rubber companies have moved out of the area, Summit County has become much more white-collar and service-oriented, rather than industrial. Sixty-two percent of the population 16 years and older works in either professional or management-related fields, or sales and office positions. In contrast, only about 22% work in the more traditional blue-collar laborer positions.
The median income of households in Summit County is $46,997 per year. Thirteen percent of the population is in poverty. It should also be noted that because the economy has declined since these statistics were taken (2005-2007), the percentage of those in poverty has likely risen and the annual household income could very well have decreased.

The demographics of membership and attendance at The Chapel are somewhat different than that of Summit County. Like Summit County, the majority of people are white. At last measure, 97% of members and attendees were white. The average age of members and attendees is in the low 50s, as opposed to Summit County’s median age of 38.8. In general, the members and attendees of The Chapel are also well-educated, with over half having a college degree, as opposed to Summit County’s 36%. The age, education, and spiritual maturity of members and attendees contribute to the fact that there are numerous qualified teachers among the laity of The Chapel. There are also many older, long-time Christians that enjoy listening to these mature, qualified brothers teach. However, in a broad sense the church seems to be missing the younger (in terms of age as well as spiritual maturity) Christians who often desire to learn, grow, and process their faith through peer discussion and dialogue.

The Chapel is in the declining phase of the organizational life cycle. There are many reasons why the church is where it is in its life cycle (leadership transition, rise and fall of the mega church, Emerging Church Movement, leadership’s hesitancy to make organizational climate changes to better cater to young adults, etc.). However, senior leadership realizes the present state and is committed to working hard to move towards rebirth.
The strengths of The Chapel are numerous. First, The Chapel has a long history of sound biblical teaching and exposition, God-honoring worship, and a strong sense of mission. The newest senior pastor will only continue in this history. Second, The Chapel has a positive name and reputation in the area. The Chapel continuously seeks out ways to tangibly bless the city and world. The community recognizes this effort and appreciates it. Third, The Chapel has a strong financial outlook with no debt of any kind. Fourth, the locations of its two campuses are well placed with dense populations of people surrounding them. Green Campus is in a growing, upper middle-class suburb. Akron Campus is situated in downtown Akron, right next to a large state university. Fifth, the ministry and support staffs are gifted at what they do and can very adequately serve in their areas of ministry. This is especially true of the current senior pastor and executive pastor who are strong leaders with solid vision for the church. These leaders understand where the church is and are very realistic about changes that need to take place. Sixth, the congregation is comprised of a high percentage of mature Christians. These mature believers willingly serve, lead, and participate in the life and needs of the church. A final strength is that many congregants grew up in the church and have attended The Chapel for over ten years. These attendees are committed to the church and will not easily leave for less than significant reasons.

Unfortunately, there are also numerous weaknesses and limitations for effective ministry at The Chapel. An historical problem at The Chapel, which is significantly improving in recent years, is that things do not happen quickly. It is very difficult to make decisions “on the fly” because there are so many approvals that need to take place before decisions can be made. Second, as stated above, the congregation is
comprised of a high percentage of mature Christians who have attended The Chapel for more than ten years. The weakness of this reality is that the church is not effectively reaching the unchurched. Many Chapel members and attendees have lost touch with those that are not part of The Chapel. Although mature Christians should have more knowledge and experience sharing Christ with the unchurched, it is clear that most are not doing it and have very few relationships with unbelievers, as evidenced by the low number of conversions and baptisms.

The third weakness of The Chapel is that it offers a very diverse and large set of activities and programs. It has often been said that The Chapel has something for everyone. While having many choices can be seen as positive, it also creates significant weaknesses. For example, there are too many “good” activities to distract people from the most significant ones. Also, the discipleship process, which is not particularly clear to begin with, becomes even more convoluted by the numerous programs. The congregant can get involved in many ministries at The Chapel while never growing into a balanced disciple of Christ. On top of all this, the staff is tempted to focus on programs above people.

Finally, the fourth weakness of The Chapel is that there has historically been an overall “play it safe” climate in decision-making and ministry programming. Certainly the prudent Christian should not make overly risky, unwise decisions. However, there are also times when a choice needs to be made in faith, “against the odds” so to speak, trusting that the Lord will make it happen. With the exception of building the Green Campus, most of the decisions in ministry have not required the supernatural blessing and presence of God to succeed. This conservative approach seems to trickle
down to lay teachers, who often prefer the same lecture-style lesson in their ABFs rather than the unsafe and unpredictable discussion.

**Rationale**

Paul writes in Romans 10:15, “How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news!” The believer has been entrusted with the best news of all time, and he has the privilege and responsibility to share this news and teach it to others. In 2 Timothy 2:2, Paul tells Timothy, “And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable men who will also be qualified to teach others.” Leaders in the church who have been taught the wonderful truths about Jesus Christ are called, like Paul calls Timothy, to entrust these truths to reliable men who are qualified to teach others. But how can these reliable men, who are qualified to teach, effectively communicate these truths to others? Someone must instruct these teachers in how to make their listeners become learners.

Teaching in the church is a high calling with great responsibility. If believers are to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them and teaching them to obey all the commandments of Christ, as Jesus instructs His church in Matthew 28:19, then the need for effective teaching is crucial.

Teaching is only effective if learning occurs (Yount 1996, 94). Learners need an environment in which they can verbalize their faith, thoughts, and feelings, discuss their relationship with God, share their experiences, listen, and relate to others’ experiences (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 64-68), ask questions burning in their hearts, and offer answers to questions burning in others’ hearts (Larson 1997, 15-17).

When church attendees find such an environment, they continue in it. They
become more completely assimilated into that local community of believers and participate in the purpose and mission of the church. It is this writer’s hope that this project contributes to making that a reality at The Chapel.

Definitions

The purpose of this project was to help the reader understand how to teach most effectively adult students in ABFs at The Chapel. The project contrasted the effectiveness of andragogical teaching versus teaching pedagogically.

Adult Bible Fellowships. Larson writes, “Adult Bible Fellowships are groups for study and fellowship, organized around the Sunday morning adult Bible study hour, often called Sunday School. They have guidelines and goals, and much variety” (Larson 1997, 10). In addition, ABFs are generally mid-sized groups of 15 to 80 people, generally based on a particular affinity like singles, young married couples, or senior citizens. The ABFs at The Chapel are defined by the acronym “E.C.O.,” which stands for Equipping, Care, and Outreach, all of which are essential components of every ABF.

Andragogical teaching. Andragogical teaching was defined in this project as discussion-based in which adults are “highly participative in the learning process” (Patterson 1993, 125). Malcolm Knowles states the precepts for andragogical teaching:

In contrast, the andragogical model focuses on the education of adults and is based on the following precepts: adults need to know why they need to learn something; adults maintain the concept of responsibility for their own decision, their own lives; adults enter the educational activity with a greater volume and more varied experiences than do children; adults have a readiness to learn those things that they need to know in order to cope effectively with real-life situations; adults are life-centered in their orientation to learning; and adults are more responsive to internal motivators than external motivators. (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 72)

Pedagogical teaching. Etymologically pedagogy is defined as the teaching of
children (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 36). However, pedagogical teaching was defined in this project as lecture-based in which “the teacher is the expert in the content area and presents information to the learner who passively absorbs whatever is required” (Patterson 1993, 125). Essentially, in pedagogical teaching, the teacher speaks almost exclusively and the learner listens with very little verbal interaction.

**Limitations**

The limitations and delimitations of this project were the following: First, the project was fifteen weeks. Second, the project was conducted in two ABFs at The Chapel and offer conclusions that apply directly to those two ABFs. Both groups met at the same campuses, had approximately twenty attendees per week, and were composed of senior adults ages sixty years and older. Third, a teacher-training curriculum was created at the end of the project and will be used for future training of adult teachers at The Chapel. Therefore, only the two teachers and assistant teachers, in the ABFs during the project, can be considered. The long-term results of the project’s impact on current adult teachers at The Chapel are beyond the scope of this project. Fourth, this project will result in a change to the training requirements for new ABF and Home ABF teachers at The Chapel. They will be encouraged and challenged to utilize participatory methods in their teaching. Given the nature of this fifteen-week project, the long-term effect this change will have on new ABF and Home ABF teachers is also beyond the scope of this project.
Research Methodology

As stated above, the project was fifteen weeks. The first five weeks were spent doing the preliminary work, specifically, preparing eight lessons from the book of Ephesians and the project questionnaires. The eight lessons were based on four different passages, with a lesson prepared that used pedagogical methods and a lesson prepared that used andragogical methods for each passage.

For four weeks, this writer taught the four pedagogical lessons to the Fellowheirs I ABF at The Chapel. Pre-series questionnaires and post-series questionnaires were given to the participants. The pre-series questionnaires were administered immediately before the first lesson. The post-series questionnaires were administered immediately following the series. Simultaneously, this writer taught the four andragogical lessons to the Fellowheirs II ABF at The Chapel, with the same pre-series questionnaire and post-series questionnaires given to class participants.

The next five weeks were spent analyzing the data collected from the questionnaires in determining to what degree the andragogical lessons were more effective in helping the learners. During this time, a teacher-training curriculum was created to be utilized at The Chapel for future development of adult teachers. Summaries of the statistical analysis from the questionnaires and of andragogical teaching were also created during this period.

The final week of the project was spent presenting the findings of the project, as well as a summary explanation of andragogical teaching, to the regular teachers of the participating ABFs and their class members. The teachers and class members were each given summary sheets of the project’s conclusions and of andragogical teaching.
The questionnaires used for the class members were developed to measure biblical knowledge acquired through the project, the personal life application of concepts taught through the lessons, as well as the value the learner placed on the particular teaching methodology. Results from the questionnaires were most valuable on the individual level. These results demonstrated what each project participant learned, applied, and valued throughout the course of the project. The project participants that completed questionnaires used the last four digits of their social security number as their identifier. The criterion for class member inclusion in the project was that the individual attend at least three out of the four lessons. The participating ABF teachers were asked to attend all four lessons. Questionnaires consisted of questions answered using a Likert scale, objective short answer, and multiple-choice. All questionnaires were consistent with Southern Baptist Theological Seminary standards, received approval by the seminary ethics committee, and were conducted in hard copy form.

The first goal of the project, that the ABF teachers participating in this project learn the tenets of andragogical teaching, was met as these teachers received the findings of this project and were given an explanation of andragogical teaching. Special care was taken with these teachers to answer any questions that arose regarding the project results or andragogical teaching. This writer’s contact information was given to the participating teachings if any further questions arose.

The second goal, that new ABF and Home ABF teachers adopt a more participatory teaching style, was met when changes were made to the new teacher application and training requirements for new ABF and Home ABF teachers that reflect the benefits of participatory teaching among adult learners in the ABF environment. This
included a short report of the findings of this project as well as a short explanation of andragogical teaching. These were the same reports given at the conclusion of this project to the ABF teachers that participated in this project, as explained above.

The third goal, to develop a teacher-training curriculum that equips all ongoing teachers of ABFs and Home ABFs to utilize the tenets of andragogical teaching, was met when a new teacher-training curriculum, based on the results of this project, was developed to guide existing teachers of adults at The Chapel to bring about more effective learning in their groups.

The fourth goal, that the adult learners in the participating ABFs understand the tenets of andragogy and more highly value dialogue and discussion, critical reflection, and active participation in the learning process, was met when ABF student participants received the summary of findings of this project and were given an explanation of andragogical teaching.
CHAPTER 2
AN ASSESSMENT OF KEY BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS RELATED TO ANDRAGOGICAL TEACHING

Introduction

Are there any theological doctrines supporting andragogical teaching in the church today? What do the Scriptures say about adult learning? How did the teachers in the early church teach? In understanding the validity of an andragogical teaching methodology in the church today, it is important to understand and assess key biblical and theological concepts that relate to the nature of the believer, the nature of the church, and the nature of how believers learn and grow as disciples of Christ. The following will examine these topics.

The Priesthood of All Believers

Every human being is ontologically created in the image of God (Gen 1:26; 9:6; Jas 3:9) and inherently reflects that image, though marred by the fall. According to 2 Corinthians 1:21-22, every true disciple of Jesus Christ also has the Holy Spirit living inside of him. Words on a page do not do justice to the significance of this reality. The fullness of the Godhead lives inside of every redeemed follower of Jesus Christ! If the role of the Holy Spirit is to sanctify the believer (1 Pet 1:2), to make him holy and more clearly reflective of humanity’s inherent image of Jesus Christ, imagine the growth potential each individual with the Spirit of God living and working inside of him. Each
person’s point of growth is different from others at any given time. It is, however, the Spirit’s indwelling that makes every individual an integral part of the kingdom of God. In addition, each believer has influence to share and gifts to offer for the building up of others in the kingdom.

In his first epistle, the apostle Peter presents a doctrine originally applied to the nation of Israel (Exod 19:5-6) that is reapplied, or perhaps transferred, to the followers of Jesus Christ. In 1 Peter 2:4-10, Peter writes that those that come to the Living Stone, Jesus Christ, are also like living stones being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood. One becomes a “living stone” by faith in the resurrected Jesus Christ (Clendenen 2003, 104-05). The word οἶκος (oikos, house) refers to the temple and is πνευματικός (pneumatikos, spiritual) because it is indwelt with the Holy Spirit (Clendenen 2003, 105). So believers are living stones being built into a spiritual house to be indwelt by the Spirit of God.

In the original priesthood established in the Old Testament, priests were appointed by God to offer sacrifices, prayers, and praise to God on behalf of the people. This, in turn, sanctified the people and made them acceptable to come into God’s presence (Grudem 1994, 626). The priests were limited to a select tribe, the Levites, and were set apart as intermediaries between the people and God. Peter, however, writes that all believers in the risen Christ are being built up into a holy priesthood, meaning all believers have direct access to God, and the responsibility to minister to others in God’s family, that is, serving and helping other “living stones” (Edge 1985, 43-44).

Peter reaffirms this truth in verses 9-10. Believers are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, and a people belonging to God. They have this distinction so
that they may declare the praises of the saving God who rescued them from darkness and placed them in His wonderful light. According to Peter, there is clearly a purpose, or mission, to this holy priesthood that is being built up. The purpose of the holy priesthood is to offer “πνευματικος (pneumatikos, spiritual) θυσιας (thusia, sacrifices)” to God. It has long been debated as to the nature of these spiritual sacrifices. Among ideas like the evangelization of the world, the Eucharist, the dedication of the entire person to God, and self-surrender, Jobes makes note that Peter later writes in 2:9 that the royal priesthood is to declare the praises of God (Jobes 2005, 150). Perhaps these declarations themselves are the spiritual sacrifices. She notes that these declarations are not by words alone, but also by living good lives. Therefore, these spiritual sacrifices can generally be understood as “all behavior that flows from a transformation of the human spirit by the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit (1:2)” (Jobes 2005, 151).

In a further understanding of this holy priesthood, Schreiner notes that “Peter was not thinking mainly of each individual functioning as a priest before God. The focus here is on the church corporately as God’s set-apart priesthood in which the emphasis is likely on believers functioning as priests” (Schreiner 2003, 106). Schreiner goes on to suggest that Western believers tend to individualize the notion of the priesthood instead of seeing the community emphasis (Schreiner 2003, 106). He concedes that Peter’s words also apply to the individual as well. However, Schreiner stresses that the individual is not the focus.

Interestingly, Calvin takes a similar perspective on this passage, with a greater emphasis on the living stones metaphor rather than the holy priesthood. Calvin writes,

We must further observe, that he constructs one house from the whole number of the faithful. For though every one of us is said to be the temple of God, yet all are
united together in one, and must be joined together by mutual love, so that one
temple may be made of us all. Then, as it is true that each one is a temple in which
God dwells by his Spirit, so all ought to be so fitted together, that they may form
one universal temple. This is the case when every one, content with his own
measure, keeps himself within the limits of his own duty; all have, however,
something to do with regard to others. (Calvin 1999, 64-65)

Therefore, Calvin similarly supports an interpretation of this passage that emphasizes a
community or corporate understanding of the living stones and holy priesthood into
which believers are being built, as well as a secondary emphasis on the individual.

**Implications for Andragogical Teaching**

Although removed from a context of adult education, Peter’s instruction on the
priesthood of all believers is significant in formulating a philosophy of Christian adult
education in the church today. If all believers are indwelt with the Holy Spirit, all are
being taught, sanctified, and led by the Spirit of God. Every believer has a direct line to
the Creator of the universe. Since this is true, then each individual has the potential to
learn directly from the Lord and, in turn, share with other learners the wisdom, insights,
and experiences personally learned from a direct relationship with God.

Secondly, when one becomes a Christian, he or she is meant to be in
community with other Christians. He is another “brick in the wall,” so to speak, that
together with the other bricks forms the communal residence for the presence of the Spirit
of God. The Christian is designed to be in intimate relationships with other believers. In
these prescribed relationships, there is growth—both individual growth and corporate
growth. To build on the metaphor of believers being built into a spiritual house, each
living stone is built upon other living stones and relies on them for support. Each living
stone also supports other living stones and provides them with a foundation for increasing
growth. Therefore, although the Cornerstone, Jesus Christ, is essential for the rest of the building’s structure and soundness, Christian growth in this life does not come only because of the Cornerstone. Instead, each stone also needs the other stones for the growth necessary to become a well-built structure (Rom 12:9-10, 15-16; 13:8; 15:14; Col 3:16; 1 Thess 5:11; Heb 3:13; 10:24-25).

Thirdly, the declaration that believers are also a holy priesthood is telling. As stated above, the Old Testament priests were the intermediaries between God and His people. They alone could approach God and offer sacrifices, prayers, and praises on behalf of the people. They had direct access to God. Believers too have direct access to God through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Exod 28:38; Lev 10:17; Heb 10:19-22) (Mounce 2006, 537).

The other party the priests go between, however, is significant too: the people of God. Priests ministered to the people. They served them and supported them. They encouraged them and proclaimed to them the love, mercy, and forgiveness of God (Lev 9; Deut 18:5; Neh 8:1-8). Therefore, since all believers are now holy priests, Christians should minister to one and other in a similar manner: serving and supporting each other, encouraging each other with the truth of God’s Word, and pronouncing His love, mercy, and forgiveness to one and other (Rom 14:13; 15:14; 1 Cor 1:10; Eph 4:2, 32).

How does all this relate to andragogical teaching in the church? First, every Christian has been indwelt with the Holy Spirit to seal him, but also to instruct him and mature him as a follower of Jesus Christ. Second, Christians have been designed to be in community with one another, meeting each other’s needs, and growing together into a spiritual house. Finally, each Christian is now a holy priest, not only able to approach
God directly, but also to minister, serve, support, and instruct one and other.

Some Christ-followers have been given the gift, responsibility, calling, and office to teach in the church (Rom 12:7; Eph 4:11-12). Most, however, are not gifted to teach the Word of God in this formal capacity. Yet all believers, according to their various abilities and gifts, have the responsibility to contribute to the support and growth of the complete body of Christ through the ministry and calling God has given them as well as the example of their lives. The question arises: Where are believers collectively gathered and able to offer this ministry to each other? The answer: In their Bible studies, worship services, small groups, Sunday School classes, and Adult Bible Fellowships. These gatherings are excellent times in which believers can minister to one another while learning together, where each is able to use his own gifts and experiences to build up others.

In addition to the church being a priesthood of believers and living stones, which are being built into a spiritual house, Paul also compared the church to a human body. In his epistle to the Ephesians and his first epistle to the Corinthians, Paul unveils his metaphor for the church as the body of Christ. The following section will investigate this metaphor and the implications it has for andragogical teaching.

**Believers as the Body of Christ**

Hearing that one cannot see God the Father because He has no physical body, a young boy once asked, “Does Jesus have a body?” Struck by the intelligence and simplicity of the question, the boy’s father quickly thought of Jesus’ preexistence, incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and ascension—and wondered himself if the post-incarnate Son still had a body. Then he remembered 1 Corinthians 12 and replied, “Yes.”
Does Jesus have a physical body? Yes, the church is the body of Christ. It is certainly a humbling notion to realize that as a follower of Christ, one is also part of the body of Christ on earth. Yet, this is the privileged position in which believers find themselves.

1 Corinthians 12:4-31

The Apostle Paul first uses the metaphor of the church as a body in 1 Corinthians 12. The overarching thesis of chapter 12 is that all Christians are spiritual, now that they are led and indwelt with the Holy Spirit (Garland 2003, 561). As spiritual beings led and indwelt by the Holy Spirit, believers are also gifted by that same Spirit. Since the Corinthians viewed the gift of tongues as greater than other gifts and as a sign that the recipients of this gift were especially spiritual, Paul wrote this passage to emphasize the value of all spiritual gifts, and to end the division created by the Corinthians’ glamorization of the gift of tongues (Garland 2003, 574). The one Spirit gave all gifts, just as He determined, for the common good.

Diversity is valuable. In this passage Paul stresses the value and beauty of diversity. He begins with the Godhead (1 Cor 12:4-6). He suggests that within the Godhead there are different gifts, service, and working, but the same Spirit, Lord, and God. In the one Godhead is diversity in Person and function, as well as equality of Persons and unity in purpose (Deut 6:4; 1 Cor 8:4; Phil 2:5-11; Heb 1; Acts 5:3-4; John 16:8-11; 2 Cor 13:14; 1 Pet 1:2) (McGrath 1988, 130-31). Boice says it well:

While each is fully divine, the three persons of the Godhead are related to each other in a way that implies some differences. Thus, it is usually said in Scripture that the Father (not the Spirit) sent the Son into the world (Mk. 9:37; Mt. 10:40; Gal. 4:4), but that both the Father and the Son send the Spirit (Jn. 14:26; 15:26; 16:7). We
don’t know fully what such a description of relationships within the Trinity means. But usually it is said that the Son is subject to the Father, for the Father sent him, and that the Spirit is subject to both the Father and the Son, for he is sent into the world by both the Son and the Father. However, we must remember that when we speak of subjection we don’t mean inequality. Thus, although related to each other in these ways, the members of the Godhead are “the same in substance, equal in power and glory,” as the Westminster Shorter Catechism says. . . . In the work of God the members of the Godhead work together. (Boice 1978, 145)

This diversity in the Godhead is also reflected in His people. The same Spirit gifts individual believers in unique ways for the common good (1 Cor 12:7). Some believers are given more public gifts that inspire and awe, while to others are given more common gifts that are just as necessary for the good of the whole. All the gifts are necessary to keep the body from becoming a grotesque monstrosity or even worse, obsolete (Fee 1987, 583).

**Interdependence.** There is also an interdependence the various parts of the body have with one and other (1 Cor 12:21-26) (Hays 1997, 207). Each part would have a difficult time functioning properly without the other parts. One part of the body cannot say to another that it is not needed, and the weaker or less honorable parts of the body should have special treatment and be held in equal concern as all other parts. In commenting on verses 21-26, Hays writes that Paul offers the analogy of the church as the body “not to keep subordinates in their places but to urge more privileged members of the community to respect and value the contributions of those members who appear to be their inferiors, both in social status and in spiritual potency” (Hays 1997, 213). If one part of the body suffers, the other interdependent parts should suffer with it. If one part of the body is honored, the other interdependent parts should rejoice with it. The interdependence God created inherent in the various parts of His church necessitates that
each part values each other and remains an undivided whole.

**Active diversity is necessary for completeness and unity.** Simple diversity in the body of Christ, however, is not enough. Interdependence is a painful hindrance if certain parts of the body are not functioning properly. Each diverse part must also actively use his gifts for the common good. Implicit in Paul’s thoughts in 1 Corinthians 12 is that gifted believers use their gifts and not simply possess them. Those with the gift of administration must use that gift in the leadership and organization of the church. Those with the gift of faith must use that gift to help others in their faith. Those with the gift of wisdom must contribute to the decision-making of the church to help it effectively reach the world. Those with the gift of helping others must serve others to the glory of God. It is not enough to be diverse or even value diversity. For the body to function in wholeness, the diverse parts must offer and use their gifts for the good of the whole.

When the diverse parts of the body use their gifts, they must also be united in purpose. If the various parts of the body all actively move towards their own differing purposes, the body as a whole is pulled apart and useless. It is the same in the church. If there is not a unity of purpose to which all individuals in the church can support and work towards in their own unique ways, then the church, too, will be pulled apart and become useless. Believers in the local and universal church must work together in unity to be effective for the glory of God.

Thus, in 1 Corinthians, the Apostle Paul introduces the metaphor of the church functioning as a body. In his epistle to the Ephesians, he expounds on this metaphor. The following section examines that excerpt from Ephesians.
In a prison cell, the Apostle Paul again uses the metaphor of the church as a body in Ephesians 4. He begins chapter four with a reaffirmation of what he wrote to the Corinthians about unity and interdependence. Love and oneness are the overarching imperatives for God’s people to exhibit toward one another. In a very similar ethos as 1 Corinthians 12, Paul emphasizes the unity inherent in all Christians that comes through the Holy Spirit, despite the diversity in each individual’s physicality, mentality, personality, temperance, and, of course, giftedness. F. F. Bruce notes the congruity between Ephesians 4 and 1 Corinthians 12, and ascertains that this unity of all believers is not for just one congregation but all churches (Bruce 1984, 334).

In verse 7, Paul writes that Christ has given “grace” to each one as He apportioned. Bruce writes,

> Within the unity of the body each member has a distinctive part to play, a distinctive service to perform, for the effective functioning of the whole. The ability to perform this service is here called the ‘grace’ given to each. . . . But other members of the body had their respective varieties of ‘grace’; since ‘we, though many, are one body in Christ,’ says Paul to the Romans, therefore, ‘having gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, let us use them’ (Rom 12:5-6). (Bruce 1984, 339-40)

So Bruce understands the “grace” that Christ has apportioned as those responsibilities or gifts He has given individual believers to be used for the good of the larger body of believers. Arthur Patzia similarly understands the verse. He too equivocates the “grace” with those gifts Christ bestows to each believer. Patzia notes, “No one has all the gifts required for the body; rather, the gifts of each member are supplemented by the gifts of all members. It is the working together of each part that produces unity and growth” (Patzia 1990, 235).
Paul specifies certain areas of grace, or giftedness, in verses 11-13. There is considerable variance in opinion as to whether the apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers referenced in those verses are specific gifted people given to the church (Bruce 1984, 345; O’Brien 1999, 297-301), or offices of the church given to lead it (Patzia 1990, 238-41; Calvin 2003b, 277), or solely the functions of church leadership and not the offices. However, one point is certain. Patzia writes, “that Christ gave (appointed) these offices to the church for the specific function of having the church attain its full maturity in him (Eph 4:12-16)” (Patzia 1990, 240). The point of these functions, or offices, or men that Christ gifted to His church is “to prepare God’s people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up” (Eph 4:12). The leaders of the church are placed in that leadership to \( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\tau\iota\omicron\omicron\nu \) (katartismo, prepare) all the various parts of the body for service. Patzia writes, “The word \( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\tau\iota\omicron\omicron\nu \) (‘training,’ ‘preparing,’ ‘equipping’) conveys the idea of an harmonious development in which all parts are brought to a condition of being able to perform according to their created purpose (2 Tim 3:17)” (Patzia 1990, 243). These church leaders are training, preparing, and equipping the church to do the work of the ministry and building themselves up in the process, thus creating unity in all, from the most significant apostles to the most seemingly insignificant disciple (Wood 1981, 58).

All this takes action on the part of every individual believer. Christ is the head of the body of believers. As verse 16 reads, this body is held together by love and action as each part uses his or her gifts and functions to serve the rest of the body and to help it grow and mature.
Implications for Andragogical Teaching

The implications this passage has for the church are many, especially regarding learning in small groups. Imagine the beauty and value in a group of believers, in community with one another, learning together, and each contributing his unique areas of giftedness for the good of the whole. Many formal church educational settings permit only one person to use his gifts, or “grace” apportioned by Christ, to build up the body assembled together. Perhaps this is reasonable, or even best, in church settings of larger numbers of believers, such as sermons during services. Logistically, it may create too much chaos to have more than one person use his gifts during that time. However, in settings with smaller numbers of believers gathered together in community to learn, those same logistical issues are not nearly as problematic. Would it not be more biblical in an ABF if each group member had a chance to contribute according to his giftedness, learning from the Lord, and personal experiences? Would it not be biblical in a lesson on evangelism that a group member with the gift of evangelism could contribute his or her experiences to build up the rest of the group? In a lesson on loving one another, would it not be biblical to have a group member gifted in hospitality contribute his or her thoughts and experiences on loving and serving others? In a lesson on suffering, would it not be biblical to have a group member with the gift of faith share his or her perspective on trusting God despite circumstances?

It may be argued that, for this situation to occur, the teacher would have to relinquish the use of his giftedness (teaching) to allow others to utilize their own areas of giftedness. This, however, is simply not true. The goal of the teacher is not only to have communicated accurate information, but that the students learn and become wise.
Wisdom “consists of judicious use of information to enrich life” (Crenshaw 1998, 152), or in other words, true knowledge put into practice. In ancient Israel, wisdom, not knowledge, was the goal of teaching. “A person could be both knowledgeable and foolish, but no one could be wise and foolish. . . . The mere gathering of information, however valuable, did not make a person wise, for the truly learned individual gave the teachings flesh and blood” (Crenshaw 1998, 152). It is the same today. Teachers today are not merely disseminators of information. They facilitate the acquisition and accumulation of wisdom in their students, and should use the best means possible to accomplish this goal. At times this achievement may entail the teacher taking the role of expert and constitute more lecture to clarify points. At other times, group members will take the role of expert and build up the class through their wisdom and experience and the teacher assumes the role of facilitator. The teacher has been given to the church to prepare God’s people for ministry so that the church may grow in numbers and maturity (Eph 4:12).

The Apostle Paul presents the metaphor of the church’s being a body, the body of Christ. This body is diverse, interdependent, and at its best, united. Each part of the body has a function and role that it must fulfill for the good of the entire body. The leaders of the church must prepare, train, and encourage individuals to use their gifts and engage in their roles for the benefit of the church as a whole. Teachers in the church have the unique opportunity to allow and even encourage this to happen every time they teach a community of believers gathered together to learn.

The doctrines of the church as the body of Christ and the priesthood of believers have great implications on teaching in the church today. These doctrines offer a
strong rationale for andragogical teaching in the church. In addition to the justification these doctrines offer for discussion-based teaching, the two most prominent teachers detailed in the New Testament, Jesus Christ and the Apostle Paul, also used andragogical methods in their teaching. The following sections will examine the andragogical teaching methods of Jesus and Paul.

**Andragogical Teachings of Jesus Christ**

Jesus was the master teacher. Roy B. Zuck writes, “Jesus was a dynamic, remarkably effective teacher. Never boring, always stimulating. Never obtuse, always clear. Never pompous or distant, always personal and lovingly concerned. No wonder people who heard him teach often addressed him as ‘Teacher’!” (Zuck 1995, 10). With just a cursory glance at the teachings of Jesus in the Gospels, one realizes Jesus was an incredible teacher. Whether He was teaching in the open air on a mountainside or in the serene confines of the temple, Jesus was at home instructing others from the Scriptures.

In an examination of effective teaching in a mid-sized group setting, it is fitting to assess Jesus’ teaching techniques. It is clear that at times Jesus taught pedagogically, offering lecture-based sermons to large groups of listeners. It is also clear, however, that Jesus taught andragogically, offering discussion-based lessons to smaller groups of listeners. The following sections will examine the latter. In Matthew 19, Jesus utilized many tenets of andragogical teaching, which will be detailed below. Following that discussion will be a brief survey of other teachings of Jesus that surface additional andragogical methods used in His teaching.
Matthew 19

In Matthew 19, Jesus offers two excellent examples of andragogical teaching. The first is in response to questions on divorce asked by Pharisees. The second is in the context of questions brought by a rich young man. Both sections will be reviewed to see which andragogical methods Jesus utilized.

Matthew 19:1-12. By this time Jesus had large crowds following Him, because He healed people of sickness (v. 2), but also because of His excellent, authoritative teaching (Matt 7:28-29). As Jesus healed people, it is also reasonable to assume that He talked to the people, and took advantage of opportunities to share truth and correct misunderstanding (teach) as appropriate. In fact, it would be strange if Jesus did not take the opportunity to teach, in some manner, about the Father’s love and faithfulness while He was healing the hurting.

Pharisees approached Jesus to test Him. They asked a question about grounds for divorce. In whatever way Jesus would answer, it would seemingly put Him at odds with one of two groups: the school of Hillel or the school of Shammai (Carson 1984, 411). After a bit of give and take, Jesus gave an answer the Pharisees were not expecting, answering their question while avoiding their trap.

Even though Jesus was a master teacher who taught with authority, He apparently created an environment in which people felt free to bring Him their questions. Even though He was God incarnate, He did not present Himself as better than others, giving His wisdom to ignorant nobodies. Instead, He was approachable and like one of the people. He taught with a deep care and concern for the people (Zuck 1995, 82). These are qualities of a great teacher.
In the situation presented in Matthew 19, Jesus briefly taught on a subject that was relevant to His learners: divorce. According to the definition of andragogy in chapter 1, one of Malcolm Knowles’ precepts is that adults have a readiness to learn those things that they need to know in order to cope effectively with real-life situations (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 72). These “real-life situations” are based on one’s “readiness to learn.”

An especially rich source of “readiness to learn” is the developmental tasks associated with moving from one developmental stage to the next. The critical implication of this assumption is the importance of timing learning experiences to coincide with those developmental tasks. For example, a sophomore girl is not ready to learn about infant nutrition or marital relations, but let her get engaged after graduation and she will be very ready. (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 67)

Jesus allowed the Pharisees to ask the real-life question on divorce, even if the question emerged from poor motives. Others listened to this “question and answer” discussion Jesus had with the Pharisees (v. 10), likely beyond Jesus’ disciples (v. 2, “large crowds followed him”). Perhaps some in the group were contemplating divorcing their wives. Jesus taught a mini-lesson on a subject that would have been very real to His listeners, and an experience with which they or someone they knew was likely struggling. It is probable that some had a “readiness to learn.”

A second precept of andragogy, which Knowles details, is that adults are life-centered in their orientation to learning (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 72). Knowles writes,

In contrast to children’s and youths’ subject-centered orientation to learning (at least in school), adults are life-centered (or task-centered or problem-centered) in their orientation to learning. Adults are motivated to learn to the extent that they perceive that learning will help them perform tasks or deal with problems that they confront in their life situations. (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 67)

Divorce qualifies as a life-centered issue with which Jesus’ listeners dealt. With a good
understanding of how God feels about divorce, after overhearing Jesus and the Pharisees’
discussion, Jesus’ listeners could make God-honoring decisions about divorce and offer
God-honoring counsel to others in their lives dealing with the problem of an unhappy
marriage.

A third tenet of andragogy is that adult learners need to be highly participative
in the learning process (Patterson 1993, 125). Jesus’ willingness to allow His learners to
ask questions is a clear indicator that they were involved in the learning process. This
approach was often the case in Jesus’ teaching. Jesus did not always give long, lecture-
based discourses to His passive, listening learners. Many times He allowed them to be
involved actively in the learning process by asking Him questions or answering His
questions. The next passage further illustrates this andragogical method.

Matthew 19:16-22. The Apostle Matthew wrote,

Now a man came up to Jesus and asked, “Teacher, what good thing must I do
to get eternal life?”

“Why do you ask me about what is good?” Jesus replied. “There is only One
who is good. If you want to enter life, obey the commandments.”

“Which ones?” the man inquired.

Jesus replied, “‘Do not murder, do not commit adultery, do not steal, do not
give false testimony, honor your father and mother,’ and ‘love your neighbor as
yourself.’

“All these I have kept,” the young man said. “What do I still lack?”

Jesus answered, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give
to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me.”

When the young man heard this, he went away sad, because he had great
wealth. (Matt 19:16-22)

If, according to the principles of andragogy, adult learners need to be active
and highly participative in the learning process, then Jesus practiced andragogical
teaching in this passage. Here Jesus had an encounter with a questioner in a similar way
Unlike the previous passage, however, there is no reason to believe the questioner was trying to trap Jesus in His answer (Blomberg 1992, 296). As noted above, Jesus was an approachable teacher. People felt at liberty to ask Him questions for further understanding.

Jesus answered the rich man’s question with a question of His own (“Why do you ask me about what is good?”), as well as another leading answer (“If you want to enter life, obey the commandments”). The rich man asked another clarifying question (“Which ones?” v. 18), and Jesus again answered, seemingly pushing the rich man to search to answer his question himself. Finally, after the rich man apparently wanted either to justify himself before Jesus or to be spoon-fed the answer, Jesus gave the rich man an answer the man did not expect: sell his possessions and give to the poor. In this instance, Jesus created a disequilibration in the man’s understanding of himself and God’s requirement for eternal life (Downs 1994, 84). Interestingly, Jesus did not appear to help this rich man accommodate or assimilate the foreign perspective Jesus offered (Downs 1994, 83). In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus was much clearer in His resolution to the problem that no one can keep the entire Law and thus be worthy of eternal life. He demonstrated the need for a relationship with God and how much more important the internal is above the external (Blomberg 1992, 297). In this case, however, Jesus allowed the man to wrestle with Jesus’ words and to discover for himself the key to eternal life.

A fourth tenet of andragogy is that adult learners need to be self-directed in their learning. According to Knowles, “[Adult educators] make efforts to create learning experiences in which adults are helped to make the transition from dependent to self-
directing learners” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 65). The rich man came to Jesus looking for an easy answer from which he would feel justified. He came to Jesus as a dependent learner. Jesus, however, did not acquiesce. Instead, Jesus pushed the rich man to be self-directed in his learning. He left the man out of balance, in a place in which the man had to wrestle with Jesus’ words. Jesus did not spoon-feed the rich man; instead, Jesus prompted the man to prayer and self-discovery.

Finally, Jesus creates a deep “need to know” in the rich man, which is a fifth tenet in andragogy. This man must have walked away discouraged and confused at Jesus’ words and desperate to understand them. In andragogy, “the first task of the facilitator of learning is to help the learners become aware of the ‘need to know.’” At the very least, facilitators can make an intellectual case for the value of the learning in improving the effectiveness of the learners’ performance or the quality of their lives” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 65). Jesus created in this rich man a definite “need to know.” He left the man with a great need to know what part his possessions played in attaining eternal life.

**Jesus’ Teaching from the Synoptic Gospels**

Matthew 19 contains only two examples of Jesus’ mastery of andragogical teaching, from which five principles of andragogical teaching can be observed. Those principles, which can be generally characterized by students as being much more participative in the learning process, are also found in Matthew 9:14-17; Matthew 16:13-30 (Mark 8:27-29; Luke 9:18-20); Matthew 18:1-9; Matthew 18:21-35; Matthew 21:23-27; Matthew 21:33-46 (Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19); Matthew 22:15-22 (Mark 12:13-17; Luke 20:20-26); Matthew 22:23-33; Matthew 22:34-40 (Mark 12:28-31); and

**Matthew 13.** Jesus offers no fewer than five parables in His teaching in Matthew 13. Not only do these five parables address real-life scenarios and images in which Jesus’ learners were familiar (Keener 2009, 375-76), but also in this example of andragogical teaching Jesus creates in His learners a strong motivation to learn. Knowles writes, “Adults are responsive to some external motivators (better jobs, promotions, higher salaries, and the like), but the most potent motivators are internal pressures (the desire for increased job satisfaction, self-esteem, quality of life, and the like)” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 68). A sixth tenet of andragogical teaching is to create strong internal motivation to learn the information presented.

If one intrinsic motivator is a greater quality of life and satisfaction, then Jesus offers in these parables the greatest internal motivator to learning that exists: an understanding of the kingdom of God and how one enters it. Jesus used these parables to teach His learners how to live with the highest satisfaction in this life and, even more importantly, how to obtain eternal life in paradise with the loving Father God. These parables are kingdom parables, ones in which Jesus used to teach about the kingdom of God on the earth and beyond (Keener 2009, 371). Jesus did not motivate His learners with teachings on how to gain wealth, enjoy an easy life, or even be respected by other men. Instead, He motivated His learners with teachings about His Father’s kingdom and how one could be a part of it. Jesus had a mastery of internal motivation.

**Matthew 10.** The seventh and final tenet of andragogy observed in Jesus’ teaching is the incorporation and utilization of learners’ wisdom and experience in the
learning process. Knowles writes,

Adults come into an educational activity with both a greater volume and a
different quality of experience from that of youths. By virtue of simply having lived
long, they have accumulated more experience than they had as youths. But they
also have had a different kind of experience. This difference in quantity and quality
of experience has several consequences for adult education. (Knowles, Holton, and
Swanson 2005, 65-66)

The first consequence Knowles offers is that there is diversity and
heterogeneousness of adult learners; therefore, “greater emphasis in adult education is
placed on individualization of teaching and learning strategies” (Knowles, Holton, and
Swanson 2005, 66). A second consequence Knowles offers is especially germane to this
discussion on Jesus’ teaching methods. Knowles writes,

It also means that for many kinds of learning, the richest resources for learning
reside in the adult learners themselves. Hence, the emphasis in adult education is on
experiential techniques—techniques that tap into the experience of the learners,
such as group discussions, simulation exercises, problem-solving activities, case
methods, and laboratory methods instead of transmittal techniques. Also, greater
emphasis is placed on peer-helping activities. (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson
2005, 66)

Jesus took His learners through many experiences in which they learned and
practiced the lessons He taught them. One example involved his twelve apostles. In
Matthew 5:13-16, Jesus taught the apostles, and others, that they were the “salt of the
earth” and the “light of the world.” They were to have an illumining and preserving
effect on their cultures (Carson 1984, 139-39). Jesus taught that His followers were to
change the world through the example of their lives and by sharing the good news that
the kingdom of God had arrived.

In Matthew 10, Jesus sends the twelve out to experience intentional and
purposeful living as “salt” and “light.” Jesus instructs His apostles to “go rather to the
lost sheep of Israel. As you go, preach this message: ‘The kingdom of heaven is near.’
Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse those who have leprosy, drive out demons. Freely you have received, freely give” (Matt 10:6-8). Jesus offers His adult learners, the apostles, not just transmittal techniques to teach them to influence the world for Him. Instead, He gives them the practical experience of living as “salt” and “light.”

In the parallel passage to Matthew 10, Mark 6:6-13, as Jesus sent His disciples out, He sent them out in pairs. This approach would have certainly helped the apostles deal with the fright of going into potentially hostile areas to preach the arrival of the kingdom of God. It also added accountability that each apostle completed the mission on which Jesus sent him. Even more than this accountability, however, Jesus certainly must have thought about the encouragement, critique, and general feedback that each apostle could offer his partner as he experienced telling others about the kingdom of God. Jesus understood the value of peer helping peer in the learning process. On this mission that Jesus sent His disciples, He gave them experiences in which they had opportunity to truly learn how to be “salt” and “light,” as well as the potential for critical peer feedback and learning.

**Andragogical Teachings of the Apostle Paul**

The Apostle Paul appears to have lectured to his listeners many times throughout the portion of the New Testament that details his teaching. Whether it was speaking in the meeting of the Areopagus (Acts 17:22-31), addressing a murderous crowd in Jerusalem (Acts 22:1-21), or testifying before King Agrippa (Acts 26:2-23), Paul was comfortable with the pedagogical, lecture method of instruction.

It should be noted that unlike the teachings of Christ in the Gospels and first part of Acts, the New Testament is not filled with extended and/or even brief discourses
of Paul’s face-to-face teachings of groups or individuals. Acts tells of the actions of Paul and the other apostles more than the content and method of their teaching. In addition, since epistles are written, one-way communications, they are pedagogical in nature since there can be no immediate discussion or interaction with the writer/speaker, Paul himself. Therefore, the nature of the New Testament does not offer the quantity of examples of andragogical teaching from Paul that it offers for Jesus Christ. Even in its limited format, however, the New Testament demonstrates and intimates Paul’s skill in andragogical teaching.

**Paul Debated**


The word συζητεῖν (syzeteo, debate) in verse 29 means “to dispute, argue, or question together” (Zuck 1998, 149). The nature of a debate is interaction. The two or more parties that engage in the debate speak and have opportunities to interact with the others’ statements. There is a give and take of information in which all parties are teachers as well as fellow learners, an important tenet in andragogy. Paul certainly had an agenda in his debate: he wanted to teach others about Jesus Christ and His life, death, resurrection, ascension, second coming, and offer of salvation to anyone who believes. Paul intended to teach and persuade others to believe what he believed about Jesus Christ through debate. Paul knew that if others were to believe as he did, that he would need to interact sufficiently with their questions, understandings, and misunderstandings—a
simple doctrinal lecture on the person and divinity of Christ would not do.

**Paul Reasoned and Discussed**

The content of Paul’s andragogical teaching did not consist only of debate.

Paul also reasoned and discussed with his learners. While in Thessalonica,

As his custom was, Paul went into the synagogue, and on three Sabbath days he reasoned with them from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead. “This Jesus I am proclaiming to you is the Christ,” he said. Some of the Jews were persuaded and joined Paul and Silas, as did a large number of God-fearing Greeks and not a few prominent women. (Acts 17:2-4)

The word διαλέγομαι (dialogomai, reasoned) in verse two “suggests interaction by discussion that involves questions and answers and is intellectually stimulating” (Zuck 1998, 149). Slightly different than debating, this reasoning and discussion is between parties less diametrically opposed, but highly interactive nonetheless. This same verb διαλέγομαι, is also used in Acts 17:17; 18:4, 19; 19:8-9; 20:7, 9; 24:12, 25, showing that Paul often taught using lecture along with interaction and discussion as the format. Zuck notes, “In Acts 20:7 the NIV renders this verb by the rather weak verb ‘spoke,’ and in 20:9 the NIV wrongly translates the same verb as ‘talked on and on,’ as if Paul were lecturing endlessly. But διαλέγομαι conveys discussing along with lecturing, not lecturing only” (Zuck 1998, 149). Discussion was an important component to Paul’s teaching.

**Paul Disputed**

Finally, part of Paul’s teaching repertoire entailed disputing. In addition to reasoning with the Athenian Jews and God-fearing Greeks in the synagogue and marketplace, Paul disputed with Epicurean and Stoic Philosophers (Acts 17:18, “A group
of Epicurean and Stoic philosophers began to dispute with him”). According to Zuck, συμβάλλων (symballo, disputed) “etymologically means ‘to throw together,’ thus conveying the thought of discussing or throwing ideas back and forth” (Zuck 1998, 149). As in the two previous examples, this example of Paul’s teaching entailed interaction between teacher and learner that included dialogue and discussion, not simply one-way communication or lecture.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there is significant biblical and theological support for andragogical teaching methodologies. Each follower of Christ is part of a New Testament holy priesthood with responsibilities to minister to and support each other. The indwelling and unity of the Spirit given to all those in the community of believers creates an environment in which each individual follower of Christ has a direct connection to the Spirit of God, and is yet diverse and interdependent with each other, as the parts of the body are diverse and interdependent. In assessing the connection to the Holy Spirit each individual possesses, along with the interdependence the diverse parts of the body of Christ have with one another, there is a biblical basis for teaching methodologies that incorporate the sharing of wisdom, experiences, and expertise of each member of the class, not just the teacher.

There is also support for andragogical teaching in Jesus and Paul’s methods of instruction. Both men interacted with their learners and welcomed questions and discussion as essential aspects of their teachings. Although both men used lecture as a method in their teaching repertoires, both men also realized that lecture alone was insufficient in effectively facilitating learning among their listeners. Andragogical
teaching was an important component to both Jesus’ and Paul’s teaching.
CHAPTER 3
CURRENT SCHOLARSHIP IN ADULT EDUCATION

Introduction

Recent decades have yielded numerous works that examine effective adult education. Whereas in the past, much effort was put into understanding how children learn most effectively, and an assumption was made that adults learn likewise, current scholarship maintains that adults learn differently than children. The following chapter will examine and summarize the findings of key social scientists in effective adult education. The first section will examine key Christian scholarship on this topic, while the second section will examine key secular scholarship on this topic.

Current Christian Scholarship in Adult Education

Numerous men and women have researched and written about education in the church. Many of their findings are either specific to adult education in the church, or at least very applicable to adults. Seven of the most significant writers, or teams of writers, were chosen because their combined works offer an excellent understanding of effective adult education in the church today. The following section will examine particular topics or emphases that each of the seven writers, or teams of writers, cover well in their works. This cumulative survey will provide an understanding of current Christian scholarship in adult education.
George R. Knight and Robert Pazmiño: Progressivism

Academic scholarship has yielded numerous philosophies and theories of education. In general, these theories are neither entirely biblical nor unbiblical, but each has some components of their metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology, consistent with a biblical view of education, and others inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture. George R. Knight’s book, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, is not written to address specifically adult education. Instead, it offers an analysis of the various philosophies and theories of education from a Christian perspective, and challenges the reader to develop his own philosophy of Christian education consistent with the metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology of the Bible. Robert Pazmiño’s book, *Foundational Issues in Christian Education: An Introduction in Evangelical Perspective*, also explains the various philosophies and theories of education, and offers a Christian perspective and similar challenge for the reader. Both books present findings relevant to adult education in the church.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, as a critical reaction to the shortcomings of the prevailing philosophic systems (idealism, realism, neo-scholasticism), pragmatism was America’s contribution to philosophic thought (Knight 2006, 66). Pragmatism itself looked to “empirical science, the changing world and its problems, and nature as the all-inclusive reality beyond which their faith in science would not allow them to go” (Knight 2006, 67). The focus was on the ends, and not the means. According to the pragmatist, the focus should not be on the ultimates, absolutes, and eternal essences, but on the immediate changing world (Knight 2006, 66).
Of course, this philosophy, in itself, does not have room for a biblical
metaphysic or epistemology. Pragmatism led to the educational theory called
progressivism. Progressivism also fails to hold a metaphysical or epistemological view
consistent with biblical Christianity, but its anthropological view necessitates means and
methods that are very relevant and beneficial to adult education in the church.
Progressivism focuses on the needs, passion, and purpose of the learner. The curriculum
and teaching methods grow out of the needs, interests, and initiatives of the learner.
Progressive educators believe people have a natural desire to learn and solve problems,
especially those relevant to their lives. Students are active rather than passive in the
learning process. They engage actively in problem solving that is interesting and relevant
to them. The teacher realizes this activity and desire to learn in his students, and
harnesses that energy, guides and directs it, and motivates the students to the desired
learning outcomes (Knight 2006, 106-07).

Pazmiño points out that cooperative learning is stressed in progressivism.
Students are given much freedom in their learning and problem solving, but students are
also challenged to consider the communal implications of their choices (Pazmiño 1997, 116). Pazmiño writes,

For progressives, students are autonomously thinking and socially responsible
individuals who are called to work democratically and cooperatively with others.
Persons are viewed as organisms in ecological continuity with others and their
social environment. Students are to be actively engaged in their own learning and
that of others. (Pazmiño 1997, 116)

If one dismisses progressive metaphysics and epistemology, and instead
focuses on its anthropology and resulting instructional methodology, there is much that
can be affirmed from progressive principles for education in the church, especially for
adults. Pazmiño lauds progressive educators’ concern and understanding that learners are to be active in the learning process. The sensitivity to learners’ experiences, needs, and interests is also valuable. In addition, the emphases on cooperative learning and dealing with issues and problems in everyday life are excellent educational principles from which the church can benefit (Pazmiño 1997, 116). Students active in the learning process, cooperative learning, solving real-life problems, and capitalizing on students’ experiences are also integral components of andragogical teaching. The focus on students’ interests and abilities is also valuable to adult education in the church. Students learn and grow in areas they are passionate, proficient, and gifted; each one contributes their expertise for the good of the whole, the church.

**Gregory C. Carlson: Adult Development and Christian Formation**

Fred Wilson notes that for too long the church has held to the myth that to be adult is to be finished developmentally. He believes that unless the church can overcome this outdated understanding of adult development, or lack thereof, then ministry to adults will have a destructive effect (Wilson 1995, 187). A recent work dealing with this topic of Christian formation and learning theory is *Christian Formation: Integrating Theology & Human Development*, edited by James R. Estep and Jonathan H. Kim. In the chapter dealing with adult development, Gregory C. Carlson tackles this important issue of adult development and Christian formation. He summarizes the tenets of the two most significant adult learning theorists (Knowles and Mezirow), analyzes their theories from a biblical perspective, draws implications, and offers a biblical approach to adult development.
Three implications Carlson draws from the adult learning theorists and the Scriptures are germane to this project. First, Carlson states that Christian educators sometimes minimize the educational capability of learners. Carlson writes, “Rarely do we teach with any of Paul’s passion in Romans 15:14 as he describes his Roman learners: ‘My brothers, I myself am convinced about you that you also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, and able to instruct one another’” (Carlson 2010, 225).

Second, Christian educators often discount the value of the past experiences of their learners. Carlson writes, “We have very little mutuality in setting goals for learning; and we discount the learning experiences from the past history of adults. Perhaps this is why small groups have had such an impact upon the spiritual formation of some church members” (Carlson 2010, 225). Adult learners have had numerous valuable experiences in their lives from which they grew in wisdom and understanding, and from which they can instruct and encourage others.

Third, Christian educators must do more than tell their learners what is correct, true, and right. Instead, they must allow for interactivity in the learning process. Carlson writes, “We need to provide education where our teaching is more than telling but involvement” (Carlson 2010, 226).

Carlson’s biblical approach to adult development entails three main focus areas: instruction, fellowship, and service. Regarding instruction, adults are to be taught sound doctrine that manifests itself in sound living (Carlson 2010, 226). In terms of fellowship, adult development in the Bible has a strong focus on “roles of relationships.” These roles are shaped by the development of the adult, and also shape the adult in the role. These relationship roles include older/younger relationships shaped by the family
analogy, marriage relationships, and work relationships (Carlson 2010, 226). Finally, regarding service Carlson writes, “Our service to the Lord is an overflow of our connectedness to the life of Christ and result in good works” (Carlson 2010, 228). Therefore, Carlson notes that adult development is not simply a matter of communicating correct doctrine, but also forming right relationships and spurring the learner to the action—service—of Christ and others.

Carlson summarizes his understanding of the teaching component of adult development and Christian formation well. He writes,

Teach? Adhere to the principles of how God has designed adults to develop. Certainly, we will include more interactivity and attention to learning styles. Be able to discern the needs of adults as they develop—both in the stages of normal chronological growth and the phases of dealing with what life brings and God designs. Also included for the master teacher would be the ability to set mutual goals. Being mindful of the instructional, fellowship, and service needs of those you teach is essential for producing disciples of Christ. Teach with creativity and interest to those the Lord has allowed you to shepherd. (Carlson 2010, 226)

The effect this sort of teaching would have on adults in the church is obvious: learning and spiritual growth.

James C. Wilhoit: Spiritual Formation in Community

James C. Wilhoit brings a new dimension to the discussion on adult education in the church: the necessity of the collective church in spiritual formation. Wilhoit writes, “Spiritual formation is certainly a multifactorial process that requires us to constantly ask God what we should be doing, rather than relying on our power and skill” (Wilhoit 2008, 17). Part of this “multifactorial process” is learning together, or fostering remembering in community as Wilhoit refers to it. Wilhoit adds, “Christian spiritual formation: (1) is intentional; (2) is communal; (3) requires our engagement; (4) is
accomplished by the Holy Spirit; (5) is for the glory of God and the service of others; and (6) has as its means and end the imitation of Christ” (Wilhoit 2008, 23). Wilhoit understands deep learning and spiritual formation take place in an intentional, engaging, active community of Christ-followers whose purpose is to serve others and bring glory to God. So, what does learning look like in this sort of community?

The emphasis of this community is more on learning, than teaching. Wilhoit writes,

An important step in establishing a successful educationally based spiritual formation program in a local church is to shift the emphasis from teaching to learning. When we emphasize learning, we highlight the experiences of individuals and communities. . . . Learning needs to flow from experiences where the truths of the gospel are directly related to ordinary life and work. We should see all the disciplines in this section as aspects of the educational, learning-engendering work of the church. (Wilhoit 2008, 134)

It is clear that Wilhoit sees an important component of learning as the freedom of individuals to share their experiences with others in their community. Part of this shift from teaching to learning means a shift from teacher-centered learning, where the teacher is the sole dispenser of knowledge and information, to student-centered learning, where discussion is valued, and each individual can share his experiences and understanding with others in the community.

Wilhoit is an advocate of churches involving individuals in some type of small-group construct for this very reason. They provide an environment in which people can refine their knowledge of God and themselves, as well as receive needed support and challenge to thrive in their Christian life (Wilhoit 2008, 124). Personal stories, Wilhoit advocates, are an important part of the communal environment. Wilhoit writes, “An important moment in spiritual formation comes when we link ‘my story’ with the ‘our
story’ of the church universal and understand that we are part of something far larger than ourselves” (Wilhoit 2008, 117). In short, each individual in the church needs to be in deep, sharing community with other followers of Jesus Christ in order to grow in Christian maturity. This, of course, is consistent with andragogical teaching.

**William R. Yount: The Disciplers’ Model and Adult Christian Education**

William R. Yount offers his own philosophy of Christian education he termed The Disciplers’ Model. Yount’s model contains seven components. The foundational components are the Bible and the Needs specific to the learner. Three supports, or pillars, rise from and rest on the foundational components: Thinking, Valuing, and Relating. Thinking consists of being filled with a knowledge of God’s will, growing in spiritual understanding, and growing in wisdom. The Valuing pillar emphasizes the emotional components of Christian growth and maturity. The Relating pillar focuses on students’ relationship with God and their relationships with others. The three pillars together support the capstone, which is Growth. The Bible, Needs, Thinking, Valuing, and Relating components all contribute to maturational growth. The final component is the Holy Spirit, which encircles the entire model. The Holy Spirit’s presence breathes life into lessons and ultimately is responsible and receives glory for true spiritual growth (Yount 2010, 6-26).

Yount comingles the seven components of his model with educational psychology. For the teacher, the Bible foundational stone is related to content mastery. The Needs foundational stone is related to individual differences. The Thinking pillar is related to cognitive development. The Valuing pillar is related to affective development.
The *Relating* pillar is related to social context and group dynamics. The *Growth* capstone is related to maturation. Finally, the *Holy Spirit* has no counterpart in educational psychology (Yount 2010, 29). Most germane to this project were Yount’s thoughts regarding the *Valuing* pillar and the *Relating* pillar in regards to teaching.

Addressing the *Valuing* pillar, Yount writes,

A second essential for emotionally warm classrooms is a willingness to share. Willingness to share is a strong indication of the level of trust in the class. Teachers weaken trust when we create tension in the classroom. We do this by . . . standing behind a podium or sitting behind a desk, excessive lecturing, or responding to questions or comments with frustration.

Disciplers build trust between themselves and learners by caring for them, listening to them, and responding in kind way. . . . We engage learners with subjective questions throughout out lectures in order to stir them up to share personal experience related to the topic. If possible, we seat learners in a semi-circle or U-shape so they can see each other and more easily interact with each other. (Yount 2010, 17)

In moving on to the *Relating* pillar, Yount writes,

When the class environment promotes freedom and openness, willingness to share with others, personal safety, and time for interactive experiences, learners have many more opportunities to connect with classmates. Teachers do well to provide intentional opportunities for interaction among students by using frequent, small-group discussions as well as longer-term group projects. (Yount 2010, 21)

Finally, Yount summarizes well how the components of his model (with the addition of the *Holy Spirit*) synergistically work together to bring about learning and growth in the individual. He writes,

The three Pillars of the Model reflect three kinds of human growth. The rational helps the learners process the facts and concepts of a course objectively. The emotional helps the learners process the values and priorities of the course personally. The relational helps learners process course content in community with others. These three stand firmly on the Foundation Stones and, in turn, support the Capstone of discipling Bible study, which is ‘growing up’ in the Lord. (Yount 2010, 21)
Many of the principles Yount encourages in Christian educators are consistent with andragogical teaching. Yount points out that teachers should create interactive experiences for their learners. Effective teachers should ask subjective questions to their learners to stir them to share appropriate personal experiences. Finally, teachers should avoid excessive lecturing and instead incorporate and facilitate group discussion. Each of these points is consistent with andragogical teaching and extremely relevant to adult education in the church.

In *Called to Teach: An Introduction to the Ministry of Teaching*, Yount expounds more on the teacher as the facilitator. He writes,

Another popular role for teachers is group facilitator. Some see ‘telling’ as an autocratic, rigid, and controlling process. They see discussion as softer, more personal, more flexible, and less directive. And it is quite true that discussion has solid advantages over the more structured ‘telling’ approach. Sharing ideas and molding concepts through discussion helps students develop critical thinking skills. The give and take of ideas and perceptions among students develops democratic skills. Such interaction permits affective learning to happen more naturally than in the more structured ‘telling’ approach. (Yount 1999, 54)

Of course greater discussion in class does carry inherent dangers. Yount points out that discussion is less efficient than lecture. The teacher relinquishes more control in discussions. The quality of learning is circumstantial and controlled by the maturity of group. The discussion can easily lose direction and never reach its destination (Yount 1999, 55). There is also the potential for constructivist learning to occur in which truth is defined subjectively in terms of the group or individual only, instead of objectively in any context (Yount 2010, 250-51). All of these are indeed potential dangers in discussion-based, andragogical learning environments. However, with these increased risks come increased rewards in effectiveness.
Yount emphasizes that teaching with discussion and interaction is worth the risk—especially with adults—in *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*. Yount writes, “The key to learning for adults is found in shifting the focus from the teacher to the learner” (Yount 2008, 356). Referencing Jesus’ words in John 14:25-27 that the Holy Spirit would come to teach and remind his disciples of all things, Yount writes,

> If the Holy Spirit is indeed the Teacher, and He indwells each adult believer, then each has the ability to discern the truth of the Scripture as it is revealed by the Spirit. Thus, every adult believer is both teacher and learner and should be encouraged to share his or her experiences with others, and so build up the body of Christ. Involving the learner actively in the study experience usually reaps rich dividends. (Yount 2008, 356)

Yount reemphasizes that lecture generally is not the most effective route to learning for adults. Adults do not learn simply because the teacher speaks, but instead adults learn when they perceive their personal needs are being met. Adults learn when they are involved actively in the learning experience (Yount 2008, 357).

**Howard Hendricks: Active and Participative Learners**

Howard Hendricks makes an important observation when he writes, “The way people learn determines how you teach” (Hendricks 1987, 37). This, of course, was a critical point in the project. Adult learners learn in ways unique to their stage in life. Teachers must recognize this fact, and order their teaching accordingly. In *Teaching to Change Lives: Seven Proven Ways to Make Your Teaching Come Alive*, Hendricks details his seven laws of teaching. His second law, *The Law of Education*, is the quotation above: the way people learn determines how you teach. Hendricks elaborates,

> The teacher must excite and direct the learner’s self-activities, and, as a rule (though I’ll give some exceptions later), *tell the learner nothing—and do nothing for him*—
that he can learn or do himself. Therefore, what’s important is not what you do as a teacher, but what the learners do as a result of what you do.

This definition casts both teacher and learner into well-defined roles:
- The teacher is primarily a stimulator and motivator . . . not the player, but the coach who excites and directs the players.
- The learner is primarily an investigator, a discoverer, and a doer.

So, again, the ultimate test of teaching is not what you do or how well you do it, but what and how well the learner does. (Hendricks 1987, 37)

Hendricks has three overarching goals in teaching. The first goal is to teach people how to think. The second goal is to teach people how to learn. The third goal is to teach people how to work (Hendricks 1987, 41-45). The teacher should not see his role as one in which he disseminates a certain quantity of information to his students for their memorization, but rather as helping and motivating the students to think, learn, and work for themselves. His goal is not to hold his students’ hands and spoon-feed them the information needed to understand a text, know a concept, or pass a test. Instead, he seeks to create self-directed and disciplined learners. Hendricks writes,

Never forget that your task is to develop people who are self-directed, who are disciplined, who do what they do because they choose to do it. That’s why I suggest you spend more time questioning answers than answering questions. . . . It’s far, far better to have students leave your class scratching their heads with questions they think and talk about, and with problems they’re eager to find solutions for in the week ahead. (Hendricks 1987, 45)

The third law that Hendricks gives is called the Law of Activity. “The Law of Activity” tells us that Maximum learning is always the result of maximum involvement” (Hendricks 1987, 53). Hendricks notes that the activity in which the learner is engaged must also be meaningful and purposeful to be effective. What kinds of activities are meaningful? Hendricks answers that question with five forms of meaningful activities.

The first form of meaningful activities Hendricks cites are those that provide direction without dictatorship. “When you give assignments—and you should—to get
your students more involved in the learning process, remember to always provide a sphere of freedom. You want structure—not a straightjacket” (Hendricks 1987, 58).

Second, activities that stress function and application are meaningful. “That is, activity that immediately lets the learner put to use everything that’s just been taught” (Hendricks 1987, 60). Third, activity with a planned purpose is meaningful. “As we said before, objectives determine outcomes. You achieve that for which you aim. Please note: Forget ‘busywork.’ Don’t involve learners in activities for which there’s no meaningful objective” (Hendricks 1987, 60). Fourth, activities that are concerned with the process, as well as the product, are meaningful. “Then students not only know WHAT they believe, but WHY” (Hendricks 1987, 61). Fifth, realistic activities that include problem-solving situations are meaningful. “We often fail to get down to the real problems people have. So find out, Where are they? What are they struggling with? What temptations are they facing?” (Hendricks 1987, 62).

Hendricks understands teaching to be a process in which both the teacher and the learner are active. The teacher is not the disseminator of information to his passive, listening learners. Instead, he is the stimulator and motivator. The learner is the investigator, the discoverer, and the doer. The teacher instructs and challenges his students to be disciplined and to think, learn, and work for themselves. The teacher also seeks to get the students involved in learning activities that are meaningful and purposeful. All these work together as essential components of effective teaching and are consistent with andragogical teaching.
Kenneth O. Gangel: Biblical Adult Learning and Synergogy

Kenneth Gangel states the obvious when he writes, “Methods which enhance the adult learning process should be included in the classroom experience” (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20). As obvious as this statement sounds, the risks (namely, discussion being less efficient than lecture, the teacher relinquishing significant classroom control, the potential for the quality of learning being diminished, the potential for the discussion losing direction, the increased potential for constructivist learning to occur) involved in using andragogical methods that enhance adult learning are often too great for teachers accustomed to pedagogical methodologies in which the teacher alone assumes the role and responsibility of bringing about learning in the classroom. For many teachers, these risks are enough to deter them from andragogical teaching. In adult learning, however, teacher-dominated learning is simply not as effective as the riskier alternative.

**Biblical adult learning.** Gangel affirms much of what others in the section above affirm about adult education in the church. Gangel begins in the Scriptures. In examining many of the specific learning experiences in the Scriptures (Exod 18; 2 Sam 7:2; 12; Matt 9:9; 11:28-30; 12; 15:2-3; 18:1-9; Mark 3:13-14; 8:34; 12; Luke 7: 18-23, 36-50; 9; 18:22; John 3; 4; 10:27; 12:32), Gangel arrives at four conclusions about effective adult education. “First, the teacher must know the students well in order to approach them on the basis of their self-perceptions” (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20). The examples in the Scriptures of adult learning reveal that the teacher and student shared significant time together, learning who each other was, and sharing many experiences...
together. Teachers of adults today would do well to share more time with their students than just the hour each week the class meets.

The second conclusion Gangel gives is that “the learner must start on the basis of his or her own experience, whether drawing water at a well, living as a shepherd, or leading a huge number of people around the desert” (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20). Each learner arrives at the learning environment with a set of experiences upon which to build. Adult learning occurs when the learner realizes his need for greater understanding because his current capabilities are shown inadequate in dealing with his present circumstances (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20).

Gangel’s third conclusion is this: “The learning experience is far more ‘do’ than ‘know’ oriented” (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20). With adults, it is essential to put into practice what they learn. Learning for learning’s sake is insufficient. In addition, when the learner puts into practice that which they learned, they also realize a greater need to learn more and share with others their experiences (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20).

Finally, Gangel notes that the adult learning experience takes significant time. Gangel writes,

It takes time to get to know people, to understand how they see themselves, to discern their experiences and their needs, to think of illustrations or stories which capture the imagination, and to design practical applications so learning moves beyond mere intellectual exercise to life change. True learning appears to demand a leisurely pace, as opposed to a hurried approach. And the immediacy of application (Moses, David, woman at the well) lays a foundation for our teaching today. (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 20)

**Synergogy.** Gangel also writes about a concept termed “synergogy.” Richard Patterson writes about the origin of synergogy as a response to bad andragogical
teaching/learning that degenerated to learners sharing extensively from their ignorance with no authoritative source of truth. Synergogy attempts “to avoid the abuses of some applied andragogy by positioning a truth source in the adult learning experience” (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 125-26). Gangel defines synergogy as “learner-centered teaching which applies the principles of andragogy to peer group learning situations” (Gangel and Hendricks 1988, 159). The premise of synergogy is that team (the group of learners, students) cooperation, not competition, yields greater learning than individual efforts alone yield for each individual learner. The teacher, through learning designs and instruments, “structures the process of learning by providing a framework of orderly steps to acquire knowledge, attitude, and skills (cognitive, affective, conative)” (Gangel and Hendricks 1988, 159). Often the teacher’s responsibilities are mainly focused in the preparation of a synergogical lesson, as opposed to the time when the group of learners is gathered. When gathered, the group of learners manages and regulates themselves as they progress through the steps of the lesson.

Gangel’s conclusions, drawn from the Scriptures on adult education, are very much in line with those of the other scholars in this study. Synergogical teaching is an interesting addition to the concept of andragogy. It coalesces with many of the principles of andragogy detailed in chapters 1-2. The roles of the teacher and learner are changed slightly, but both are still very active and engaged in the learning process.

Lawrence O. Richards: Lesson Construction for Adults

Lawrence Richards has written extensively on adult education in the church. He too notes the foundational concept to this project: With adults, the flow of ministry, of
which teaching is a part, is two-way. It does not flow solely from teacher to student, but also from student to teacher and from student to student (Richards 1975, 230-31). What Richards adds to this project is his philosophy of Bible lesson construction that is effective in teaching adults.

In Richards and Gary Bredfeldt’s book *Creative Bible Teaching*, Richards presents to the reader his approach to creating a Bible lesson. After the foundational work of inductive Bible study, writing the exegetical idea and pedagogical idea for the passage, and creating lesson aims (content aim, inspiration aim, and action aim) specific to the learners, Richards unveils his *Hook-Book-Look-Took* lesson construct.

Richards clarifies what the *Hook* is and why it is so important to an effective Bible lesson: “You must seek to entice them (*your students*) away from their private thoughts and share in this time of learning. And so you use a hook. Fishermen use it to get the fish out of the lake into the boat. You use it to bring your students into the Word of life” (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 155; italics mine). A good *Hook* gets attention, surfaces a need relevant to the learners, answers the learners’ question, “Why should I listen to this?” and naturally leads into the Bible study (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 155-56). For the adult learner, establishing a personal sense of need for the topic to be studied is integral, as stated above (Richards 1974, 81). A good *Hook* may also allow the teacher to create a scenario or problem, and ask questions to his learners which would allow for learner interaction and discussion. The possibilities are endless. Point being, opening a Bible lesson with a *Hook* is very consistent with andragogical teaching.

After the *Hook* comes the *Book*. “In the Book section the teacher seeks to clarify the meaning of the passage being studied. In this part of the teaching-learning
process, the teacher helps his students get—and understand—the biblical information” (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 156). Richards acknowledges that a lecture method or a more participatory method can be used in this section. When teaching adults specifically, Richards is a proponent of challenging students to discover the meaning of the text themselves (Richards 1974, 86-88). Again, there are a limitless number of ways to allow for this student discovery. However, it should also be noted that the teacher should also realize his responsibility to correct student errors and clarify the meaning of the text appropriately.

Following the Book section is the Look section. Richards writes,

When the students understand what the Bible says, it’s time to move to implications. Their knowledge must be tempered with ‘spiritual wisdom and understanding’ (Col. 1:9). So the next step the teacher must plan for in the lesson preparation process involves guiding the class to discover and grasp the relationship of the truth just studied to daily living. (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 157)

In this Look section, the meaning of the text from the book section is brought to the twenty-first century. An important word in the quote above is “discover.” Particularly in teaching adults, it is essential to allow for student interaction and discovery in the Look section, as it was in the Book section. Teachers should use creativity in allowing for this bridge to be built from the original world in which the biblical text was written into the twenty-first century world in which the students live today.

The final component in the lesson construct is the Took section. In the Took section, a response is required. “For spiritual growth and reality in Christian experience, faith demands response in all the varied situations of human life” (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 158). Richards writes that teachers should help their students decide on actions that need to take place in their lives and determine a plan to accomplish it (Richards and
Bredfeldt 1998, 158). It is here that the teacher challenges his students to determine specific actions pertaining to the lesson topic that need to be incorporated into the student’s life. Time and intentionality are allotted in class for this conclusion to the lesson (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 158-59).

Of course not every lesson should follow the same *Hook-Book-Look-Took* format. Even though this structure allows for many methodologies to be employed while staying true to the construct (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 159), following *Hook-Book-Look-Took* for every lesson would get monotonous and too predictable for adult learners. However, it is a format that can be used with great regularity in teaching adults in the church today.

**Conclusion:**  
**Current Christian Scholarship**

In conclusion, there is great uniformity among Christian scholarship regarding teaching adults in the church. Effective adult educators in the church have a strong concern for people and an understanding that they are to be active, even self-directed, in the learning process. They have sensitivity to and value for learners’ experiences, needs, and interests. They place an emphasis on cooperative learning, and dealing with issues and problems in everyday life. They realize the educational capability of learners. They understand deep learning and spiritual formation will take place in an intentional, engaging, active, open, and loving community of Christ-followers. Finally, they construct their lessons to accommodate these beliefs, realizing that effective teaching of this sort takes time.
This concludes the survey of key Christian scholarship on adult education in the church. The following section will move out of the realm of Christian scholarship and into the realm of secular scholarship on adult education.

**Current Secular Scholarship in Adult Education**

As stated earlier, the recent decades have given significant critical scholarship to the topic of adult education. This focus is especially true among secular scholarship. The remainder of this chapter will examine the leading secular scholars in adult education. Five scholars will be examined. As in the previous section, there will be some overlap in their understandings of adult education, but each scholar brings a perspective unique to his or her own scholarship and expertise. It should be noted that each of these scholars offers a perspective that is often incredibly detailed and complex. The purpose of this section is not to give an exhaustive analysis of their core beliefs. Instead, the purpose is to give a short summary of their perspectives on adult education that have bearing on andragogical teaching in the church. Appropriately, this section will begin with a review of the theories of Malcolm Knowles, the father of andragogy.

**Malcolm S. Knowles: Andragogy**

In chapter 1, a brief summary of the tenets of Knowles’ theory of andragogy was given. As the leading concept in this project, it is appropriate in this section to expound on the history and tenets of andragogy. A derivative of the term “andragogy” traces its roots back into the early nineteenth century, used by German grammar school teacher Alexander Kapp. The term itself was used in the context of adult education in 1921 by German social scientist Eugen Rosenstock. Yugoslavian Dusan Savicevic, not
Knowles, brought the term and concept of andragogy to the United States in 1967 (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 58-59). It was Knowles, however, who was andragogy’s greatest champion.

Interestingly, the form of inquiry and discussion-based teaching that andragogy proposes has been in use in adult education for centuries by the Chinese, Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. Knowles expounds,

The ancient Chinese and Hebrews invented what we now call the *case method*, in which the leader or one of the group members describes a situation, often in the form of a parable, and together with the group explores its characteristics and possible solutions. The Greeks invented what we now call the *Socratic dialogue*, in which the leader or a group member poses a question or dilemma and the group members pool their thinking and experience to seek an answer or solution. The Romans were more confrontational: They used challenges that forced group members to state positions and then defend them. (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 35-36)

In 1950, Knowles wrote *Informal Adult Education*. This work, and other similar works, began to integrate what was known and experienced in adult education in an effort to formulate a comprehensive theory of adult learning. Finally, in the 1960s, the term “andragogy” was used as the organizing concept of adult learning theory (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 61).

Originally, andragogy was only understood as the contrast to pedagogy. If pedagogy was the teaching or leading of children, andragogy found its meaning as the teaching or leading of adults. Pedagogy was teacher-directed education based on six assumptions. First, “learners only need to know that they must learn what the teacher teaches if they want to pass and get promoted; they do not need to know how what they learn will apply to their lives.” Second, “the teacher’s concept of the learner is that of a dependent personality; therefore, the learner’s self-concept eventually becomes that of a
dependent personality.” Third, “the learner’s experience is of little worth as a resource for learning; the experience that counts is that of the teacher, the textbook writer, and the audiovisual aides producer.” Fourth, “learners become ready to learn what the teacher tells them they must learn if they want to pass and get promoted.” Fifth, “learners have a subject-centered orientation to learning; they see learning as acquiring subject-matter content.” Sixth, “learners are motivated to learn by external motivators (e.g., grades, the teacher’s approval or disapproval, parental pressures)” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 61-63).

In many ways, andragogy still finds its greatest meaning in its antithetical relationship with pedagogy. Knowles’ tenets of andragogical theory are the reciprocal of the six tenets of pedagogy above. It is worthwhile, at this point, to expound briefly on each of these six tenets.

**The need to know.** As opposed to pedagogy, adult students need to know why it is important to learn something before they begin learning (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 64). Before delving into the content of a lesson, it is imperative for the andragogical teacher to demonstrate to the learners why it is important to learn about this topic. “At the very least, facilitators can make an intellectual case for the value of the learning in improving the effectiveness of the learners’ performance or the quality of their lives” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 65).

**The learners’ self-concept.** Adults are responsible for their own decisions and lives. Their self-concept is not dependent on the teacher. In fact, it is important to the adult learner that others also recognize his responsibility and ability to be self-
directed in his decision-making. Teachers should be intentional in creating learning experiences that facilitate the transition from dependent learners to self-directed learners (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 65).

**The role of the learners’ experiences.** Knowles notes that adults enter the learning experience with a vast difference in the quantity of experiences and a fundamental difference in the quality of experiences. Under this reality, groups of adults are generally very heterogeneous in terms of their backgrounds, learning styles, motivations, needs, and interests. In light of these differences and experiences, it is appropriate to place a greater emphasis on peer-helping activities. Finally, because these adults often define themselves in terms of the experiences they have had, it is important for the adult educator to acknowledge these experiences and hence value each learner (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 65-67).

**Readiness to learn.** Knowles realizes through his research that “adults become ready to learn those things they need to know and be able to do in order to cope effectively with their real-life situations” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 67). Knowles also writes that adults have a strong readiness to learn when the content helps them move to a higher developmental level. The teacher can also induce readiness to learn in various ways: depicting models of exemplary performance, career counseling, and simulation exercises (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 67).

**Orientation to learning.** Adults have life-centered, task-centered, or problem-centered orientation to learning. “Adults are motivated to learn to the extent that they perceive that learning will help them perform tasks or deal with problems that they
confront in their life situations” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 67). Knowles goes on to write that these adult students learn most effectively when the new content (knowledge, understandings, skills, values, attitudes, etc.) is presented in a real-life context (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 67).

**Motivation.** Whereas pedagogy states that external motivators motivate learners, Knowles’ andragogical theory states that adult learners are most responsive to internal motivators. Although adults respond to external motivators as well, the most important are internal motivators such as “increased job satisfaction, self-esteem, quality of life, and the like” (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 68).

The actual practice of these tenets can take the form of many different methods in the classroom. Creativity can abound for the andragogical teacher. Much in this theory coincides well with the biblical and theological tenets described in chapter 2. With this summary understanding of andragogy, it is now appropriate move on to the other leading secular learning theorists.

**Jack Mezirow: Transformative Learning**

Jack Mezirow begins his work, *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*, with *a priori* assumption that should immediately raise a red flag for the Christian educator. Mezirow writes,

> As there are no fixed truths or totally definitive knowledge, and because circumstances change, the human condition may be best understood as a continuous effort to negotiate contested meanings. Milan Kundera, in *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*, wisely suggests that if there were too much incontestable meaning in the world we would succumb under its weight. (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 3)
Christians have issues with any statement, or worse yet, philosophy that fundamentally dismisses any acceptance of fixed truth and definitive knowledge. This assumption of Mezirow, of course, must be rejected. There are, however, many aspects to transformative learning theory that are valuable to Christian educators in the church.

Transformative learning theory is a complex and detailed theory. Given Mezirow’s assumption of no fixed truth, the learner’s context takes utmost importance. Mezirow writes, “That is why it is so important that adult learning emphasize contextual understanding, critical reflection on assumptions, and validating meaning by assessing reasons” (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 3). It is clear that according to transformative learning theory, what one has learned is highly dependent on one’s context (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 3).

With an understanding of the underlying assumptions of transformative learning theory, it is appropriate to define the theory. What is the definition of transformative learning? Mezirow gives a basic understanding of the theory:

Transformative learning refers to the process by which we transform our taken-for-granted frames of reference (meaning perspective, habits of mind, mind-sets) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective so that they may generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true and justified to guide action. Transformative learning involves participation in constructive discourse to use the experience of others to assess reasons justifying these assumptions, and making an action decision based on the resulting insight. (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 8)

Carlson’s summary of transformative learning theory is helpful. He summarizes the theory as centering on three themes. First, the learner critically reflects on current assumptions. Second, the learner becomes aware of his frames of reference. Third, learners participate in rational discourse (Carlson 2010, 214).
According to Mezirow, moving through these three main themes takes place in ten steps:

1. A disorienting dilemma
2. Self-examination
3. A critical assessment of assumptions
4. Recognition of a connection between one’s discontent and the process of transformation
5. Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions
6. Planning a course of action
7. Acquiring knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plan
8. Provisional trying of new roles
9. Building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships
10. A reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s new perspective (Mezirow, Taylor, and Associates 2009, 19)

A major focus of transformative learning is to understand one’s own purposes, values, feelings, and meanings rather than thoughtlessly accept, without critical reflection, those assumptions received from others in one’s various developmental contexts (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 8). This focus brings liberation and learning. It is the goal of transformative learning.

Defining terms and concepts is key in understanding transformative learning theory. A frame of reference is “a ‘meaning perspective,’ the structure of assumptions and expectations through which we filter sense impressions” (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 16). Frames of reference result from the way in which one interprets experience, and “often represent cultural paradigms (collectively held frames of reference)—learning
that is unintentionally assimilated from the culture—or personal perspectives derived from the idiosyncrasies of primary caregivers” (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 16-17).

Mezirow defines reflective, or rational, discourse as “that specialized use of dialogue devoted to searching for a common understanding and assessment of the justification of an interpretation or belief. This involves assessing reasons advanced by weighing the supporting evidence and arguments and by examining alternative perspectives” (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 10). He feels that American culture is not prone to collaborative thinking, and instead is conditioned to think in terms of winning and losing an argument. This view is diametrically opposed to reflective discourse (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 11). Mezirow writes,

Discourse is not based on winning arguments; it centrally involves finding agreement, welcoming difference, ‘trying on’ other points of view, identifying the common in the contradictory, tolerating the anxiety implicit in paradox, searching for synthesis, and reframing. (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 12-13)

In order to participate in the discourse that transformative learning prescribes, participants must have

1. More accurate and complete information
2. Freedom from coercion and distorting self-deception
3. Openness to alternative points of view: empathy and concern about how others think and feel
4. The ability to weigh evidence and assess arguments objectively
5. Greater awareness of the context of ideas and, more critically, reflectiveness of assumptions, including their own
6. An equal opportunity to participate in the various roles of discourse
7. Willingness to seek understanding and agreement and to accept a resulting best judgment as a test of validity until new perspectives, evidence, or arguments are
encountered and validated through discourse as yielding a better judgment (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 13-14)

As valuable as much of what Mezirow suggests is to the church, there is one glaring problem: his fundamental denial of absolute truth. This denial is a serious error for the Christian. Instead of seeking a contextualized truth agreed upon by a group of individuals, the Christian accepts the existence of absolute truth and seeks to understand it by dialoging with others. Truth does not change according to its sociological contexts. It is unchanging, regardless of context. It is the Word of God.

Mezirow’s theory also has a very high view of mankind. Mezirow admits that his theory “assumes the perfectibility of human beings” (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 8). Certainly this assumption discounts the pervasiveness of sin, especially since Mezirow’s worldview excludes any notion of redemption and sanctification by the Holy Spirit. This shortcoming is most clearly seen in his hope for reflective, rational discourse. Believing the majority of adults can come together “free from coercion and self-deception,” with “openness to alternative points of view,” and with “empathy and concern about how others think and feel,” and maintain collaborative thinking free from a winning/losing mindset is extremely idealistic in a fallen world.

Although there are aspects to Mezirow’s theory that have questionable benefit to adult education in the church, there are also aspects that are very relevant. Mezirow’s understanding of adult education translates well into what Christian educators seek to do in the church. He notes, “Adult education may be understood as an organized effort to assist learners who are old enough to be held responsible for their acts to acquire or enhance their understandings, skills, and dispositions” (Mezirow and Associates 2000, 26). Challenging learners to assess critically their beliefs, in a respectful and
collaborative community of others, validate or invalidate them, and then act on them is an important part of Christianity. Valuing and seeking understanding (“trying on”) of one’s experiences and perspectives is also commendable and important for Christians.

Stephen D. Brookfield was an associate of Mezirow at Teachers College, Columbia University. Brookfield’s work supplements much of Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory. Brookfield’s emphasis is on the significance of critical thinking in adults. It is to this topic that this project turns.

**Stephen D. Brookfield: Critical Thinking**

Brookfield is another social scientist with incredible depth and complexity. His critical theory is not easily summarized in a succinct manner. Yet, even with a summary examination of his theory, there are valuable insights that can be applied to adult education in the church.

The vision of critical theory is broader than adult education. It has great societal implications. Brookfield writes,

Critical theory is normatively grounded in a vision of a society in which people live collectively in ways that encourage the free exercise of their creativity without foreclosing that of others. In such a society people see their individual well-being as integrally bound up with that of the collective. They act toward each other with generosity and compassion and are ever alert to the presence of injustice, inequity, and oppression. (Brookfield 2005, 39)

Therefore, understanding the vision for the theory is important to create a society in which individuals are interconnected, altruistic, freely creative, and just toward one another. Implied from the quotation above, Brookfield acknowledges that critical theory is based on Marxism and pragmatism (Brookfield 2005, 16-23).
Critical theory fundamentally rests on the notion that adults should be critical thinkers, which is also integral to adult education in the church. According to Brookfield, thinking critically is “reflecting on the assumptions underlying our and others’ ideas and actions, and contemplating alternative ways of thinking and living” (Brookfield 1987, x). This theory is defined very similarly as Mezirow’s critical reflection. Again similar to Transformative Learning Theory, Brookfield identifies two activities that are central to critical thinking: identifying and challenging assumptions, and exploring and imagining alternatives (Brookfield 1987, 15). Brookfield believes critical thinking in adults yields some very desirable results. He writes,

> When we think critically, we come to our judgments, choices, and decisions for ourselves, instead of letting others do this on our behalf. We refuse to relinquish the responsibility for making the choices that determine our individual and collective futures to those who presume to know what is in our own best interests. We become actively engaged in creating our personal and social worlds. In short, we take the reality of democracy seriously. (Brookfield 1987, x)

How does critical theory, and critical thinking in particular, affect the practice of adult education? In Brookfield’s book written for adult educators, *The Skillful Teacher*, he summarizes the challenge of teaching well: “For the truth is . . . teaching is frequently a gloriously messy pursuit in which shock, contradiction, and risk are endemic” (Brookfield 2006, 1). An enormous advocate of discussion-based teaching, Brookfield writes of the necessity of “muddling through” teaching when the unexpected often happens, and students are actively involved in the learning (Brookfield 2006, 1-8).

According to Brookfield, there are three assumptions that undergird his teaching, and he feels should undergird all skillful teaching of adults. His first assumption is that “skillful teaching is whatever helps students learn” (Brookfield 2006, 18). This assumption is very similar to Hendricks' belief above that the way people learn
determines how one teaches. At first, this statement seems obvious and simplistic. However, upon deeper inspection, catering teaching to whatever helps the student makes the teaching more, and not less, complex. The teacher makes the appropriate adjustments dependent on the learner (Brookfield 2006, 18).

The second assumption is that “skillful teachers adopt a critically reflective stance towards their practice” (Brookfield 2006, 24). To have a critically reflective stance, teachers should have informed pedagogic actions, resulting in intentionality in their teaching methods. These informed actions meet three conditions. The first condition is that these actions “can be explained and justified to ourselves and others” (Brookfield 2006, 25). They are based on well-thought-out assumptions the teacher has about the practice of teaching. The second condition is that the actions are researched (Brookfield 2006, 25). It is important for teachers to have a strong rationale for their chosen methods. Finally, the third condition for an informed pedagogic action is that the action “has a good chance of achieving the consequences it intends, precisely because it has been researched” (Brookfield 2006, 25).

Brookfield defines the critical reflection necessary for teachers as “the process by which we research the assumptions informing our practice by viewing these through four complementary lenses—the lenses of students’ eyes, colleagues’ perceptions, literature, and our own autobiography” (Brookfield 2006, 26). Understanding the effectiveness of teaching through these four lenses will help greatly the teacher in his effectiveness in the classroom. It also models the critical thinking process in front of the students, a process that is foundational to the learning the teacher should intend to impart to his students (Brookfield 2006, 27).
The third and final assumption that undergirds effective adult teaching is that “the most important knowledge skillful teachers need to do good work is a constant awareness of how students are experiencing their learning and perceiving teachers’ actions” (Brookfield 2006, 28). Not always an easy endeavor, becoming aware of the students perspective on one’s teaching is essential for skillful teaching. This supposition, of course, is clearly connected with the first assumption, that teachers do whatever is necessary to help students learn. If student learning is the goal, the skillful teacher must seek to understand if his teaching is being translated effectively to his students.

In review, this examination of Brookfield reveals both his theoretical understanding of effective teaching, and the practical outgrowth of that theory in the classroom. Similar to Mezirow, challenging students to critical thinking is foundational to Brookfield’s understanding of adult education. Although not totally opposed to creative lecture (Brookfield 2006, 97-113), the teacher should teach in ways that help students learn, which, for adults, includes much discussion and interaction. In addition, teachers should reflect critically on their own teaching, which models critical thinking to students. Finally, teachers should understand their students’ perceptions of their teaching actions to be certain they are being effective.

Brookfield’s perspective is significant for adult education in the church. As stated above with Transformative Learning, challenging adult students in the church to think critically is imperative and will ultimately help deepen their Christian faith and living. Teachers in the church also need to cater their teaching to their learners. They should reflect critically on their teaching and seek feedback from students, other teachers, and educational literature. Are teachers in the church encouraging the free exercise of
their students’ creativity, and challenging them to make choices and decisions for the
good of others and the world? Surely this mindset has a place among the educators in the
church.

Complementing the perspectives on adult education of Knowles, Mezirow, and
Brookfield is David A. Kolb. Kolb’s contribution to this project was his emphasis on
experiential learning. As will be shown in the next section, experiential learning too has
significance for effective adult education in the church today.

**David A. Kolb: Experiential Learning**

In the most general sense, experiential learning is exactly what its name
suggests: learning through experience. Building on the works in experiential learning of
John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Jean Piaget, Kolb ultimately proposes his own model of
experiential learning. This model adds important insight for adult education in the
church.

Kolb’s examination of Dewey, Lewin, and Piaget’s understanding of
experiential learning led him to a list of six characteristics that were present in each
man’s theory. These six characteristics are

1. “Learning is best conceived as a process, not in terms of outcomes.” Ideas are not
   fixed and unchanging, but continuously formed and re-formed through experience
   (Kolb 1984, 26-27).

2. “Learning is a continuous process grounded in experience” (Kolb 1984, 27).

3. “The process of learning requires the resolution of conflicts between dialectically
   opposed modes of adaptation to the world.” This suggests that learning is inherently
   a tension and conflict-filled process (Kolb 1984, 29-30).

4. “Learning is a holistic process of adaptation to the world.” Learning involves the
total person—thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving (Kolb 1984, 31).
5. “Learning involves transactions between the person and the environment. . . . Learning in this sense is an active, self-directed process that can be applied not only in the group setting but in everyday life” (Kolb 1984, 34-36).

6. “Learning is the process of creating knowledge” (Kolb 1984, 36).

Kolb defines learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb 1984, 38). He also adds, “Knowledge results from the combination of grasping experience and transforming it” (Kolb 1984, 41). This experiential learning process is “a four-stage cycle with four adaptive learning modes: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation” (Kolb 1984, 40). Concrete experience and abstract conceptualization are dialectically opposed and form a vertical axis Kolb calls prehension. At one end of the axis, one experiences the world either conceptually and symbolically (comprehension), or at the other end of the axis, one experiences the world tangibly through direct physical experience (apprehension). Reflective observation and active experimentation are also dialectically opposed and form a horizontal axis Kolb calls transformation. One can transform his grasp of experience either through internal reflection (intention) at one end of this axis, or through active and external manipulation of the external world (extension) at the other end (Kolb 1984, 40-41).

The intricacies of this model were not as significant to this project as its general precept that learning occurs as knowledge is acquired, and reformed through constant progression through the four stages of the experiential learning cycle. It is not enough for the teacher to present content to his students and expect learning to occur. Learning is not “primarily a personal, internal process requiring only the limited environment of books, teacher, and classroom,” completely removed from the real world
Learning must involve exiting the academy and entering into practical living.

For adult education in the church, this model challenges the teacher to involve experiential learning in his instruction. Adults should be challenged to live out biblical concepts (concrete experimentation) intentionally, reflect on these experiences personally and through discussion with others (reflective observation), confirm or create abstract generalizations (abstract conceptualization), and delve into new experiences to test hypotheses (active experimentation). Adult learning in the church cannot be solely, or even primarily, in the classroom. Incorporating active experience into teaching in the church is an essential component of deep learning.

It should be noted that Kolb’s model shares many of the same characteristics as Richards and Bredfeldt’s Hook-Book-Look-Took method of lesson construction. Like Kolb, Richards and Bredfeldt’s emphasis is also ultimately on the practice and actions of the learner. The time learning together in the classroom ultimately gives the learner opportunities to create concrete experiences, and challenges him toward active experimentation with the concepts learned.

The final secular adult education scholar this project surveyed is Jane Vella. Vella’s expertise in adult education is in the use of dialogue in teaching. A basic assumption in Vella’s understanding of adult education is that learning is best achieved in dialogue (Vella 2002, 3). The practice of education in dialogue is what Vella calls learning tasks.
Jane Vella: Learning Tasks

For adults with an abundance of life experience, dialogue between teacher and learner is essential. This understanding led Vella to discover twelve principles and practices that are essential to teaching in dialogue. None of these twelve can be excluded; each is necessary to effective adult education in dialogue. The twelve principles are as follows:

1. “Needs Assessment: participation of the learners in naming what is to be learned” (Vella 2002, 4).

2. “Safety in the environment and the process. We create a context for learning. That context can be made safe” (Vella 2002, 4).

3. “Sound relationships between teacher and learner and among learners” (Vella 2002, 4).

4. “Sequence of content and reinforcement” (Vella 2002, 4). Content should be properly sequenced from easy to difficult, from simple to complex. Reinforcement means the repetition of content in diverse, engaging, and interesting ways until the content is learned (Vella 2002, 12-13).


6. “Respect for learners as decision makers” (Vella 2002, 4).


8. “Immediacy of learning” (Vella 2002, 4). Adults need to see the usefulness of learned content immediately (Vella 2002, 19).


11. “Engagement of the learners in what they are learning” (Vella 2002, 4).

Building on these twelve principles, Vella saw a need to shift from traditional teaching tasks to learning tasks. Teaching tasks are more teacher-centered, and often do not engage learners in critical thought and critical feeling (Vella 2001, 17). Learning tasks, however, are different. “A learning task is a way to structure dialogue. It is an open question put to members of a small group, who have been given all the resources they need to respond” (Vella 2001, XIII). Open questions respect the fact that adult learners have wisdom and experiences from which to draw insightful responses. These open questions invite critical thinking, reflection, and creativity (Vella 2001, 9). Having the resources to respond to open questions refers to the content of the lesson. Students have access to content through a lecture, video clip, an article, a model, or an endless number of other mediums of communication (Vella 2001, 11).

Vella understands effective lesson design to consist of four components, with learning tasks utilized in each component. *Inductive work* is the first component. *Inductive work* “connects learners with what they already know and with their unique context” (Vella 2001, 33). The second component is *input*. *Input* “invites them to examine new input (concepts, skills, or attitudes)—the content of the course” (Vella 2001, 33). The third component is *implementation*. *Implementation* “gets the learners to do something directly with that new content, somehow implementing it” (Vella 2001, 33). The final component in the lesson design is *integration*. The teacher should design “a learning task that integrates this new learning into their lives” (Vella 2001, 33).

Vella has four assumptions about adult learning and learning tasks. First, learners have the capacity to learn (Vella 2001, 2). Learners arrive to class with the capacity to do the work of learning. The teacher should realize this capability, and allow
for this in his lesson. Second, learners learn best when they are actively engaged with the content (Vella 2001, 3). This active engagement includes cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement. Third, new content can be presented through learning tasks (Vella 2001, 5). Finally, learning tasks promote accountability (Vella 2001, 6). Learners become accountable for their own learning.

The concept of learning tasks is tremendously valuable to adult Christian education. Vella’s lesson design structure is very transferrable to learning in the church. It follows very similar purposes as Richards and Bredfeldt’s Hook-Book-Look-Took design and Kolb’s experiential learning process, both described earlier. The additional layer of adding a learning task to each component is helpful.

Vella’s work confirms the need to get adults active and engaged in the learning process. Her structured dialogue is helpful to the teacher in the church with fears about the chaos that can ensue from allowing learners to ask questions and discuss content being introduced. Open-ended questions related to the adoption and practice of Christian virtues and mandates can challenge the adult learner to put into practice what is discussed in the classroom. Overall, Vella’s insights into adult education are of great benefit to adult educators in the church.

**Conclusion: Current Secular Scholarship**

Similar to those of the Christian scholars, the secular scholars in adult education hold like views in how to teach adults most effectively. Adult students should be active and engaged in the learning process. Their life experiences should be valued and utilized to enhance discussion and apply concepts to real-world living. Previously held assumptions should be challenged by students and teacher alike using their critical
thinking skills. More accurate assumptions can be arrived at in the context of community and mutually beneficial discussion. Learning through experience (doing) is significant to the learning process. Adult learners are capable of learning and should be held accountable for their part in the process. Finally, there is more equality between teacher and adult learner, inside and outside the classroom.

Chapter Conclusion

In summary, whether one comes at adult education from a Christian or secular perspective, many of the same conclusions will be reached. Adults must be active and participative in the learning process. They must be recognized as self-directed learners. Adults’ experiences must be valued, utilized, and even given meaning through their learning. They must know why the content of learning is important to their real lives, and receive proper motivation. Adult educators must recognize adult students’ capability to learn and provide accountability for students’ roles in the learning process. Adult learning environments must be safe places of encouragement, collaboration, and trust. Adult lessons should be intentionally structured in ways that draw the learner into the subject at hand, provide new content that has bearing on the learner’s life, and present a challenge to incorporate this new content into the learner’s life. Finally, throughout the lesson, the learner should be engaged and active, working through the tasks of learning.

The homogeny of findings among current scholarship in adult education should provide the teacher of adults in the church great comfort in his understanding of the best ways to teach his students so that learning and life change occurs. The next chapter tested these findings and put them into practice. Just how much more effective
was andragogical teaching than pedagogical teaching among adults in the church?

Chapter 4 seeks to answer this question.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY USED IN CONDUCTING PROJECT

Introduction

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the effectiveness of a lecture-based, pedagogical teaching philosophy versus a discussion-based, andragogical teaching philosophy in Adult Bible Fellowships at The Chapel in Akron, Ohio. As a result of this project, two ABFs at The Chapel were taught four lessons each on Ephesians. As evidenced by the questionnaires, the students in both groups grew in their knowledge of Ephesians, enjoyed the style of teaching under which they learned, and applied the main ideas of the lessons to their lives. Although learning occurred in both groups, when compared to the group that learned under pedagogical teaching, it was discovered that the group that learned under andragogical teaching had greater learning. In addition to fulfilling its purpose, the project also met its goals.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of andragogical teaching was measured using a fifteen-week project. The fifteen weeks were divided into four phases with different emphases in each phase. The first phase encompassed the first five weeks of the project and included all the preliminary work. The second phase encompassed the next four weeks and entailed completing the original research in the two ABFs chosen in this project. The third phase included the following five weeks and was spent analyzing the results of the project, summarizing the project and the tenets of andragogical teaching to
be presented to the project participants, and creating a teacher-training curriculum. The final week marked the fourth phase, and was spent debriefing with the ABFs’ members and leaders who participated in this project, along with the new pastor of ABFs.

The first goal of the project, that the ABF teachers participating in this project learn the tenets of andragogical teaching, was met as these teachers received the findings of this project and were given a summary explanation of andragogical teaching. Time was spent with the participating teachers to ensure each clearly understood andragogy and the value therein.

The second goal, that new ABF and Home ABF teachers adopt a more participatory teaching style, was met when changes were made to the new teacher application and training requirements for new ABF and Home ABF teachers that reflect the benefits of participatory teaching among adult learners in the ABF environment. This new requirement included a summary report of the findings of this project, as well as a summary explanation of andragogical teaching. These were the same reports given at the conclusion of this project to the participating ABF teachers, as explained above.

The third goal, to develop a teacher-training curriculum that equips all ongoing teachers of ABFs and Home ABFs to utilize the tenets of andragogical teaching, was met when a new teacher-training curriculum, based on the findings of this project, was developed to guide existing teachers of adults at The Chapel to bring about more effective learning in their groups.

The fourth goal, that the adult learners in the participating ABFs understand the tenets of andragogy and more highly value dialogue and discussion, critical reflection, and active participation in the learning process, was met when ABF student participants
received the findings of this project and were given an explanation of andragogical
teaching.

**First Phase: Five Weeks of Preliminary Work**

The project began with the decision-making process on the texts from the book of Ephesians on which to teach. Given the nature of the project, it was determined that the teaching component of the project should consist of a four-week series taught in each ABF. The six-chapter length of Ephesians prohibited choosing a text from each chapter. Instead, two passages were chosen from the first half of the book, which focused on correct doctrine, and two passages were chosen from the second half of the book, which focused on correct living, or the application of the correct doctrine in chapters 1-3.

The first passage chosen was Ephesians 1:1-14. This writer felt it was important to begin the series at the beginning of the book in order to give the history and background of Ephesians, and to introduce the writer, the apostle Paul. This passage also offered a significant theological doctrine on which all students participating in the study needed to have a clear understanding: God’s sovereign predestination of all those who come to believe. Lesson 1 was created during the first week of the project. A detailed account of the exegetical idea, pedagogical idea, and lesson aims of each lesson on each passage will be given in the following section.

The second passage chosen was Ephesians 2:8-10. This passage was chosen because it too offered insight into an important theological doctrine. It was decided that verse 10 be included in this passage as well because of the importance of understanding verses 8-9 in the context of verse 10. The Christian is saved by grace, through faith, and
is created to do good works that God prepared especially for him. Lesson 2 was created during the second week of the project.

The third passage chosen was Ephesians 4:1-6. This passage was chosen because it emphasized one of the main themes throughout Ephesians: unity in the church. This passage was also chosen because of the current climate at The Chapel. The church is in transition due to a recent change in senior leadership. Unity among the body, and supporting the new leadership of the church, is currently an important need among the congregation. Lesson 3 was created during the third week of the project.

The final passage chosen was Ephesians 6:10-18. This passage was chosen because of the importance for the Christian to stand firm, fully armored, and aware of the aggressive activities of the evil one. Lesson 4 was created during the fourth week of the project.

After each lesson was completed, presentation slides were created for each lesson and each class. This writer was intentional to maintain the same visual aids used in the lessons taught in each ABF. The visual components of the lessons would have no significant effect on outcome of the research.

After completing the lessons, consideration was given to the creation of the questionnaires used to gather the data. There were 14 questions on both the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire that were the same. These questions were a combination of short answer, multiple choice, and Likert scale. The first 9 questions gauged the knowledge of certain specifics of Ephesians that students possessed entering into the study. The first 2 questions were historical questions. The next 3 questions focused on a general understanding of the book as a whole. The following 4 questions
centered on the four passages that were studied during the four-week series taught in the ABF. The next 4 questions asked respondents about their personal practice—life application—of the teachings of the four passages studied during the four-week series. The final question gathered the respondent’s perceived understanding of the book of Ephesians as a whole. The final 5 questions used a Likert scale for student responses.

In addition to these 14 questions, the pre-questionnaire had 4 questions that gathered information on the respondents’ involvement in any other groups that were discussion-based, the style of teaching under which they most preferred to learn, the style of teaching under which they learned best, and the style of teaching in the ABF in which they were involved. Finally, there were 4 questions that gathered information on the respondent’s demographic.

In addition to the 14 questions above, the post-questionnaire added an additional 6 questions. One question asked the respondent which part of the lesson was most memorable. The remaining 5 questions asked respondents if studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in their class was: fun and enjoyable, helpful to the respondents in learning information from Ephesians, helpful to the respondents to put into practice that which they learned, helpful to the respondents to grow in their relationships with other class members, and challenging to the respondents to think critically about the meaning and message behind the texts studied. These final 5 questions utilized a Likert scale for responses.

After the questionnaires were completed and approved by the seminary ethics committee, the two ABFs were chosen to participate in the project. It was decided that two groups of senior adults, Fellowheirs I and Fellowheirs II, would be chosen for the
study. These two groups were chosen for three reasons. First, they met during different hours on Sunday mornings, and also both groups met at the Akron Campus of The Chapel. In fact, Fellowheirs I met before the first service, while Fellowheirs II met during the second service, thus allowing this writer to teach the first group, attend service, and then teach the second group. Second, these two groups consisted of members who were not only of the same demographic, but they also used to meet together as one ABF. In previous years, they had grown so large it became necessary to divide into two groups. Therefore, the samples were very similar. Third, in this writer’s opinion, the hypothesized results of this project would be more significant because many at The Chapel felt that senior adults preferred and learned best in lessons taught in a lecture format.

After the ABFs were chosen, the teachers of the groups were contacted and asked if they would participate in the project. After agreeing, this writer drafted a letter that was sent to all members of each ABF that explained the project in detail, and requested their participation (Appendix 8). The creation of the questionnaire, the choosing of the participating ABFs, and the contact made to the participating ABF teachers was done during the fifth week of the project. After the lessons were completed, the questionnaires were created, the letters were sent out, and the leaders were committed to the project, the four-week teaching series in each ABF began.

Second Phase: Four Weeks of Original Research

The second grouping of weeks consisted of completing the original research in each group. At the beginning of the first session, the pre-questionnaire was administered in each class. The pre-questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1.
Pre-Questionnaire

Students that chose to participate in the project were given time prior to the beginning of the lesson to complete the questionnaire in its entirety. Respondents were instructed not to guess randomly at questions for which they did not know the answer. They were told it was acceptable to leave those questions blank. Eighteen students from the andragogical ABF responded to the pre-questionnaire, and 28 students from the pedagogical ABF. It was clarified that only those respondents that were present for at least three of the four weeks of the series would be eligible to take the post-questionnaire, and whose data would be fit for the project. After the pre-questionnaire was administered, the first lesson began.

Lesson 1: Ephesians 1:1-14

Lesson 1 was completed during the sixth week of the project. The exegetical idea for the first lesson was that God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit. The pedagogical idea was that as chosen children of God, believers should feel extremely grateful, loved, and secure for God’s wonderful and irrevocable gift of salvation.

There were three lesson aims. The cognitive aim was that students would process and come to terms with the truth of God’s total sovereignty in their salvation by studying Ephesians 1:1-14. The affective aim was that students would feel and experience anew the security and freedom of God’s love, remembering the promised inheritance they would one day receive because of the sealing of the Holy Spirit, by hearing and then quietly processing the implications of Ephesians 1:1-14. The behavioral aim was that students would reflect on how they should live as secure, forgiven children
of God, by writing down specific actions in their lives they should continue or change, and committing to making at least one positive change in the next week.

In all of the lessons, the main differences between the pedagogical and andragogical versions of the lessons were that as the pedagogical versions were completely lecture-driven, the andragogical versions incorporated more student activity, interaction, and discussion, and students were challenged to discover passage interpretations and applications, instead of being given them by the teacher. The first andragogical lesson opened with students being put into groups of four, to share with each other the greatest gift they had ever received. This sharing time led into the discussion of God’s gifts, His spiritual blessings, given to believers.

After approximately 10 minutes of lecture, students were assigned a learning task. Students were again placed in groups of four, and each group was assigned one of the six spiritual blessings Paul emphasized in the passage. Groups were asked to complete four tasks regarding their assigned spiritual blessing. They were to read the part of the passage that spoke of their assigned blessing, discuss the meaning of the blessing as a group, summarize what the blessing was in their own words, and finally to write down why the spiritual blessing was significant, and what were the implications to their lives. They were given 10 minutes to complete the task, and each group was asked to report their findings to the class.

The final difference between the pedagogical version and andragogical version of the lesson was in the personal application. Whereas in the pedagogical version the students were challenged to consider application points at the end of class, and to write them down afterwards, the andragogical version allotted quiet time in class for students to
consider the application points, to write them down with the provided pencils and on notecards, and to share them with their spouse or a close friend. Students in the andragogical class were then challenged to put their notecard in a visible place where it could provide a visual application reminder throughout the week.

**Lesson 2: Ephesians 2:8-10**

Lesson 2 was completed during the seventh week of the project. The exegetical idea for the second lesson was that although grace and not works saved Christians, they were *created* to do good works prepared especially for them by God. The pedagogical idea was that good works were not optional for Christians. Instead, Christians were created for them.

There were three lesson aims. The cognitive aim was that students would understand not only that salvation was by grace, through faith, but also that they were created to do good works by examining Ephesians 2:8-10. The affective aim was that students would feel the importance that God places on doing good works by examining the importance He places on doing good to others in passages of Scripture other than Ephesians 2:8-10. The behavioral aim was that students would commit to doing two good works the following week that God prepared in advance for them to do, by writing down specific actions they should take in helping others.

Similar to the first lesson, the main difference in the andragogical version of the lesson was in the student discovery that was inherent in the learning task and application. After an initial hook/introduction, a recap of the main ideas from the previous week was given. Instead of simply lecturing through the recap, this writer asked
the students questions regarding the learning from the previous week, and the students responded in a discussion format.

After the recap, a learning task was assigned. Students were placed in groups of five, and asked to read Ephesians 2:1-10. They were then asked to discuss the meaning of the passage, specifically what the passage taught on the Christian’s sin, God’s love, God’s grace, the Christian’s faith, and the Christian’s works. After they came to a consensus understanding of those five topics from the passage, they were asked to write down their findings in one sentence. After 20 minutes, students were asked to report their findings to the class.

After the learning task, this writer clarified the meaning of the text through a short lecture, and emphasized the significance of good works in the life of the believer. Students were given five minutes in class to reflect quietly on the day’s teaching, and to reflect prayerfully on the good works God prepared specifically for them. This writer then led the students through a personal application time of prayer, in which students were asked to commit to doing the good works God prepared for them.

Lesson 3: Ephesians 4:1-6

Lesson 3 was completed during the eighth week of the project. The exegetical idea for the third lesson was that as a follower of Christ, one is united with others in Christ, and should live in ways that promote that unity. The pedagogical idea was that one should order his life to promote unity with other brothers and sisters in Christ.

This lesson had three lesson aims as well. The cognitive aim was that students would understand the call to unity that God gave and expects of His people by examining Ephesians 4:1-6. The affective aim was that students would feel the devastating effects
of disunity, and understand how detrimental it can be to the church by hearing stories and examples of disunity. The behavioral aim was that students would commit to unity in the church and its leadership, by declaring it to others in the class, and by writing a letter to the leadership team of the church declaring their support and commitment.

The main differences between the pedagogical and andragogical versions of the lesson were in the hook/introduction, the student discovery brought about by a learning task, and in the personal application. The “hook” involved student volunteers doing various tasks with challenging encumbrances, which pointed to their need for assistance from other students without those encumbrances. This activity led into the topic of the interconnectedness and unity of the church.

After a brief recap of the previous two weeks, and an introduction to Ephesians 4, students were assigned a learning task. Students were placed in groups of four, and assigned one of the five virtues Paul wrote that believers in the church should possess (humility, gentleness, patience, forbearance, and love). Each group was asked to respond to three questions regarding the virtue. First, they were asked what the virtue meant, and how they defined it. Second, they were asked how the virtue contributed to unity in the church. Third, they were asked to cite some practical examples of this virtue lived out in individuals in the church. They were given fifteen minutes to discuss the questions, and afterwards were asked to report their findings to the class. As groups reported their findings, this writer contributed to the discussion by sharing insights he learned through his personal study of the passage.

After the learning task, students in the andragogical class were challenged to consider applying this teaching on unity by writing a letter to the leadership team at The
Chapel. They were asked to express to the church leaders that they would work toward peace and unity in the church, and would support the vision the leadership had for the church without grumbling or complaining. They were challenged to tell the senior pastor they would follow his leadership and support his decisions. Students were given pencils, paper, and envelopes and allotted 10 minutes to complete this application.

**Lesson 4: Ephesians 6:10-18**

Lesson 4 was completed during the ninth week of the project. The exegetical idea for the fourth lesson was to be strong in the Lord, and to put on His full armor so that one can stand firm against the attacks of the devil. The pedagogical idea was that being strong in the Lord, and prepared for the attacks of the devil, brings victory in the Christian’s struggle with evil.

There were three lesson aims. The cognitive aim was that students would understand the meaning and significance of the armor of God by studying Ephesians 6:10-18. The affective aim was that students would not fear, but respect the power of evil in this world, by understanding evil’s power in relation to mankind and to God. Finally, the behavioral aim was that students would commit to being strong in the Lord by writing down actions and concepts they believed would help strengthen them, by utilizing the spreadsheet provided in class that gauged their progress for two weeks.

The main differences between the pedagogical and andragogical versions of the lesson were in the student discovery brought about by a learning task, and in the personal application. After the hook/introduction and a 10 minute lecture-driven exposition of the Ephesians 6:10-12, students were given a learning task to discover the meaning of the various pieces of armor described in verses 13-18. Students were placed
in groups, and given a handout with half a page of researched information regarding one of the pieces of armor, and half a page where students could make notes. Students were then asked to read about their assigned piece of armor, discuss the significance of the piece of armor, discuss what “wearing” their assigned piece of armor looked like, and finally to discuss how they would explain the meaning of the armor to others. They were allotted 6 minutes to complete the above assignments. After 6 minutes, each group had to give each other group a two-minute explanation of their piece of armor, and listen as each other group shared the meaning of their piece of armor to them in 2 minutes. In 24 minutes, each group explained the meaning of their assigned piece of armor five times, and heard each other piece explained to them.

After the learning task, students were challenged to consider up to five habits they could instill in their lives to wear tangibly the full armor of God. They were given a spreadsheet that allowed them to record the daily practice of those habits for two weeks. They were allotted 5 minutes to consider those habits.

**Post-Questionnaire**

When the fourth lesson was completed, students were given a post-questionnaire to complete. They were afforded the option of either completing the questionnaire immediately after class, or taking it home to complete, and send in the following week. Students that took the post-questionnaire home were given addressed, stamped envelopes in which to mail the questionnaires back to this writer. Only students who completed the pre-questionnaire, and were present for three of the four lessons, were given a post-questionnaire to complete. A list of the names of the eligible students in each class was made to follow up post-questionnaires that were not received by the
Tuesday following the final lesson. Sixteen students that took the pre-questionnaire from the andragogical class were eligible and completed a post-questionnaire. Fifteen students that took the pre-questionnaire from the pedagogical class were eligible and completed a post-questionnaire. The post-questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2. Following the four-week series taught in each ABF, a summary of the findings of the project, a summary of andragogical teaching, and a comprehensive teacher-training curriculum were created.

Third Phase: Five Weeks of Analyzing the Results

The third phase of weeks consisted of analyzing and summarizing the results of the project, creating a summary of the tenets of andragogical teaching, and creating a three-session, teacher-training curriculum. The analysis and summary of the results from the questionnaires was completed during the tenth week of the project with the assistance of a statistics professor with expertise in data analysis. Both a T-Test and a Z-Test were used in the assessment. The results of this analysis will be discussed in Chapter 5, and the specifics of the analysis for both classes are found in Appendix 5. Appendices 3 and 4 detail the summaries of results of the questionnaires for the andragogical class and pedagogical class, respectively.

Teacher-Training Curriculum

The creation of a teacher-training curriculum was a significant result of the findings of this project. Current scholarly research in adult education, noted in Chapter 3, reveals the value in andragogical methods of teaching. Therefore, the teacher-training
curriculum emphasized three main areas: fundamentals of creating a Bible lesson, the
nature and methods of effective teaching, and the nature of the learner.

**Teacher-training 1.** The first section of the teacher-training curriculum
focused on creating an effective Bible lesson, and was completed during the eleventh
week of the project. Richards’ and Bredfeldt’s book, *Creative Bible Teaching*, was the
primary text utilized in this training, and their Hook-Book-Look-Took construct was the
model that ABF teachers were encouraged to use. The training began by explaining the
value in doing the preliminary work of writing an exegetical idea, pedagogical idea, and
lesson aims. It then progressed to explain the specifics of the “hook,” “book,” “look,”
and “took” portions of the lesson.

As each part of the training was explained, students participated in a mock
lesson on 1 Kings 19:9-13a where they could experience each component of the lesson
being taught. This mock lesson was exemplary in getting students involved in the
learning process, and demonstrated tangibly each component of the construct.

The final part of the training was a practicum. Students worked in groups to
create an exegetical idea, pedagogical idea, lesson aims, “hook,” and “took” for various
passages in Ephesians. After working together for forty minutes, each group presented
their findings in a four-minute presentation to the entire group. The training concluded
with a time of prayer and evaluation. The student handouts for the first teacher-training
curriculum are found in Appendix 10. The teaching notes for the first teacher-training
curriculum are found in Appendix 9.
**Teacher-Training 2.** The second section of the teacher-training curriculum focused on andragogy, with a special emphasis on inductive teaching, and was completed during the twelfth week of the project. Knowles, Holton, and Swanson’s book, *The Adult Learner*, and *The Christian Educator’s Handbook on Adult Education*, edited by Gangel and Wilhoit, were the two primary texts used in this training. This training section provided a clear explanation of the tenets of andragogy, and showed inductive teaching as an important approach within andragogical teaching.

Amidst the factual information explaining andragogy, mock lesson examples were utilized throughout the training to demonstrate the philosophy in action. The art of asking questions and facilitating discussion, simulations, case studies, and problem-solving were methods of inductive teaching that were demonstrated throughout the training.

Like the first section, the final part of this training section was a practicum. Students worked in groups to create an exegetical idea, pedagogical idea, and lesson aims for various passages in 1 Peter. After this preliminary work, each group worked together to create an inductive lesson on their passage. After forty minutes, each group presented their findings in a four-minute presentation to the entire group. The training concluded with a time of prayer and evaluation. The student handouts for the second teacher-training curriculum are found in Appendix 12. The teaching notes for the second teacher-training curriculum are found in Appendix 11.

**Teacher-Training 3.** The third section of the teacher-training curriculum focused on students’ learning styles, and was completed during the thirteenth week of the project. The primary text used in this section of training was *Learning Styles*, by Marlene
LeFever. This training section provided a clear understanding of the various learning styles of students, and offered a framework of lesson construction complementary to Hook-Book-Look-Took. The modalities of learning and hemisphericity were also explained in this training.

Similar to the other training sections, the third teacher-training curriculum incorporated multiple times of student interaction and discussion. It also included a practicum. Students worked in groups to create a portion of a lesson from 1 John 3:1-10, taking into consideration learning styles. An exegetical idea, pedagogical idea, and lesson aims for the passage were given to the students ahead of time so they could quickly begin the actual lesson construction. Each group was assigned one of the learning styles on which to focus their portion of the lesson. After thirty minutes, each group presented their findings in a four-minute presentation to the entire group. The training concluded with a time of prayer and evaluation. The student handouts for the third teacher-training curriculum are found in Appendix 14. The teaching notes for the third teacher-training curriculum are found in Appendix 13.

**Summary of Andragogical Teaching**

The fourteenth week was spent summarizing the tenets of andragogical teaching. A document was created that succinctly defined andragogical teaching, clarified the rationale for andragogical teaching, and explained the benefits that lie therein. This document was created to become part of the application and job description used in recruiting new ABF teachers, to be used in explaining andragogical teaching to the teachers of the ABFs that participated in this project, and finally to be used in
explaining andragogical teaching to the students in the ABFs that participated in this project. This summary is found in Appendix 7.

**Fourth Phase: One Week Debriefing with Participants**

The final week of the fifteen-week project was spent debriefing with those that participated in the project. Debriefing was done with the ABF members that participated in the project, the ABF teachers that participated in the project, and the new pastor of ABFs at The Chapel. In the middle of the project, this writer was downsized from his staff position at The Chapel. Another gentleman was named the pastor overseeing ABFs at all three campuses of the church. This writer felt it would be helpful to this gentleman to include him in the debriefing of the project for the future development of adult ABF teachers at The Chapel.

Each debriefing session consisted of sharing the summary of results of the project (Appendix 6), and the summary of andragogical teaching (Appendix 7). Care was taken to answer any questions that arose regarding the project results or andragogical teaching. This writer’s contact information was given to project participants if any further questions arose. Great thanks were expressed to all who participated in the project.

The time with the new pastor overseeing ABFs focused much the same as that with the project participants. In addition, the pastor was offered complete use of the teacher-training curriculum created during the project, as well as complete use of the summary sheets to incorporate into the ABF teacher application and job description.
Conclusion

In conclusion, the purpose of the project was to evaluate the effectiveness of andragogical teaching in ABFs at The Chapel. The fifteen-week project consisted of four essential phases: the preliminary work, the completion of the original research, the analysis and summary of the results of the project, and the debriefing with project participants. Each phase was integral in achieving valuable results. Chapter 5 will summarize the findings of the project, and offer conclusions regarding those findings.
CHAPTER 5
EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE PROJECT

Introduction

Equipping teachers in the church to become more effective in teaching the truths of Christianity is an important part of the calling of the church’s pastoral leaders. This project was created to contribute to that end. Chapter 5 will evaluate the goals of the project, analyze the results of the questionnaires, indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the project, specify ways the project could be improved, and reflect on what this writer learned theologically and personally through the course of the project. First, however, will be an evaluation of the purpose of the project.

Evaluation of the Purpose

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the effectiveness of a lecture-based, pedagogical teaching philosophy versus a discussion-based, andragogical teaching philosophy in Adult Bible Fellowships at The Chapel in Akron, Ohio. As a result of this project, two ABFs at The Chapel were taught four lessons each on Ephesians. As evidenced by the questionnaires, the students in both groups grew in their knowledge of Ephesians, enjoyed the style of teaching under which they learned, and applied the main ideas of the lessons to their lives. Although learning occurred in both groups, when compared to the group that learned under pedagogical teaching, it was discovered that the
group that learned under andragogical teaching had greater learning. In addition to fulfilling its purpose, the project also met its goals.

**Evaluation of the Goals**

There were four goals for this project. The first goal was that the ABF teachers participating in this project learn the tenets of andragogical teaching. This goal was met as these teachers received the summary of the findings of this project, and were given a summary explanation of andragogical teaching. Each teacher was also given a copy of the entire teacher-training curriculum (created to meet the third goal) that clarified andragogical teaching on a more exhaustive level. Time was spent with the participating teachers to ensure each clearly understood andragogy and the value therein.

The summary of project results can be found in Appendix 6. The summary of andragogical teaching can be found in Appendix 7. The teacher-training curriculum can be found in Appendices 9-14.

The second goal, that new ABF and Home ABF teachers adopt a more participatory teaching style, was more challenging to meet as a result of this writer being downsized from the staff at The Chapel. Although slightly different than originally intended, this goal was met when changes were offered to the new pastor of ABFs. This goal included making changes to the new teacher application and training requirements for new teachers to reflect the benefits of participatory teaching among adult learners in the ABF environment. These changes included the summary report of the project results, as well as the summary of andragogical teaching. These were the same reports given at the conclusion of this project to the participating ABF teachers, as explained above and
found in Appendices 6 and 7. The new pastor of ABFs intends on making these changes to the new teacher application and training requirements.

The third goal, to develop a teacher-training curriculum that equips all ongoing teachers of ABFs and Home ABFs to utilize the tenets of andragogical teaching, was met when a new teacher-training curriculum, based on the findings of this project, was developed to guide existing teachers of adults at The Chapel to bring about more effective learning in their groups. The training was extensive, and designed to be taught in three sessions that were three and one half hours each. Many of the specifics of this curriculum can be found in Chapter 4, while the trainings can be found in their entirety in Appendices 9-14.

The fourth goal, that the adult learners in the participating ABFs understand the tenets of andragogy, and more highly value dialogue and discussion, critical reflection, and active participation in the learning process, was met when ABF student participants received the findings of this project and were given an explanation of andragogical teaching. These were again the same documents used in goals one and two, and can be found in Appendices 6-7.

**Analysis of Questionnaire Results**

The results of the questionnaire were analyzed and the findings were significant. In the ABF that learned under andragogical methodology, there were 18 respondents to the pre-questionnaire. However, only 16 respondents were eligible (completed the pre-questionnaire, and were present for three of the four lessons of the project) to complete the post-questionnaire, and were included in the study. Eight of the respondents were females and 8 were males. Two of the respondents were under 60,
while the other 14 were 60 or older. Every respondent had attended the ABF for at least 12 years, with 10 having attended more than 27 years. The average tenure in the ABF was over 25 years.

In the ABF that learned under pedagogical methodology, there were 28 respondents to the pre-questionnaire. However, only 15 respondents were eligible to complete the post-questionnaire and were included in the study. Eight of the respondents were females and 7 were males. Three of the respondents were under 60, while the other 12 were 60 or older. Most respondents had attended the ABF for at least 8 years, with 8 having attended more than 15 years. The average tenure in the ABF was over 11 years.

The responses to the questionnaires were analyzed using three methods, depending on the nature of the question. After the demographical questions, the first 9 questions measured the factual content learned from Ephesians and its background. Responses were analyzed using a Proportion Test since respondents marked either the correct or incorrect answer on both the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire. Z-stats, or z-scores as Salkind refers to them, are “the result of dividing the amount that a raw score differs from the mean of the distribution by the standard deviation” (Salkind 2000, 155-156). Ultimately the z-stats derived from these questions indicated how effective each teaching methodology was in increasing factual learning from the project’s lessons. Corresponding z-stats and p-values were computed for each question and can be found in Appendix 5.

The next 5 questions measured how well the respondent applied the main ideas of the passages studied in the project to his life, and how well he felt he understood the overall themes of Ephesians. According to Salkind, “A t-test for dependent means
indicates that a single group of the same subjects is being studied under two conditions” (Salkind 2000, 207). Responses, therefore, were analyzed using this T-Test for dependent samples since respondents from each class could choose their level of agreement with each question using a Likert scale on both the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire. Answers from the questionnaires were given numeric values for analysis as follows: SA=6, AS=5, A=4, D=3, DS=2, SD=1. Corresponding t-stats and p-values were computed for each question and can be found in Appendix 5.

The following 5 questions measured the respondents’ perceived level of effectiveness of the method with which they were taught. Responses were analyzed using a T-Test for independent means since respondents only answered these questions on the post-questionnaire, and the pedagogical class was being compared with the andragogical class. The T-Test for independent means was used because, according to Salkind, it measures the “difference on average scores of one (or more) variable(s) between the two groups that were independent of one another” (Salkind 2000, 192). For the analysis, answers from the questionnaires were given the same numeric values as above according to their level of agreement. Corresponding t-stats and p-values were computed for each question and can be found in Appendix 5.

The final question asked the respondent what was the most memorable part of the lessons. Respondents could choose one answer from the following list: introduction, Bible exposition, challenge to life application, stories, discussions, and activities. Responses to these questions were simply pooled and compared by classes.

The results of the analysis of the first 9 questions revealed that both classes had statistically significant increases in scores from the pre-questionnaire to the post-
questionnaire. The andragogical class, however, had z-stats and p-values that were significantly higher than the pedagogical class on 6 of the 9 questions. Two of the 9 questions had relatively equal z-stats and p-values between the two classes. The pedagogical class had a higher z-stat and p-value on one question. These results revealed that the null hypothesis could be rejected, and that the overall scores from the andragogical class were significantly higher than those of the pedagogical class in terms of factual content learned from Ephesians.

The results of the analysis of the next 5 questions yielded very interesting and unexpected results. The first 4 of these 5 questions measured how well the respondent applied the main ideas of the passages studied in the project to his life. Both the andragogical class and pedagogical class had negative t-stats (indicating lower responses on the post-questionnaire than the pre-questionnaire) for two questions. The andragogical class had non-significant t-stats and p-values for the other two questions, while the pedagogical class had a non-significant t-stat and p-value for one of the remaining two questions, and a statistically significant (positive) t-stat and p-value for the other question.

What is the reason for this non-significant or negative change between the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire? This writer believes the answer lies in the respondents’ very high pre-questionnaire scores and conviction brought about in the lessons. On the pre-questionnaires, all respondents in both classes were in some level of agreement that they applied the commands of Paul in the passages studied during the project to their lives. Most agreed or agreed strongly to these statements. With such high initial responses, respondents could not agree much stronger in their post-questionnaire
responses. The only options were to keep the same level of agreement or even decrease their level of agreement.

It is also a viable explanation that prior to the lessons, the respondents truly felt they were practicing in their lives the commands Paul made in the passages. However, after the lessons, they were convicted that perhaps they were not practicing the commands as intentionally and consistently as once thought. It is reasonable to believe the explanation of the teachings of Paul, the challenges of the lessons, and the conviction of the Holy Spirit revealed to the respondents that they had room to grow in their application of the main ideas of the passages. This too would explain the reason for no change, or negative change, from the pre-questionnaire to the post-questionnaire for these questions.

The fifth question, in this grouping of 5, measured respondents perceived overall understanding of the themes of Ephesians. Although both groups had statistically significant t-stats and p-values, the andragogical class felt they had a better understanding of the themes of Ephesians, and had a t-stat and p-value that was significantly higher than the pedagogical class.

The following 5 questions were only on the post-questionnaire and the comparison was strictly between the two classes. The t-stat was -3.173913 and the p-value was 0.0066 (with pooled variances), which indicated that the responses from the andragogical class were significantly higher than those from the pedagogical class. In fact, the andragogical class’s mean scores on each of the 5 questions were higher than the pedagogical class’s corresponding mean scores. The question with the largest overall differential between the two classes asked the respondent’s agreement with the statement...
that the methodology utilized in class helped the respondent grow in his relationships with other class members. The respondents from the andragogical class were much higher than those of the pedagogical class. This was not a surprising result, but a significant one because a main purpose of the group’s existence was to develop relationships between members. Overall, the respondents from the andragogical class felt the methodology utilized in the lessons taught during the project was more effective than the respondents from the pedagogical class.

The final question asked respondents to choose the most memorable part of the lessons. The pedagogical class had significant variance in its responses. None of the respondents chose “Activities.” The 15 respondents’ choices were spread out over the other five options. The most commonly chosen responses were “Bible exposition” (six responses) and “challenge to life application” (four responses). The andragogical class had less variance in its responses. “Introduction,” “stories,” and “activities” were not chosen by any respondent. However, “discussions” (eleven responses) was the most memorable part of the lessons to the andragogical class by a considerable margin. Although this result was not surprising either, it was significant that the classroom discussions were the most memorable portion of the class—not the traditional instruction from the pedagogical teacher—for a group of mature, long-time Christians.

Overall, the project found that andragogical teaching was more effective than pedagogical teaching in students learning factual content on Ephesians. Both andragogical teaching and pedagogical teaching had no effect, or even a negative effect, on the students’ intentionality in applying the main ideas of the Ephesians passages to their lives during the project. Students that learned under andragogical teaching felt more
confident that it was an effective methodology than students who learned under pedagogical teaching. Finally, students who learned under andragogical teaching felt that the discussions, in which they were involved as part of the learning process, were the most memorable part of the lesson, while students who learned under pedagogical teaching had much more variety in which part of the lessons was most memorable to them.

**Strengths of the Project**

The strengths of this project were many. First, the project established the excellence of andragogical teaching in the ABF setting at The Chapel. Clearly, the class that learned under andragogical methods had greater positive change in their responses between the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire as compared to the class that learned under pedagogical methods. The biblical and scholarly research in chapters 2 and 3 were also consistent with these findings.

Increasing the validity of these findings and the credence of this project was the nature of groups in which the project was conducted. Fellowheirs I and II were groups of senior adults that were familiar with lecture-driven teaching. They were comfortable with it, as indicated by their long, average time of attendance in the ABFs, both of which were taught in pedagogical forms. More than one staff person at The Chapel felt that this was the most effective teaching style for senior adults. Andragogical teaching was a foreign concept to these groups of learners; yet, it was embraced by the group that learned under its methodology, and shown to be effective.

The second strength of the project was that it demonstrated that teaching could take a variety of forms, and still yield significant student learning. Both methods of
teaching were effective in helping students learn content on Ephesians and its background. Although andragogical teaching was more effective overall, pedagogical teaching brought about significant learning as well. The project demonstrated that lecture-driven teaching is an important component of adult learning that the church should also do with excellence.

The third strength of the project was the resultant teacher-training curriculum created to meet the third goal established at the outset of the project. This teacher-training curriculum will be used for many years to come to train current and future leaders in this writer’s church. The curriculum will continuously be updated and expanded upon as years pass, however, the core content of the training is timeless and will continue to be an excellent resource for current and future teachers in the church.

A fourth strength of the project was that its findings were offered to be incorporated into the application for new ABF teachers at The Chapel. The short summary of andragogical teaching, created as a result of the project, was also offered to be incorporated into this application. This summary will help clarify the expectations the church has of its ABF teachers before a new teacher is appointed to his position. Ultimately, this clarification will contribute to more effective learning among adults in the church.

The fifth strength of the project was its findings regarding the importance of discussions and relationship development inherent in andragogical teaching. It was clear from the questionnaires that the majority of the class that learned under the andragogical methodology was most affected by the lesson discussions. These same questionnaire respondents were also in strong agreement that andragogical methodologies helped them
grow in their relationships with other class members. Comparatively, the respondents that learned under the pedagogical methodology were not in strong agreement regarding the extent to which the pedagogical methodology helped them grow in their relationships with other class members. In fact, their responses were significantly lower than the respondents from the andragogical class.

Most ABFs or small groups exist in churches to help their members connect with one another, in addition to helping their members learn and grow in their connection to God. Relationship development is an important component of these groups. Therefore, a teaching methodology that enhances interpersonal relationships between group members is highly valuable in the ABF or small-group setting. Beyond its benefits to student learning, andragogical teaching was shown to be a strong conduit to relationship development.

**Weaknesses of the Project**

In addition to the many strengths, this project also had weaknesses. The first weakness was in its sample size. Although acceptable, fifteen respondents in one class and sixteen in the other was a relatively small sample. The findings of the project could be even stronger if the sample size was larger. Both ABFs that participated in the study had a large number of members who spent winters in places with warmer temperatures. This migration narrowed the potential for a larger sample in those two ABFs during the months the project was conducted.

A second weakness of the project was in the questionnaires. The questionnaires only asked a small sampling of questions to ascertain the learning that occurred from the lessons. In addition to two questions pertaining to background and
four questions regarding the overarching themes of Ephesians, the questionnaires included only one question on the content of each lesson and one question on the application of that content. The project would have been more effective if the questionnaires asked more questions to gauge the learning that ensued from the lessons.

A third weakness of the project was in its exclusion of other ABFs in the church. It would have been valuable to introduce the findings of the project, and the summary of andragogical teaching to the other ABF leaders at The Chapel. Broadening the scope of this project became unrealistic by the conclusion since this writer was downsized from the staff, but it would have been valuable to make the other ABF teachers immediately aware of the project results. A thirty-minute informational meeting between Sunday services would have been a perfect opportunity to share the project findings, and offer a short training on the benefits of andragogical teaching.

**Project Modifications**

In evaluating the project, there are modifications this writer would make if he were to conduct it again. First, the project would have been conducted with a larger sample. Given that many of the ABFs for seniors at The Chapel have similar percentages of their membership that live in warmer climates over the winter months, it would be best to conduct the project between late spring and early fall. A sample of at least thirty people per group would be ideal.

A second modification to the project would include a second round of research with the same two groups similar in nature to the first, but switch the group that learned under andragogical methodologies. This switch would reveal if the findings regarding andragogical teaching were the same for both groups. If four more weeks were allotted
to teach four new lessons on four other passages from Ephesians to the two groups, switching the groups that learn under pedagogical and andragogical methodologies, with similar pre-questionnaires and post-questionnaires, this would further demonstrate the validity of the findings.

A third modification to the project would include doing a second post-questionnaire with the project participants. This second post-questionnaire would be done four weeks after the initial post-questionnaire. It would offer further understanding of how each method affected the respondent’s retention of the factual content learned in the project, and if the content led to further application to the respondent’s life.

A fourth modification to the project would include a change to the format of the questionnaires. The questionnaires had three styles of inquiry: fill-in-the-blank, multiple choice, and Likert scale. This diversity of inquiry led to a challenging analysis process with multiple testing instruments needed. Beyond the initial demographical questions, it would have been simpler to have one style of inquiry for all the questions: Likert scale. This style would have made the completion of the questionnaires easier for the respondent, and the analysis easier for this writer. It would also be advantageous to change the identifier from the last four digits of one’s social security number to a less sensitive identifier, like the last four digits of their phone number. Some respondents were hesitant to write any part of their social security number on the questionnaires.

Overall, the project was successful. It accomplished the goals originally intended at its outset. At the conclusion of the project, this writer took the opportunity to reflect theologically and personally on discoveries over the course of the fifteen weeks.
Theological Reflections

In reflecting on the project, important truths about God, His church, and the church’s leadership were learned. Revelations in each of those areas confirmed what is revealed in the Scriptures, and were clearly seen in the lives of those who participated in the project.

Christians Need Others

The writer of Hebrews wrote in Hebrews 10:24-25, “Let us consider how we may spur one another on toward love and good deeds. Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing, but let us encourage one another—and all the more as you see the Day approaching.” The Bible declares it time and again. Christians need one another to grow. During the project, this truth was seen in a variety of ways. The most obvious way was seen in the lessons themselves. The class that learned andragogically thrived as people shared their insights on the passages, the experiences they had in relation to the topic, and the ways in which they felt the biblical truths should be applied to their lives. Truly, the collective learning among the group was greater as a result of numerous people offering input than this writer could possibly offer by himself. Students were challenged to understand different perspectives, and wrestle with different applications that were not immediately obvious to them.

It was also evident how much Christians need one another during each class’s prayer time. Group prayer with senior adults is rich. The prayers of those nearer to eternity are intense. The issues the group prayed about were very serious, and often related to sickness, and the end of life. People supported one another. They encouraged
one another. They cried with each other in life’s valleys, and rejoiced with each other on life’s mountaintops. They prayed together as one to the One who has the power to act.

Finally, it was clear how much Christians need one another by the joy exhibited by the class members in being together. Many of the class members had extreme difficulty in walking to class. Their joints ached, their backs hurt, and walking one hundred feet felt like walking ten miles. Yet, each made the effort to attend week after week because they loved each other. Class was an opportunity for members to lift one another’s spirits. The metaphor of the church being the body of Christ was clearly seen as each part of the body was needed and contributed to the good of the whole.

**God is Creative in His Design**

Genesis 1:1 says, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” The way in which God designed His creation is awe-inspiring. The way in which He created human beings is so complex even the brightest minds cannot explain all the intricacies. The way in which adults learn is also multifaceted and varied. God designed humans with a capacity for learning to occur in an incredible variety of ways. There is no “one way” to learn. Adults are not computers who can be programmed. Adults are living, breathing, thinking, creative organisms with many learning styles and preferences. God, in His graciousness, even created adults with the capacity for significant learning when the instructor teaches a poor lesson. Not only does this allow the adult educator in the church freedom in his instructional methodology, it affords him forgiveness in his delivery as needed.
Leaders Equip God’s People

The final theological reflection of this writer was on the importance of the leaders of the church equipping the laity of the church for effective ministry to God’s people, especially in teaching the Word of God. The apostle Paul challenged Timothy to entrust his teachings about Christ to reliable men who were also qualified to teach others (1 Tim 2:2). In Ephesians 4:11-13, Paul explained to the Christians in Ephesus that God gave leaders to the church to equip the people for service to build up the body of Christ. As a leader in the church, this writer’s call from God is no different. He must entrust the teaching ministry to reliable men who are qualified to teach, and equip them to do it with excellence. It is not enough to appoint teachers in the church. These teachers must be taught how to teach well, and for that, God will hold His church leaders accountable.

Personal Reflections

Completing this project was invigorating for this writer. Never did he imagine that by the project’s conclusion, he would no longer be employed by The Chapel. As challenging as it is to lose one’s job, God’s sovereignty and grace were clearly seen throughout. Creating lessons and teaching competently throughout the research did much to show this writer the extent of his passion to teach in a variety of formats, both discussion-based formats and lecture-based formats. The affirmation of the ABF students who were project participants was a salve to this writer’s soul. Surely it was providential that when he was given the news of being downsized, he would be surrounded by wise, loving, and kind friends who encouraged and cared for him like perfect grandparents.

This writer found humility in completing this project as well. Although he prepared well for each lesson he taught, surely there was room for improvement in each
time of instruction. The students in the classes, however, were kind. They wanted to learn, even from an imperfect and flawed teacher. They were willing to overlook the weaknesses of the lessons specifically, and the project generally, to focus on the strengths in order to grow and learn. They set excellent examples of eager and willing learners who took their responsibility in the learning process seriously. It was a pleasure teaching them.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this project realized its purpose and met all its goals. It revealed that andragogical teaching was indeed more effective than pedagogical teaching in ABFs at The Chapel, specifically for senior adults. Not only did students learn more factual content under andragogical teaching, they enjoyed and valued the methodology and its emphases more than those that learned under pedagogical teaching. The discussion component of andragogical teaching was the most highly memorable part of each lesson for students, and they felt these discussions did well in facilitating relationship development with others in the class.

Pedagogical teaching was not inept as a methodology. It too helped students learn factual content during the project, albeit less than andragogical teaching. Lecture-based teaching should continue to have an important role in adult education in the church, but not in priority over andragogical teaching.

As in any project, there were weaknesses. Each component of the project, however, was well prepared, presented, evaluated, and communicated. Lord willing, the effort made in this project will be used for years to come in the church, to the glory of God.
APPENDIX 1

PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE

Ephesians Lessons Pre-Questionnaire

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of two different teaching philosophies. This research is being conducted by Jeff Martell for the purpose of measuring the learning and life change throughout the course of the study. In this research, you will listen to four lessons over four consecutive weeks on the book of Ephesians. Your learning and life change from the lessons will be measured through a pre-questionnaire and two post-questionnaires. Any information you provide will be held strictly confidential, and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses. Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. By your completion of these questionnaires, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

1. The last four digits of your social security number __ __ __ __

2. (Circle one) Male/Female

3. What year were you born? __________

4. How long have you attended your ABF? ____ years ____ months

5. Are you involved in any other Christian small group that is discussion-based?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. How would you classify the style of teaching in your class?
   a. Lecture-based
   b. Mostly lecture with a little discussion
   c. Equally balanced between lecture and discussion
   d. Mostly discussion with a little lecture
   e. Discussion-based

7. As a learner, which style of teaching do you prefer to learn under?
   a. Mostly lecture
   b. Mostly discussion
8. As a learner, under which style of teaching do you learn best?
   a. Mostly lecture
   b. Mostly discussion

9. Where was Paul when he wrote Ephesians? ____________________

10. On which missionary journey did Paul found the church in Ephesus? ____________________

11. Generally, what does Ephesians 1-3 emphasize?
   a. Correct living
   b. The fruits of the Spirit
   c. Correct doctrine
   d. The pervasiveness of sin in a fallen world

12. Generally, what does Ephesians 4-6 emphasize?
   a. Correct living
   b. The fruits of the Spirit
   c. Correct doctrine
   d. The pervasiveness of sin in a fallen world

13. What are the two main themes of the book of Ephesians?
   a. The fellowship and unity of Christ’s body, the church
   b. True followers of Christ care for and bless the world through their love
   c. God’s plan of reconciliation of the universe to Himself through Christ
   d. One day Jesus will return triumphantly to bring His church to be with Him
   e. Those who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak out of love for them

14. The main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14 is:
   a. Those that place their faith in Christ are transformed. The old has gone, the new has come
   b. God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit
   c. Christ came in love, and His children too will love others
   d. Christians should put on the full armor of God so one can stand strong against the attacks of the devil

15. The main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 is:
   a. God is the vine, and we are the branches. Abide in Him.
   b. We are one body with many different parts, united in Christ
   c. The world will know we are His followers by our love
   d. Although we are saved by grace and not works, we are created to do good works prepared especially for us by God
16. The main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6 is:
   a. Faith without works is dead.
   b. As a follower of Christ one is united with others in Christ and should live in ways that promote this unity
   c. While we were still living in sin, God showed His love for us by sending Christ to die for us
   d. Follow the way of love and eagerly desire spiritual gifts

17. The main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18 is:
   a. Be strong in the Lord and put on His full armor so that one can stand firm against the attacks of the devil
   b. God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit
   c. We are being built into a royal priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ
   d. We fix our eyes not on what is seen, but on what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal

\textit{In the following section circle one response that most closely reflects your level of agreement. SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, DS=Disagree somewhat, AS=Agree Somewhat, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree}

18. SD D DS AS A SA  As a Christian, I am intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose me to know Christ

19. SD D DS AS A SA  As a Christian, I am intentional about doing the good works God has prepared in advance for me

20. SD D DS AS A SA  As a Christian, I am intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through my words and actions

21. SD D DS AS A SA  As a Christian, I am intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy

22. SD D DS AS A SA  I feel I understand the overall themes of Ephesians
APPENDIX 2
POST-QUESTIONNAIRE

Ephesians Lessons Post-Questionnaire

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of two different teaching philosophies. This research is being conducted by Jeff Martell for the purpose of measuring the learning and life change throughout the course of the study. In this research, you will listen to four lessons over four consecutive weeks on the book of Ephesians. Your learning and life change from the lessons will be measured through a pre-questionnaire and two post-questionnaires. Any information you provide will be held strictly confidential, and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses. Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. By your completion of these questionnaires, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

1. The last four digits of your social security number __ __ __ __

2. Where was Paul when he wrote Ephesians? ____________________

3. On which missionary journey did Paul found the church in Ephesus? ____________________

4. Generally, what does Ephesians 1-3 emphasize?
   a. Correct living
   b. The fruits of the Spirit
   c. Correct doctrine
   d. The pervasiveness of sin in a fallen world

5. Generally, what does Ephesians 4-6 emphasize?
   a. Correct living
   b. The fruits of the Spirit
   c. Correct doctrine
   d. The pervasiveness of sin in a fallen world

6. What are the two main themes of the book of Ephesians?
   a. The fellowship and unity of Christ’s body, the church
   b. True followers of Christ care for and bless the world through their love
c. God’s plan of reconciliation of the universe to Himself through Christ
d. One day Jesus will return triumphantly to bring His church to be with Him
e. Those who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak out of love for them

7. The main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14 is:
   a. Those that place their faith in Christ are transformed. The old has gone, the new has come
   b. God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit
   c. Christ came in love, and His children too will love others
   d. Christians should put on the full armor of God so one can stand strong against the attacks of the devil

8. The main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 is:
   a. God is the vine, and we are the branches. Abide in Him.
   b. We are one body with many different parts, united in Christ
   c. The world will know we are His followers by our love
   d. Although we are saved by grace and not works, we are created to do good works prepared especially for us by God

9. The main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6 is:
   a. Faith without works is dead.
   b. As a follower of Christ one is united with others in Christ and should live in ways that promote this unity
   c. While we were still living in sin, God showed His love for us by sending Christ to die for us
   d. Follow the way of love and eagerly desire spiritual gifts

10. The main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18 is:
    a. Be strong in the Lord and put on His full armor so that one can stand firm against the attacks of the devil
    b. God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit
    c. We are being built into a royal priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ
    d. We fix our eyes not on what is seen, but on what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal

11. What part of the lessons was most memorable to you (choose only one)?
    a. Intro
    b. Bible exposition
    c. Challenge to life application
    d. Stories
    e. Discussions
    f. Activities
In the following section circle one response that most closely reflects your level of agreement. SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, DS=Disagree somewhat, AS=Agree Somewhat, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

12. SD D DS AS A SA As a Christian, I am intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose me to know Christ

13. SD D DS AS A SA As a Christian, I am intentional about doing the good works God has prepared in advance for me

14. SD D DS AS A SA As a Christian, I am intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through my words and actions

15. SD D DS AS A SA As a Christian, I am intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy

16. SD D DS AS A SA I feel I understand the overall themes of Ephesians

17. SD D DS AS A SA Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class was fun and enjoyable

18. SD D DS AS A SA Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me to learn the information about the book of Ephesians

19. SD D DS AS A SA Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me to put into practice that which I learned from the lessons

20. SD D DS AS A SA Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me grow in my relationships with other class members

21. SD D DS AS A SA Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has challenged me to critically think about the meaning and message behind the texts being studied
APPENDIX 3

QUESTIONNAIRES SUMMARY SHEET:
ANDRAGOGICAL METHOD

In the ABF that learned under andragogical methodology, there were 18 respondents to the pre-questionnaire. However, only the 16 respondents that were eligible to complete the post-questionnaire were included in the study. Eight of the respondents were females and 8 were males. Two of the respondents were under 60, while the other 14 were 60 or older. Every respondent had attended the ABF for at least 12 years, with 10 having attended more than 27 years. The average tenure in the ABF was over 25 years.

Some respondents did not answer every question. They were told not to guess indiscriminately at questions to which they did not know the answer. Some respondents answered a question with more than one option, so that some table responses do not total 16.

The first question was included to ascertain if the respondent had another regular opportunity to participate in discussion-based learning. Most respondents were not a part of a discussion-based learning group outside their ABF.

Table A1. Initial q.—Involvement in discussion-based group, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you involved in any other Christian small group that is discussion-based?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next 3 questions were added to understand the current style of teaching in the class, the style in which the student preferred, and the style in which the student felt he learned best. The class was generally understood to be taught under a more pedagogical approach than an andragogical approach.
Table A2. Initial q.—Current style of teaching in class, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you classify the style of teaching in your class?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture-based</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lecture with a little discussion</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally balanced between lecture and discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly discussion with a little lecture</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion-based</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students preferred a lecture-based style versus a discussion-based style. However, a significant percent of the respondents did prefer a balance between the two or more discussion than lecture.

Table A3. Initial q.—Preferred style of teaching, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a learner, which style of teaching do you prefer to learn under?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lecture</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students felt they also learned best under the style of teaching that they preferred.

Table A4. Initial q.—Which style of teaching do you learn best, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a learner, under which style of teaching do you learn best?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lecture</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of lecture and discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 9 questions were included in both the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire and gauged the knowledge of the book of Ephesians students.
possessed entering into the study. The first 2 questions were historical questions. The next 3 questions focused on a general understanding of the book as a whole. The following 4 questions centered on the four passages that were studied during the 4 weeks of the project. Regarding Paul’s location when writing Ephesians, the majority of the students gave the incorrect answer of Ephesus or did not know. The desired answer was that Paul was in prison or jail. However, since most scholars believe the prison in which Paul was held was in Rome, those that answered “Rome” were considered as correct as well. In the post-questionnaire every respondent knew that Paul wrote Ephesians while in prison.

Table A5. Initial q.—Paul’s location when writing Ephesians, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where was Paul when he wrote Ephesians?</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison/Jail/Rome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 1 of the 16 respondents knew that it was on Paul’s second missionary journey in which he founded the church in Ephesus in the pre-questionnaire. In the post-questionnaire all but 1 knew it was on Paul’s second missionary journey that he founded the church in Ephesus.

Table A6. Initial q.—Paul’s missionary journey, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On which missionary journey did Paul found the church in Ephesus?</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ephesians 1-3 focused on orthodoxy, or correct doctrine. Only 3 of the 16 respondents knew the emphasis prior to the project. Most knew the emphasis of the first half of the book after the project.
Table A7. Initial q.—Emphasis of Ephesians 1-3, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Generally, what does Ephesians 1-3 emphasize?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct doctrine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ephesians 4-6 focused on orthopraxy, or correct living. Only 4 of the 16 respondents knew the emphasis prior to the project. Most knew the emphasis of the second half of the book after the project.

Table A8. Initial q.—Emphasis of Ephesians 4-6, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Generally, what does Ephesians 4-6 emphasize?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct living</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following question, there were two correct answers that were requested: The fellowship and unity in the church, and God’s plan of reconciliation of the universe through Christ. No respondent correctly chose both answers in the pre-questionnaire. Seven of the 16 knew one of the main themes prior to the project. Fifteen knew at least one of the themes, and 5 knew both after the project.

Table A9. Initial q.—Themes of Ephesians, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>What are the two main themes of the book of Ephesians?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fellowship and unity of Christ’s body, the church</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s plan of reconciliation of the universe to Himself through Christ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost one third of the respondents had knowledge of the emphasis of Ephesians 1:1-14 in the pre-questionnaire. All but 3 knew it after the project.

Table A10. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 2 of the 16 respondents knew the main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 prior to the project. Eleven knew the main idea after the project.

Table A11. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although we are saved by grace and not works, we are created to do good works prepared especially for us by God</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the 16 respondents to the pre-questionnaire answered correctly regarding the main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6. However, after the project 11 knew the main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6. See Table A12.

The final question assessing the students’ prior knowledge of Ephesians was the one in which the greatest number of respondents had prior knowledge. Six of the 16 respondents knew the main idea of Ephesians 6:10-20 prior to the project. All but 1 knew the main idea after the project. See Table A13.

The next group of 4 questions attempted to understand how the respondent applied to his life the teachings in the four passages used in the project. Each question applied the main idea of Paul’s teaching from each of the four chosen Ephesians passages to the respondent’s life, seeking to understand his intentionality in living out the
Table A12. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a follower of Christ one is united with others in Christ and should live in ways that promote this unity</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A13. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be strong in the Lord and put on His full armor so that one can stand firm against the attacks of the devil</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

command of Scripture. Interestingly, prior to the project every respondent was in some level of agreement that he was putting each of the teachings into practice in his life. Not 1 respondent had any level of disagreement to any question regarding his intentionality in practicing these teachings.

Prior to the project every respondent but 1 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose him to know Christ. The post-questionnaire results were similar.

Table A14. Initial q.—Security of being chosen, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a Christian, I am intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose me to know Christ</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to the project every respondent but 1 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about doing the good works God prepared in advance for him. After the project the responses were similar.

Table A15. Initial q.—Doing good works, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Christian, I am intentional about doing the good works God has prepared in advance for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the project every respondent but 1 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through his words and actions. The post response was similar.

Table A16. Initial q.—Seeking unity with other Christians, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Christian, I am intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through my words and actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the project every respondent but 2 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy. Again, the post-questionnaire revealed similar results.
As a Christian, I am intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy. Pre-questionnaire Post-questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question attempted to assess how well each student felt he understood the book of Ephesians overall. Whereas the previous questions assessing the respondent’s knowledge of Ephesians asked specific and objective questions regarding the content, history, and main themes of Ephesians, this question was designed to understand the respondent’s own perceived level of understanding of Ephesians. The responses were balanced among all levels of agreement and disagreement prior to the project. After the project respondents felt they had a much better overall understanding of Ephesians.

The following 6 questions were only on the post-questionnaire. They were included to gauge the respondent’s most memorable part of the lesson, if the teaching methodology utilized in class was enjoyable, effective in helping the student learn information about Ephesians, effective in helping the student apply the principles taught...
to his life, effective in helping the student develop relationships with other students, and effective in challenging the student to think critically about the meaning and message of the texts.

Not surprisingly, the most memorable part of the lessons to the respondents was the discussions.

Table A19. Initial q.—Most memorable part of lesson, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What part of the lessons was most memorable to you (choose only one)?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible exposition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to life application</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but 1 student agreed or strongly agreed that andragogical teaching was enjoyable.

Table A20. Initial q.—Fun and enjoyable, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class was fun and enjoyable</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but 1 student also agreed or strongly agreed that andragogical teaching was effective helping the student learn information about Ephesians. See Table A21.

Every respondent was in some level of agreement that andragogical teaching helped him practice what he learned in the lessons. However, the strength of agreement was less than in the previous 2 questions. See Table A22.
Table A21. Initial q.—Learn information about Ephesians, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study: Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me learn the information about the book of Ephesians</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A22. Initial q.—Life Application, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study: Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me put into practice that which I learned from the lessons</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the cumulative response of the students was still in agreement, this question yielded the lowest level of agreement of all 6 questions.

Table A23. Initial q.—Relational growth with class members, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study: Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me grow in my relationships with other class members</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the respondents, andragogical teaching was very effective in challenging students to critical thinking.

Table A24. Initial q.—Critical thinking, andragogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study: Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has challenged me to critically think about the meaning and message behind the texts being studied</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

QUESTIONNAIRES SUMMARY SHEET:
PEDAGOGICAL METHOD

In the ABF that learned under pedagogical methodology, there 28 respondents to the pre-questionnaire. However, only the 15 respondents that were eligible to complete the post-questionnaire were included in the study. Eight of the respondents were females and 7 were males. Three of the respondents were under 60, while the other 12 were 60 or older. Most respondents had attended the ABF for at least 8 years, with 8 having attended more than 15 years. The average tenure in the ABF was over 11 years.

Some respondents did not answer every question. They were told not to guess indiscriminately at questions to which they did not know the answer. Some respondents answered a question with more than one option, so that some table responses do not total 15.

The first question was included to ascertain if the respondent had another regular opportunity to participate in discussion-based learning. Most respondents were not a part of a discussion-based learning group outside their ABF.

Table A25. Initial q.—Involvement in discussion-based group, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you involved in any other Christian small group that is discussion-based?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next 3 questions were added to understand the current style of teaching in the class, the style in which the student preferred, and the style in which the student felt he learned best. The class was generally understood to be taught under a more pedagogical approach than an andragogical approach.
Table A26. Initial q.—Current style of teaching in class, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you classify the style of teaching in your class?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture-based</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lecture with a little discussion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally balanced between lecture and discussion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly discussion with a little lecture</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion-based</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students preferred a lecture-based style against a discussion-based style. However, a significant percent of the respondents did prefer a balance between the two or more discussion than lecture.

Table A27. Initial q.—Preferred style of teaching, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a learner, which style of teaching do you prefer to learn under?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lecture</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students felt they also learned best under the style of teaching that they preferred.

Table A28. Initial q.—Which style of teaching do you learn best, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a learner, under which style of teaching do you learn best?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lecture</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of lecture and discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 9 questions were included in both the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire and gauged the knowledge of the book of Ephesians students.
possessed entering into the study. The first 2 questions were historical questions. The next 3 questions focused on a general understanding of the book as a whole. The following 4 questions centered on the four passages that were studied during the 4 weeks of the project. Regarding Paul’s location when writing Ephesians, the majority of the students gave the incorrect answer of Ephesus or did not know. The desired answer was that Paul was in prison or jail. However, since most scholars believe the prison in which Paul was held was in Rome, those that answered “Rome” were considered as correct as well. In the post-questionnaire every respondent knew that Paul wrote Ephesians while in prison.

Table A29. Initial q.—Paul’s location when writing Ephesians, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where was Paul when he wrote Ephesians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison/Jail/Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the 15 respondents knew that it was on Paul’s second missionary journey in which he founded the church in Ephesus in the pre-questionnaire. In the post-questionnaire 9 respondents knew it was on Paul’s second missionary journey that he founded the church in Ephesus.

Table A30. Initial q.—Paul’s missionary journey, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On which missionary journey did Paul found the church in Ephesus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ephesians 1-3 focused on orthodoxy, or correct doctrine. Only 1 of the 15 respondents knew the emphasis prior to the project. Nine respondents knew the emphasis of the first half of the book after the project.
Table A31. Initial q.—Emphasis of Ephesians 1-3, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, what does Ephesians 1-3 emphasize?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ephesians 4-6 focused on orthopraxy, or correct living. Only 1 of the 15 respondents knew the emphasis prior to the project. Most knew the emphasis of the second half of the book after the project.

Table A32. Initial q.—Emphasis of Ephesians 4-6, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, what does Ephesians 4-6 emphasize?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following question, there were two correct answers that were requested: The fellowship and unity in the church, and God’s plan of reconciliation of the universe to Him through Christ. No respondent correctly chose both answers in the pre-questionnaire. Seven of the 15 knew one of the main themes prior to the project. All 15 knew at least one of the themes, and 5 knew both after the project.

Table A33. Initial q.—Themes of Ephesians, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the two main themes of the book of Ephesians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fellowship and unity of Christ’s body, the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s plan of reconciliation of the universe to Himself through Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One in 5 of the respondents had knowledge of the emphasis of Ephesians 1:1-14 in the pre-questionnaire. All but 4 knew it after the project.

Table A34. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God predestined and chose those that would come to faith through Jesus Christ, and sealed their eternal inheritance by the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 3 of the 15 respondents knew the main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 prior to the project. Twelve knew the main idea after the project.

Table A35. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although we are saved by grace and not works, we are created to do good works prepared especially for us by God</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the 15 respondents to the pre-questionnaire answered correctly regarding the main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6. However, after the project 11 knew the main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6. See Table A36

The final question assessing the students’ prior knowledge of Ephesians was the one in which the greatest number of respondents had prior knowledge. Six of the 15 respondents knew the main idea of Ephesians 6:10-20 prior to the project. All but 2 knew the main idea after the project. See Table A37.

The next group of 4 questions attempted to understand how the respondent applied to his life the teachings in the four passages used in the project. Each question applied the main idea of Paul’s teaching from each of the four chosen Ephesians passages
Table A36. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a follower of Christ one is united with others in Christ and should live in ways that promote this unity</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
<td>Post-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A37. Initial q.—Main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18 is:</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be strong in the Lord and put on His full armor so that one can stand firm against the attacks of the devil</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
<td>Post-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a follower of Christ one is united with others in Christ and should live in ways that promote this unity. Interestingly, prior to the project every respondent was in some level of agreement that he was putting each of the teachings into practice in his life. Not 1 respondent had any level of disagreement to any question regarding his intentionality in practicing these teachings.

Prior to the project every respondent but 1 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose him to know Christ. The post-questionnaire results were similar.

Table A38. Initial q.—Security of being chosen, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a Christian, I am intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose me to know Christ</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
<td>Post-questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to the project every respondent but 1 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about doing the good works God prepared in advance for him. After the project there was considerably stronger agreement by respondents that they were doing good works.

Table A39. Initial q.—Doing good works, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Christian, I am intentional about doing the good works God has prepared in advance for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the project every respondent but 2 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through his words and actions. The post response was similar, but again with considerably stronger agreement.

Table A40. Initial q.—Seeking unity with other Christians, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Christian, I am intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through my words and actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the project every respondent but 2 agreed or strongly agreed that he was intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy. Again, the post-questionnaire revealed similar results.
Table A41. Initial q.—Putting on the full armor of God, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Christian, I am intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question attempted to assess how well each student felt he understood the book of Ephesians overall. Whereas the previous questions assessing the respondent’s knowledge of Ephesians asked specific and objective questions regarding the content, history, and main themes of Ephesians, this question was designed to understand the respondent’s own perceived level of understanding of Ephesians. The responses were balanced among levels of agreement and disagreement prior to the project. After the project respondents felt they had a much better overall understanding of Ephesians.

Table A42. Initial q.—Overall understanding of Ephesians, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-questionnaire</th>
<th>Post-questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I understand the overall themes of Ephesians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 6 questions were only on the post-questionnaire. They were included to gauge the respondent’s most memorable part of the lesson, if the teaching methodology utilized in class was enjoyable, effective in helping the student learn information about Ephesians, effective in helping the student apply the principles taught
to his life, effective in helping the student develop relationships with other students, and effective in challenging the student to think critically about the meaning and message of the texts.

The most memorable parts of the lessons to the respondents were the Bible exposition and the life application.

Table A43. Initial q.—Most memorable part of lesson, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What part of the lessons was most memorable to you (choose only one)?</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible exposition</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to life application</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students agreed or strongly agreed that pedagogical teaching was enjoyable.

Table A44. Initial q.—Fun and enjoyable, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class was fun and enjoyable</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents but 1 also agreed or strongly agreed that pedagogical teaching was effective helping the student learn information about Ephesians. One student did not respond. See Table A45.

Every respondent was in some level of agreement that pedagogical teaching helped him practice what he learned in the lessons. However, the strength of agreement was less than in the previous 2 questions. See Table A46.
Table A45. Initial q.—Learn information about Ephesians, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A46. Initial q.—Life Application, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the cumulative response of the students was still in agreement, this question yielded far and away the lowest level of agreement of all 6 questions.

Table A47. Initial q.—Relational growth with class members, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the respondents, pedagogical teaching was effective in challenging students to critical thinking.

Table A48. Initial q.—Critical thinking, pedagogical responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study: Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has challenged me to critically think about the meaning and message behind the texts being studied</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE STATISTICS

Questions 1-14 Andragogical Results

Hypothesis test results:
p₁: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q1post
p₂: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q1
p₁ - p₂: difference in proportions
H₀: p₁ - p₂ = 0
Hₐ: p₁ - p₂ > 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p₁ - p₂</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.1711633</td>
<td>4.3817806</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
p₁: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q2post
p₂: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q2
p₁ - p₂: difference in proportions
H₀: p₁ - p₂ = 0
Hₐ: p₁ - p₂ > 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p₁ - p₂</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.17677669</td>
<td>4.9497476</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
p₁: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q3post
p₂: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q3
p₁ - p₂: difference in proportions
H₀: p₁ - p₂ = 0
Hₐ: p₁ - p₂ > 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p₁ - p₂</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
<td>0.17643109</td>
<td>3.8967054</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
p₁: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q4post
p₂: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q4
p₁ - p₂: difference in proportions
Hypothesis test results:

\( \mu_1 \): mean of Q5post
\( \mu_2 \): mean of Q5
\( \mu_1 - \mu_2 \): mean difference

\( H_0: \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0 \)
(with pooled variances)

**Difference** | **Sample Mean** | **Std. Err.** | **DF** | **T-Stat** | **P-value**
---|---|---|---|---|---
\( \mu_1 - \mu_2 \) | 0.8125 | 0.2321772 | 30 | 3.4994824 | 0.0007

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q6post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q6
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

**Difference** | **Count1** | **Total1** | **Count2** | **Total2** | **Sample Diff.** | **Std. Err.** | **Z-Stat** | **P-value**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
p_1 - p_2 | 13 | 16 | 5 | 16 | 0.5 | 0.17539018 | 2.8507867 | 0.0022

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q7post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q7
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

**Difference** | **Count1** | **Total1** | **Count2** | **Total2** | **Sample Diff.** | **Std. Err.** | **Z-Stat** | **P-value**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
p_1 - p_2 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 0.5625 | 0.17364149 | 3.239433 | 0.0006

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q8post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q8
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

**Difference** | **Count1** | **Total1** | **Count2** | **Total2** | **Sample Diff.** | **Std. Err.** | **Z-Stat** | **P-value**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
p_1 - p_2 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 0.5625 | 0.17364149 | 3.239433 | 0.0006
Hypothesis test results:
$p_1$ : proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q9post  
$p_2$ : proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q9  
$p_1 - p_2$ : difference in proportions  
$H_0$: $p_1 - p_2 = 0$  
$H_A$: $p_1 - p_2 > 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p_1 - p_2$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5625</td>
<td>0.16792332</td>
<td>3.3497431</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
$\mu_1 - \mu_2$ : mean of the paired difference between Q10post and Q10  
$H_0$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$  
$H_A$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10post - Q10</td>
<td>-0.0625</td>
<td>0.21347815</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.29277003</td>
<td>0.6131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
$\mu_1 - \mu_2$ : mean of the paired difference between Q11post and Q11  
$H_0$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$  
$H_A$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11post - Q11</td>
<td>-0.03125</td>
<td>0.1160886</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.26919094</td>
<td>0.6043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
$\mu_1 - \mu_2$ : mean of the paired difference between Q12post and Q12  
$H_0$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$  
$H_A$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12post - Q12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16903085</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
$\mu_1 - \mu_2$ : mean of the paired difference between Q13post and Q13  
$H_0$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$  
$H_A$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13post - Q13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19518001</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
$\mu_1 - \mu_2$ : mean of the paired difference between Q14post and Q14
Questions 1-14 Pedagogical Results

Hypothesis test results:
\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q1post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q1

\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14post - Q14</td>
<td>1.6666666</td>
<td>0.3956838</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2121177</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.46666667</td>
<td>0.15444045</td>
<td>3.021661</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q2post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q2

\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.33333334</td>
<td>0.18094403</td>
<td>1.8421903</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q3post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q3

\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5761905</td>
<td>0.1766315</td>
<td>3.262105</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:
\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q4post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q4

\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions

\( H_0: p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A: p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)
Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q5 post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q5
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions
\( H_0 : p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A : p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.64761907</td>
<td>0.18031171</td>
<td>3.5916636</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q6 post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q6
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions
\( H_0 : p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A : p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.30952382</td>
<td>0.18569534</td>
<td>1.666807</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q7 post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q7
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions
\( H_0 : p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A : p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5857143</td>
<td>0.18569534</td>
<td>3.154168</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q8 post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q8
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions
\( H_0 : p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A : p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.18257418</td>
<td>3.286352</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis test results:

\( p_1 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q9 post
\( p_2 \): proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q9
\( p_1 - p_2 \): difference in proportions
\( H_0 : p_1 - p_2 = 0 \)
\( H_A : p_1 - p_2 > 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 - p_2 )</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.18094403</td>
<td>3.3159425</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis test results:**

- **p_1**: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q9post
- **p_2**: proportion of successes (Success = 1) for Q9
- **p_1 - p_2**: difference in proportions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Total1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
<th>Total2</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p_1 - p_2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.46666667</td>
<td>0.17596295</td>
<td>2.6520734</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis test results:**

- **μ_1 - μ_2**: mean of the paired difference between Q10post and Q10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10post - Q10</td>
<td>-0.15384616</td>
<td>0.19102134</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.80538726</td>
<td>0.7819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis test results:**

- **μ_1 - μ_2**: mean of the paired difference between Q11post and Q11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11post - Q11</td>
<td>0.18181819</td>
<td>0.18181819</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis test results:**

- **μ_1 - μ_2**: mean of the paired difference between Q12post and Q12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12post - Q12</td>
<td>0.46153846</td>
<td>0.1439099</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.207135</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis test results:**

- **μ_1 - μ_2**: mean of the paired difference between Q13post and Q13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13post - Q13</td>
<td>-0.16666667</td>
<td>0.16666667</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.8306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis test results:**

- **μ_1 - μ_2**: mean of the paired difference between Q14post and Q14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14post - Q14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16666667</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 15-19 Results

To see which method rated higher, a one sided test yielded:

**Hypothesis test results:**

- $\mu_1$: mean of peda
- $\mu_2$: mean of andra
- $\mu_1 - \mu_2$: mean difference
- $H_0$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$
- $H_A$: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 < 0$

(With pooled variances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_1 - \mu_2$</td>
<td>-14.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-3.173913</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result:** There is a significant difference between the two methods. The andragogical method showed significantly higher ratings.
APPENDIX 6
SUMMARY OF PROJECT RESULTS

Below is the summary of findings from the project. For the first fourteen questions, a P-Value (lower is better) of less than .05 was considered statistically significant, with its corresponding Z-Stat or T-Stat (the higher the better). The Z-Stat, T-Stat, and P-Value all measured the difference in correctness between the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire for each class. Below you can see the differences in values for each question and for each class. The class with the highest positive difference for each question is in bold.

1. Where was Paul when he wrote Ephesians?
   • Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     • Z-Stat: 3.021661; P-Value: 0.0013
   • Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)
     • Z-Stat: 4.3817806; P-Value: <0.0001

2. On which missionary journey did Paul found the church in Ephesus?
   • Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     • Z-Stat: 1.8421903; P-Value: 0.0327
   • Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)
     • Z-Stat: 4.9497476; P-Value: <0.0001

3. Generally, what does Ephesians 1-3 emphasize?
   • Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     • Z-Stat: 3.262105; P-Value: 0.0006
   • Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)
     • Z-Stat: 3.8967054; P-Value: <0.0001

4. Generally, what does Ephesians 4-6 emphasize?
   • Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     • Z-Stat: 3.5916636; P-Value: 0.0002
   • Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)
     • Z-Stat: 3.8967054; P-Value: <0.0001

5. What are the two main themes of the book of Ephesians?
   • Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     • T-Stat: 1.6668367; P-Value: 0.0478
6. The main idea of Ephesians 1:1-14 is:
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - Z-Stat: 3.154168; P-Value: 0.0005
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - Z-Stat: 2.8507867; P-Value: 0.0022
   - **Essentially a tie**

7. The main idea of Ephesians 2:8-10 is:
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - Z-Stat: 3.2863352; P-Value: 0.0005
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - Z-Stat: 3.239433; P-Value: 0.0006
   - **Essentially a tie**

8. The main idea of Ephesians 4:1-6 is:
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - Z-Stat: 3.3159425; P-Value: 0.0005
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - Z-Stat: 3.239433; P-Value: 0.0006
   - **Essentially a tie**

9. The main idea of Ephesians 6:10-18 is:
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - Z-Stat: 2.6520734; P-Value: 0.004
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - Z-Stat: 3.3497431; P-Value: 0.0004

10. As a Christian, I am intentional about being joyful and resting in the fact that God chose me to know Christ
    - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
      - T-Stat: -0.80538726; P-Value: 0.7819
    - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
      - T-Stat: -0.29277003; P-Value: 0.6131
    - **Both non-significant**

11. As a Christian, I am intentional about doing the good works God has prepared in advance for me
    - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
      - T-Stat: 1.0; P-Value: 0.1704
    - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
      - T-Stat: -0.26919094; P-Value: 0.6043
    - **Both non-significant**
12. As a Christian, I am intentional about seeking unity with other Christians through my words and actions
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - T-Stat: 3.207135; P-Value: 0.0038
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - T-Stat: 0.0; P-Value: 0.5

13. As a Christian, I am intentional about putting on the full armor of God, to stand firm against the attacks of the enemy
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - T-Stat: -1.0; P-Value: 0.8306
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - T-Stat: 0.0; P-Value: 0.5
   - **Both non-significant**

14. I feel I understand the overall themes of Ephesians
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - T-Stat: 2.25; P-Value: 0.0255
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - T-Stat: 4.2121177; P-Value: 0.0007

*The following five questions were only on the post-questionnaire. Numbers were assigned to responses as follows: SA=6, AS=5, A=4, D=3, DS=2, SD=1. The numbers below each class indicate the average level of agreement respondents had with the statements.*

15. Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class was fun and enjoyable
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - 5.47
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - 5.69 (4% higher)

16. Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me to learn the information about the book of Ephesians
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - 5.36
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
     - 5.63 (5% higher)

17. Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me to put into practice that which I learned from the lessons
   - **Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)**
     - 5.22
   - **Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)**
18. Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has helped me grow in my relationships with other class members
   - Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     - 4.62
   - Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)
     - 5.32 (15.1% higher)

19. Studying Ephesians according to the format utilized in class has challenged me to critically think about the meaning and message behind the texts being studied
   - Pedagogical Class (Fellowheirs I)
     - 5.39
   - Andragogical Class (Fellowheirs II)
     - 5.63 (4.4% higher)

The question below as only on the post-questionnaire and shows a summary of how each class responded to the question.

20. What part of the lessons was most memorable to you (choose only one)?

   a. Intro
      - Ped (FHI) 1
      - And (FHII) 0
   b. Bible exposition
      - Ped (FHI) 6
      - And (FHII) 2
   c. Challenge to life application
      - Ped (FHI) 4
      - And (FHII) 3
   d. Stories
      - Ped (FHI) 1
      - And (FHII) 0
   e. Discussions
      - Ped (FHI) 2
      - And (FHII) 11
   f. Activities
      - Ped (FHI) 0
      - And (FHII) 0

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

Overall, the project found that andragogical teaching was more effective than pedagogical teaching in students learning factual content on Ephesians. Both andragogical teaching and pedagogical teaching had no effect, or even a negative effect, on the students’ intentionality in applying the main ideas of the Ephesians passages to their lives during the project. Students that learned under andragogical teaching felt more confident that it was an effective methodology than students who learned under pedagogical teaching. Finally, students who learned under andragogical teaching felt that the discussions in which they were involved as part of the learning process were the most memorable part of the lesson, while students who learned under pedagogical teaching had much more variety in which part of the lessons was most memorable to them.
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SUMMARY OF ANDRAGOGICAL TEACHING

Andragogy

Andragogy is an important concept for us to understand as we teach the Scriptures to adults at The Chapel. Andragogy literally means the leader or teacher of men or adults. It as a general educational philosophy for effectively teaching adults. Malcolm Knowles, the father of andragogy, based his theory on six assumptions:

1. Adults need to know why they need to learn something;
2. Adults maintain the concept of responsibility for their own decision, their own lives;
3. Adults enter the educational activity with a greater volume and more varied experiences than do children;
4. Adults have a readiness to learn those things that they need to know in order to cope effectively with real-life situations;
5. Adults are life-centered in their orientation to learning;
6. Adults are more responsive to internal motivators than external motivators. (Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 72)

Below are some of the mindsets and practices (educators sometimes call these process skills) with which a teacher of adults must become comfortable, courtesy of Duane Elmer:

1. Structure learning experiences that bring the learners into some kind of cognitive and/or physical interaction with the lesson content.
2. Believe learning can happen when you are not talking.
3. Ask probing, even provoking questions.
4. Guide conversation and discussion without closing it down.
5. Listen for understanding rather than evaluation.
7. Handle spontaneous issues and questions.
8. Be vulnerable, communicate that you are a trustworthy and safe person.
10. Be comfortable with silence.
11. Interact while also communicating acceptance.
12. Be willing to take some risks. (Elmer 1993, 137)
Here are some things to keep in mind about andragogical teaching:

**NOT SPOON FED, BUT DISCOVERED:** Andragogical teaching is so powerful with adults because it does not allow them to be passive learners who are spoon fed information. Instead, it allows them to engage and discover the truth or concept.

**MORE TIME PREPPING BEFOREHAND, LESS TIME TALKING DURING CLASS:** Andragogical methodologies often require a generous amount of thinking and preparation before the class, but often result in less work (talking) by the teacher during the actual teaching time because the learners are engaged in thought, activity, and discussion.

**LESS INFORMATION, HIGHER RETENTION:** The quantity of information offered to the learner is often less with andragogical methods than with lecture driven, pedagogical methods. However, the quantity of information that is retained and absorbed into life change for the learner is often higher with andragogical teaching.

**CHALLENGING FOR TEACHER, ENGAGING FOR LEARNER:** For many teachers andragogical teaching is quite challenging at first, especially if he or she has been more of a lecture driven, deductive teacher. However, you will be amazed at how it engages the learner in deeper and more meaningful ways. Stick with it! Practice makes perfect!
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PROJECT WELCOME LETTER TO PARTICIPATING
ABF MEMBERS

Dear Fellowheirs I and Fellowheirs II ABFs,

For the last four years I have been working on a doctoral degree from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY. This degree culminates in an original research project, on which I am currently working. The doctoral degree is in Educational Ministry, specifically adult Christian education. My research seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of two styles of adult education in the ABF setting of the church.

The first style of adult education is called pedagogical teaching. Pedagogical teaching will be defined in this project as lecture-based in which “the teacher is the expert in the content area and presents information to the learner who passively absorbs whatever is required” (Gangel and Wilhoit, The Christian Educator’s Handbook on Adult Education, 125).

The second style of adult education is called andragogical teaching. Andragogical teaching will be defined in this project as discussion-based in which adults are “highly participative in the learning process” (Gangel and Wilhoit, The Christian Educator’s Handbook on Adult Education, 125).

The research will be eight weeks long, with one lesson taught each of the first four weeks. Immediately before the first lesson a pre-questionnaire will be given to establish a baseline of learning. Immediately after the fourth lesson a post-questionnaire will be given to evaluate learning and life change. Finally, four weeks after the fourth lesson a second post-questionnaire will be given to further evaluate learning and life change.

Your participation is completely voluntary and anonymous. The larger the sample the better. Therefore, I do ask that if you choose to participate that you try hard to be present for each of the four weeks of class. If you are not present for at least three of the four lessons then your data will not be usable in this research. So thanks ahead of time for your extra effort to be a part of each of the four lessons of this project and completing the questionnaires.

The project begins this coming Sunday. I’m looking forward to being with you! If you have any questions or concerns please do not hesitate to contact me. See you Sunday!
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TEACHER-TRAINING 1 TEACHING NOTES:
CREATING A BIBLE LESSON

Introduction

• (Begin with funny video scene from the movie “School of Rock” in which the teacher says ridiculous things about teaching)

• So, there are some better and worse, effective and ineffective ways to teach.

• Why do you teach? (Wait for responses)

• So in order to accomplish lives changed for the Lord and people grow, we need to teach in ways that are as effective as possible.

• So as we continue on this morning we wanted to just give you some of the really foundational components of preparing a good Bible lesson, and give you a great model to follow in presenting a good interesting lesson. No one likes or wants a boring lesson! INTERESTING IS BETTER!

• What we’re giving you today I think will be helpful to you in teaching your people effectively—because that’s what we do, teach people, not lessons—and will be a good general structure to follow in your teaching.

• But let me say this too, not every lesson should follow this exact same structure. We need to mix things up and try new techniques and methodologies to most effectively communicate God’s Word and love for life change in our people. This is one really good, foundational method of getting there.

• Most of our content this morning comes from an excellent, foundational book on teaching Bible lessons called Creative Bible Teaching, originally by Lawrence O. Richards, with a great updated and expanded version available now to which Gary Bredfeldt added. I would strongly encourage you to check it out. I had Dr. Bredfeldt a couple years ago in a class I took at Southern Seminary. It’s a great book for those of us who teach the Bible to be familiar with. A lot of the tables and figures in the folder we gave you are from his book.
Big Idea/Pedagogical Idea/Lesson Aim:

- When we start out a Bible lesson most often we start out with a Bible text that we’re teaching on that week. Always a good idea to let people know what that text is ahead of time so that they can be familiar with it too, before the lesson begins.

- We probably all feel the weight, at least sometimes, that comes with teaching others the Word of God. We want to teach accurately to the meaning, and we want to teach effectively so that lives are changed. We know that James 3:1 says, “Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly.”

- So we should always begin looking at the text in prayer, that we understand it correctly and that the Holy Spirit would illumine our minds, and affect our hearts so that we can affect our listeners’ hearts and minds.

Big Idea

- So as we look at our text, we should process what the Big Idea of the text is. What is the Big Idea? Some call it the Bridge Principle or the Exegetical Idea. What is the Big Idea?

- Not rocket science. Richards and Bredfeldt define it as, “the central truth that the author of the scriptural passage intended to communicate to the original recipients or hearers of the text” (132). Pretty straightforward, but very important.

- How long should it be? Only about a sentence long.

- Why is it important to write a BIG IDEA? What are the benefits?

Pedagogical Idea

- Going along with the Big Idea is what’s called the Pedagogical Idea. What is pedagogy? (specifically, the teaching of children, but used today to mean teaching in general)

- So if the Big Idea is the central truth that the author intended to communicate to his original audience, “the pedagogical idea or teaching idea restates or revises the bridge principle or exegetical idea in light of the student audience” (132-133). It answers the question, “What do I want my students to learn?” (133).

- Why is the Pedagogical Idea important? What are the benefits of adding this step? (listen to student responses, end with the phrase that a pedagogical idea “makes it more personal to where the students are”)

• The Big Idea leads to the Pedagogical Idea. And these are the foundation upon which we build our ABF/HABF lessons.

**Lesson Aims**

• *(Content on Lesson Aims comes from Richards’ and Bredfeldt’s Creative Bible Teaching, 133-144)*

• The third kind of foundational component that comes with creating a really good Bible lesson is what’s called an educational aim, or a lesson aim. “A lesson aim is a statement developed by the teacher to describe the kind of learning and life change that is desired or expected in the life of the student as a result of completing a lesson, unit, or course of study. Teachers develop aims to describe changes that grow out of learning. Aims describe the targets of teaching (p 138).”

• So a lesson aim is the life change and learning you want your students to have by the end of your lesson. See them as your goals for your class by the end of the lesson.

• And we’ll get into this more in TT II, but these lesson aims are directly related to our three learning domains (cognitive, affective, behavioral). So you have three components to your aims: content aim, inspiration aim, and action aim. All three are important to the variety of students you will have in your ABFs/HABFs because different people learn differently.

  o **Content Aim:** Purpose is to communicate the biblical information.

  o **Inspiration Aim:** Purpose is to inspire, touch the emotions, change or challenge an attitude, affect a personal value choice, or engage commitment to an ideal or belief.

  o **Action Aim:** Purpose is to move to action or impart a skill.

• Lesson Aims should be:

  o Short enough to be remembered

  o Clear enough to be meaningful

  o Specific enough to be achieved

  o Written in terms of the student

  ▪ “Students will (learning verb) the (learning concept) by (learning response)”
• What’s the value of doing lesson aims? Is it really worth the extra effort to do all this before you actually get into the lesson?

• PERSONAL STORY: In the past I haven’t always done these for my lessons and my lessons really suffered…

• Questions?

Mock Lesson Activity

• Let’s look at an example. Open your Bibles up to 1 Kings 19:9-13a. This is the incredible history of the prophet Elijah. So, Elijah had just annihilated the 450 prophets of Baal and the 400 prophets of Asherah in a huge showdown where God just did amazing works. It hadn’t rained on the land in years and finally God brought rain. Even though Elijah was the last of God’s prophets, God had provided for him and protected him over and over again. But now Jezebel was after him again. Elijah had been on a roller coaster and was on the run again. And he was scared for his life. He tells the Lord that he just wants to die, but again God sends an angel to strengthen him. Finally, he gets to Mt Horeb (the mountain of God) and goes into a cave to spend the night.

• Look at verse 9. READ VERSES 9-13B. *(ask someone to read)*

• That is an incredible passage, isn’t it? It’s one of my favorite histories in the Bible. Here’s what I want you to do. I want you to take a few minutes, and as a table come up with a Big Idea, a Pedagogical Idea, and some Lesson Aims for this passage. Take about 10-15 minutes to do that.

• So, what did you come up with? No two will be exactly the same, and that’s OK.

  o **Big Idea:** Even when it feels like life is careening out of control, God is still sovereign.

  o **Pedagogical Idea:** Sometimes life’s problems distract us from realizing how BIG God is and we need to quiet all distractions, be still, and know He is God.

  o **Lesson Aims:**
    
    ▪ **Content Aim:** Students will learn who Elijah was and all that God brought him through, and know that God is sovereign by studying 1 Kings 19:9-13a.
    
    ▪ **Inspiration Aim:** Students will realize that when life is terribly difficult God is still there to support, encourage, and love them by connecting with Elijah’s life and difficult circumstances and how God brought him through.
- **Action Aim**: Students will be intentional about quieting their lives regularly to be still and know that God is God by committing to spend time in solitude with God at least twice in the next week.

**Hook**

**Mock Lesson Activity**

- Who has good hearing? Who feels like they have good perception?

- In a moment I’m going to let you hear a lot of different sounds. And I want you to make a list, just by yourselves, of all the different sounds you hear going on in the room. Everything. Everything you hear, write it down. Then we’ll see how many different sounds we’ve collectively heard.

- *(Play audio track of various sounds, twice)*

- At your tables, make a list of all the different sounds that you heard collectively.

- *(Have one person read the responses from one table. Then say, “What did they miss? Who has any that weren’t mentioned?”)*

- Did we miss any? Take a listen again, now that’s it’s quieter. Hear anything new? Who heard the heating system? Who heard themselves or their neighbor breathing? Who heard the 50 hearts beating in this room? And yet aren’t those the two most important and significant “noises” going on in this room?

- **MAIN POINT**: Sometimes we have to quiet our lives of all the noise and distractions to hear that which is most important/significant. Just like there were a lot of “loud” noises and distractions going on in the room that drowned out and kept us from hearing the really important noises (breathing, heartbeat), so too in life, sometimes we need to quiet down our lives from all it’s noises and distractions and be still and listen to the really important sound, the really important voice…of God. Our goal today is to learn how to be still, know, and hear God, no matter what life’s circumstances.

- *(Content in the Book section comes from Richards’ and Bredfeldt’s Creative Bible Teaching, 157-158)*

- If you’ve been a part of teaching an ABF long or have been to our teacher trainings, you’ve probably heard of the Hook-Book-Look-Took method of creating/teaching lessons in your class. So, what I took us through just a second ago was an example of a good “Hook”.

- **So, what is a Hook?** “You must seek to entice them (the busy, distracted people who you are teaching) away from their private thoughts and share in this time of learning.
And so you use the hook. Fishermen use it to get the fish out of the lake into the boat. You use it to bring your students into the Word of life” (155).

• Does this make sense? What are the qualities of a good Hook? What made a Hook you used good?

1. It gets attention
   • Funny, creative, multi-sensory, hands-on, interactive, creates a tension, etc.

2. It surfaces a need
   • When designing a hook, the teacher should have the needs of the students in view.
   • The hook should relate to the students real life situation

3. It sets a goal
   • Call it a “direction step”
   • Provides an answer to the students’ question, “Why should I listen to this?”
   • “Our goal today is to learn how to be still and hear God.”

4. It naturally leads into the Bible study (155-156)

• Make sense? Here’s what I’d like you to do: Take five minutes or so and discuss hooks at your tables. Are they effective? Which ones have you done that are most effective. And also think through another good hook for the passage that we’re looking at today. And when you’re done…

Break

• BREAK: …Feel free to take a few minutes to use the restroom, grab some more coffee and take a short break.

Book

• (Show second clip from “School of Rock” in which the teacher again says some ridiculous things about teaching)

• (Content in the Book section comes from Richards’ and Bredfeldt’s Creative Bible Teaching, 156-157)

• The next section of our approach is the Book. What do we do in the BOOK section? In the Book section, in essence “the teacher seeks to clarify the meaning of the passage being studied (156).”
• Answers the question, “What does this passage mean?”

• Effectively communicates the BIG IDEA of the text…

• …But also digs deeper than just the BIG IDEA to bring out a fuller understanding of the passage.

• Can be done most quickly and efficiently through a lecture, pedagogical (child-leading) format.

• However, it is often more effectively through a participatory, andragogical (man-leading or adult-leading) format.

  o Malcolm Knowles Theory:
    1. Adults need to know why they need to learn something;
    2. Adults maintain the concept of responsibility for their own decision, their own lives;
    3. Adults enter the educational activity with a greater volume and more varied experiences than do children;
    4. Adults have a readiness to learn those things that they need to know in order to cope effectively with real-life situations;
    5. Adults are life-centered in their orientation to learning;
    6. Adults are more responsive to internal motivators than external motivators. (Knowles, Holton III, and Swanson 2005, 72)

Mock Lesson Activity

• So, let’s look back at our example text today, 1 Kings 19:9-13a. Here’s what I’d like you to do. At your tables, I’d like you to look at our text and try to come up with what meaning God intended to have by including this narrative in the Bible. You’ve got some questions at your tables to help guide you through your discussion.

  o Questions:
    1. Why do you think God asks Elijah what he is doing there?

    2. What was going on in Elijah’s life leading up passage? How do you think Elijah was feeling? What was his mood?

    3. What do you think God was trying to convey to Elijah by passing by him? What do you think was the significance of God being in the “gentle whisper”?

• So what did you come up with? A couple people share? (God responded to Elijah’s frustration and bitterness with such grace and mercy) (God does not need fan fair, but exists too in modesty, humbleness)

• It would have been much easier for me to just read a commentary and give you the “answers” that an accomplished theologian gave about the meaning of this passage. But isn’t better to think about it yourselves and process the meaning of Scripture? Generally, you will remember your table discussions much better than some interpretation I gave you.

Look

• (Content in the Look section comes from Richards’ and Bredfeldt’s Creative Bible Teaching, 157-158)

• So after we understand God’s intended meaning of the passage we’re studying, the next step is to make it more applicable to the student’s daily lives. The Look answers the question, “What does this mean for the pattern of our daily lives?” (157).

• Original Meaning→Implications to daily lives

• A good LOOK:
  o Brings the passage into the 21st century
  o Helps make the passage come alive to students
  o Effectively applies the BOOK to the students’ daily lives.

• Case study a good way to bring it to today, with good probing questions to lead to implications. Video clip can also be effective. Perhaps an written article advocating a position contrary to Scripture could be effective (tension)
  o A case study or story is a great place to introduce some tension into lesson. A case in which it’s challenging and not black/white in applying our truth from the passage is effective.
  o “How does what we just learned from our text apply in this situation?”
  o “Anyone else experience a real situation in your life that this verse speaks to?”

Mock Lesson Activity

• At your tables you have a case study that I’d like you to read. Take five minutes to discuss the questions at the end that will help you apply our text.
CASE STUDY: Your married friends, Harold and Ruth, are the parents of three children: Robert, 12; Emily, 9; and Jeremy, 6. Times have been tough for them lately. They found out last month that Robert had non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Fortunately, the doctors caught it in the earliest stage and are confident that after treatment Robert will make a full recover. However, treatment is not easy or cheap. Emily is struggling in school. She’s just not interested and actually failing two classes. Jeremy is a strong, healthy boy. However, he has a real problem with bed-wetting…he does it (and a lot of it!) every night! Ruth has been a stay at home mom for the last 10 years. Harold has been the breadwinner of the family, but just last week lost his job. Not only are they worried about Harold not finding another job, but COBRA medical coverage is expensive, especially with the treatments that Robert needs. They do have some savings to live on for a time, but the poor stock market has taken a bite out of their nest egg. To top it all off, last night Ruth’s dad (she’s an only child and her mom died when she was 5 years old) had a stroke. It looks like he’s permanently lost functional use of his left side and will need assistance in rehab and recovery. Harold and Ruth are strong followers of Christ, and yet are feeling so helpless. With all these difficult life situations building up, they’re both beginning to feel frustrated and bitter with the Lord. They go to The Chapel and are in your ABF. You want to help. How do you encourage them? What do you say to them? How do you remind them that God is sovereign and still loves them?

So what did you come up with? How do you encourage them? How do you help them without just giving them pat answers?

Took

(Content in the Took section is adapted from Richards’ and Bredfeldt’s Creative Bible Teaching. 158-159)

The final part of our model is also the most overlooked part: The Took. What is a Took? In the Look section we think about applying the passage to some specific, often fictional, situations in our world. Often it is a little more general and vague. In the Took section, we get specific and personal.

This is the portion that gets specific and personal for your students.

Answers the question, “How do we live out the biblical truth we just discussed in our world, where we live, work, and play?”

This can look a variety of ways, depending on the topic you’re covering.

A good TOOK:

Moves your students to action. How do you move them to action? What can you do to facilitate the live change process for your students?
• A good TOOK gives your students something practical to do/change as soon as they walk out the classroom doors.

• Often, this is where the behavioral/psycho-motor teaching domain comes into play. Having them do some smaller, active task in class to lead to some bigger, active life change.

• Make sense? Questions?

**Mock Lesson Activity**

• (Option 1) Now imagine that Harold and Ruth are you. You are the one going through terribly difficult circumstances. You are feeling helpless, and frustrated and bitter towards the Lord. What would encourage you to hear or receive from someone else? How could they best minister to you? Take 5 minutes to write down your thoughts.

• (Option 2) Being able to help others quiet distractions, be still, and know that God is God and always loves us and never leaves us or abandons us, begins in our own hearts. How will you seek to grow in this discipline this week? What changes will you make? How will you quiet your own life’s distractions and hear God’s still, small voice and his gentle whisper? Write down specific ways, keep the paper in your Bible, and next week report back how you did.

**Questions**

• Questions? Take a few minutes and discuss any questions you might have with those at your table.

• Then we’ll have some time to ask unresolved questions as a group.

**Break**

• BREAK: …Feel free to take a few minutes to use the restroom, grab some more coffee and take a short break.

**Practicum**

• We thought it would be beneficial after you’ve learned some theory and practical details on how to put together a Bible lesson that you have a chance to practice putting one together.

• So for the next hour we’d like you to work specifically on the Big Idea, Pedagogical Idea, Lesson Aims, Hook, and TOOK of a particular passage, and present it to the rest
of the group. We’ll skip the Book and Look parts since it is the most time consuming and there are great references in the library to assist you in creating those parts.

• We’ll all be doing passages from the book of Ephesians. As you’re presenting, our assistant will be taking good notes and next week will email or send everything we’ve all created to the rest of us (who signed up when you came in with your name and contact info). That way, after today we’ll all have good starts on a series from Ephesians.

• On your tables you’ll find some paper and pens to write down what you’ve come up with. So, work together as a table and we’ll see how far we get. You have 40 minutes to work together and then for the last 20 minutes you’ll do 4-minute (max) presentations to the rest of class. So make sure you have one person from your group as a spokesperson.

• Let’s get started!

Conclusion

• Questions?

• Prayer at tables for ABFs/HABFs

• Evaluations
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TEACHER-TRAINING 1 STUDENT HANDOUTS:
CREATING A BIBLE LESSON

Case Study
(Student Handout)

Your married friends, Harold and Ruth, are the parents of three children: Robert, 12; Emily, 9; and Jeremy, 6. Times have been tough for them lately. They found out last month that Robert had non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Fortunately, the doctors caught it in the earliest stage and are confident that after treatment Robert will make a full recover. However, treatment is not easy or cheap. Emily is struggling in school. She’s just not interested and actually failing two classes. Jeremy is a strong, healthy boy. However, he has a real problem with bed-wetting…he does it (and a lot of it!) every night!

Ruth has been a stay at home mom for the last 10 years. Harold has been the breadwinner of the family, but just last week lost his job. Not only are they worried about Harold not finding another job, but COBRA medical coverage is expensive, especially with the treatments that Robert needs. They do have some savings to live on for a time, but the poor stock market has taken a bite out of their nest egg. To top it all off, last night Ruth’s dad (she’s an only child and her mom died when she was 5 years old) had a stroke. It looks like he’s permanently lost functional use of his left side and will need assistance in rehab and recovery.

Harold and Ruth are strong followers of Christ, and yet are feeling so helpless. With all these difficult life situations building up, they’re both beginning to feel frustrated and bitter with the Lord. They go to The Chapel and are in your ABF. You want to help. How do you encourage them? What do you say to them? How do you remind them that God is sovereign and still loves them?
Teacher Training I
(Student Handout)

1. My biggest take away from the morning was …..

2. I would repeat the following things next year …..

3. Overall worth my time (one being the lowest, ten being the highest)
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. Informative
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. Organized
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. Appropriate length of time
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. Relevance to ministry
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. Enjoyable experience
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. Sustained my attention throughout
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. I wish that next time we would …..
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TEACHER-TRAINING 2 TEACHING NOTES:
INDUCTIVE TEACHING AND
ANDRAGOGY

Introduction

- (Begin training with example of inductive teaching as an opening HOOK. This HOOK is adapted from a lesson taught by Tony Pointer).

  o Slide #1, Photo #1
    - Begin by warning group that picture is graphic and disturbing.

    - Show award-winning picture of emaciated Sudanese girl and have them take it in for a time. Give 30 seconds of complete silence.

  o Slide #2, Photo #1
    - Show next slide with the same picture and following questions: Ask, “What are your initial thoughts? How does this photo make you feel? What does this photo make you think? What does this photo make you want to do?”

  o Slide #3, Photo #2
    - Show next photo of Kevin Carter

    - While photo is still showing, read, “In March 1993 Kevin Carter made a trip to southern Sudan. A, high-pitched whimpering near the village of Ayod attracted Carter to an emaciated Sudanese toddler. The girl had stopped to rest while struggling to a feeding center, whereupon a vulture had landed nearby. He said that he waited about 20 minutes, hoping that the vulture would spread its wings. It didn't. Carter snapped the haunting photograph and chased the vulture away. However, he also came under heavy criticism for just photographing — and not helping — the little girl: "The man adjusting his lens to take just the right frame of her suffering might just as well be a predator, another vulture on the scene." The photograph was sold to The New York Times where it appeared for the first time on March 26, 1993. Practically overnight hundreds of people contacted the newspaper to ask whether the child had survived, leading the
newspaper to run a special editor's note saying the girl had enough strength to walk away from the vulture, but that her ultimate fate was unknown. Carter was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Feature Photography” (MacLeod 1994, wikipedia.com). (Given by Tony Pointer)

- **Slide #4, Photo#2**
  - Show next slide with same photo of Kevin Carter and ask the questions, “What are your initial thoughts? How does this photo make you feel? What does this photo make you think? What does this photo make you want to do?”
  - While photo is still showing, read, “On 27 July, 1994 Carter took his own life by taping one end of a hose to his pickup truck’s exhaust pipe and running the other end to the passenger-side window. He died of carbon monoxide poisoning at the age of 33. Portions of Carter's suicide note read: ‘I am depressed ... without phone ... money for rent ... money for child support ... money for debts ... money!!! ... I am haunted by the vivid memories of killings and corpses and anger and pain ... of starving or wounded children, of trigger-happy madmen, often police, of killer executioners...I have gone to join Ken if I am that lucky’” (http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,981431-6,00.html).
  - Give a bit more info about Kevin Carter from the Time Magazine article.
  - Ask, “Does this change your feelings for Kevin? Why or why not?”

- **Slide #5**
  - It’s easy for us to feel love and compassion for the hurting Sudanese girl. But it’s a challenge to feel love for the one that we perceive as being sinful, irresponsible, or apathetic in a situation that warrants deep love. Our love for the Sudanese girl seems unconditional, but our love for Kevin Carter seems more conditional on his actions, feelings, compassion, etc. Interesting…
  - In your opinion, knowing what you know now, was Kevin Carter loving those suffering in Africa? How did or didn’t he?
  - “We can say that we love God and in the very next breathe that we love meatballs. Does that cheapen the value of the word ‘love’?”

- Not only was this an example of a HOOK, as we talked about in our first teaching training, but it was also an example of inductive teaching. Those of us that
specifically teach adults, maybe that’s 16 and older, in our ABF/HABF/Small Group setting, it is imperative that we are doing a significant amount of inductive teaching.

• Have you ever heard of the term, “inductive”? What does inductive or an inductive approach mean?
  
  o **Definition of Inductive Approach**: “the analysis of data and examination of practice problems within their own context rather than from a predetermined theoretical basis. The approach moves from the specific to the general” (The Free Dictionary, http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/, March 2, 2011).

• What is the opposite of inductive? Deductive. Deductive means to go from general to specific. So taking a broad concept or idea and deducing it down to specific concepts or applications or data.

• So if inductive means going from specific to general, what does that mean in terms of teaching? Inductive teaching involves teaching broad concepts or ideas through specific examples and experiences. In doing this, it is often very participative and discussion based so that the learner is not passive, but engaged. As opposed to deductive teaching, which begins with broad statements or concepts and breaks it down to application, inductive teaching begins with a specific, often practical, example and ends up at the broad generalization or concept.

• A great book for your library is *The Christian Educator’s Handbook on Adult Education*, edited by Ken Gangel and James Wilhoit. There are a lot of really good things in there on how to effectively teach the Bible and Christian concepts to adults written by a lot of really good education scholars and practitioners. Excellent book. One of the chapters is on inductive teaching.

• **Assumptions**: In the chapter on inductive teaching, written by Duane Elmer, there are given some important assumptions on which inductive teaching rests:
  
  o “First, learning can happen, and may most effectively happen, when the teacher avoids doing all the talking” (136).
    • Inductive teaching with adults is much more effective than a lecture.

  o “Second, a deliberate kind of sharing with learners is necessary—sharing talk time, sharing thoughts, and sharing vulnerabilities” (136).
    • Teaching and learning with adults is a joint venture. One party does not dominate it. Teacher plans and directs, but learners must participate and engage.

  o “A third assumption reminds us that learning occurs in an atmosphere of trust” (137).
• Meaningful sharing and discussion only happens in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

• Andragogy: These assumptions, and many parts of inductive teaching in general, are kind of a subset of a larger philosophy of education called andragogy. We briefly talked about this idea in Teacher Training 1, but andragogy is an important concept for us to understand as we teach the faith to adults. Andragogy literally means the leader or teacher of men or adults, so understand it as a general educational philosophy for effectively teaching adults. Malcolm Knowles bases his theory on some similar assumptions that Elmer made:

1. Adults need to know why they need to learn something;
2. Adults maintain the concept of responsibility for their own decision, their own lives;
3. Adults enter the educational activity with a greater volume and more varied experiences than do children;
4. Adults have a readiness to learn those things that they need to know in order to cope effectively with real-life situations;
5. Adults are life-centered in their orientation to learning;
6. Adults are more responsive to internal motivators than external motivators.

(Knowles, Holton, and Swanson 2005, 72)

- Do you agree with these observations or assumptions from Elmer and Knowles about how adults learn? Why or why not?
- Part of the andragogical theory (self-directed learning) really is the foundation of the current model of learning that so many universities are going to that is completely self-directed (online, distance education, non-traditional education).

• So if we agree with what Elmer and Knowles propose in adult learning theory, then it’s really important that our teaching practice is consistent with these assumptions. That’s where inductive teaching comes into play. What are some of the mindsets and practices (educators sometimes call these process skills) an inductive teacher must become comfortable with? Elmer names some:

1. Structure learning experiences that bring the learners into some kind of cognitive and/or physical interaction with the lesson content.
2. Believe learning can happen when you are not talking.
3. Ask probing, even provoking questions.
4. Guide conversation and discuss without closing it down.
5. Listen for understanding rather than evaluation.
7. Handle spontaneous issues and questions.
8. Be vulnerable, communicate that you are a trustworthy and safe person.
10. Be comfortable with silence.
11. Interact while also communicating acceptance.
12. Be willing to take some risks.
   (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 137)

- What do you think of these twelve process skills? Freeing or binding? Scary or exciting?

- **NOT SPOON FED, BUT DISCOVERED**: Inductive teaching is so powerful with adults because it does not allow them to be passive learners who are spoon fed information. Instead, it often begins with a real life situation with which the learner is familiar and allows them to engage and DISCOVER the general concept or principle.

- **MORE TIME PREPPING BEFORE, LESS TALKING DURING CLASS**: Inductive teaching specifically, and andragogical methodologies in general, often require a good amount of thinking and preparation before the class, but should result in less work (talking) by the teacher during the actual teaching time, because the learners are engaged in thought, activity, and discussion.

- **LESS INFORMATION, HIGHER RETENTION**: With inductive teaching specifically, and andragogical methodologies in general, the quantity of information offered to the learner is often less than in more lecture driven, pedagogical methods. However, the quantity of information that is retained and absorbed into life change for the learner is often much higher with inductive teaching (especially highly andragogical inductive teaching) than with lecture driven, deductive teaching.

- **CHALLENGING FOR TEACHER, ENGAGING FOR LEARNER**: For many teachers inductive teaching is challenging to get comfortable with at first, especially if he or she has been more of a lecture driven, deductive teacher. However, you will be amazed at how it engages the learner in a deeper, more meaningful, attention grabbing way than more deductive methods. The learning time is much more exciting and enjoyable.

- I thought it would be valuable to give you some specific inductive techniques and practical methods that should be a good starting point for your own inductive teaching. Probably the foundational component of inductive teaching is being able to facilitate class discussion.

**Creating and Facilitating Discussion and the Art of Asking Questions**

- Creating and Facilitating Discussion and the Art of Asking Questions
  - Creating an environment of honesty, trust, commitment, and acceptance (adapted from Howard Hendricks’ *Teaching to Change Lives* (88-90) and Chapel member Rick Martin’s thoughts)
• **Commitment to lesson and learning:** If you as a teacher are not committed to your lesson or have not prepared adequately to give it then it will not take long for the classroom to disengage with your teachings.

• **Openness/vulnerability/transparency with struggles:** If you are trying to get a classroom to openly discuss their struggles and heartaches you as the teacher must be honest and accountable for your own weaknesses and struggles and not be afraid to share them.

• **Know your students:** As teacher, the more you know your students’ needs the better able you will be to meet them and the more they will trust you and allow you to meet them.

• **Validate your students:** It is important that the teacher validates and encourages student responses, especially during class. It takes courage for students to speak up in front of others. Teachers need to support them.

• **Acceptance of conflict and challenges:** The teacher should help create an environment in which his thoughts and teachings can be challenged and disagreed with. How you handle conflict and disagreement will have a significant effect on how willing the students will be to participate and discuss.

• **Trust/integrity of the teacher:** Allow your class to see the content of your teaching being played out in your daily life. If you walk the talk, they will too.

  o Good sequence for asking questions: Observation, Interpretation, Application (from Terry Powell’s book, *Now That’s a Good Question!*, 31-51)

  • **Observation:** (37)
    - “How did Nehemiah discover the plight of the Jews?”

  • **Interpretation:** (40-45)
    - “What prerequisite for effective intercession does his inquiry illustrate?”
    - “Can participants point to specific passage elements to support their answers? (Meaning stems from what the passage says, not speculation about the material)
    - “Does my question require them to explain the meaning implied or illustrated by the facts? (If participants come up
with an answer just by reiterating what the text says, it’s an observation question, not an interpretive one.)

• “Can group members answer correctly by sticking to the information provided in this Bible passage? (Don’t ask questions requiring historical background or doctrinal discernment that’s outside the scope of the lesson. If understanding your text requires that sort of material, briefly lecture on it.)

• “Is the answer to this question a significant truth offered by the passage? (In view of time limitations and group characteristics, covering every truth in your Bible passage isn’t realistic. Shoot for principles that best correlate with the passage’s main theme and have the greatest application potential.)

• “CAUTION: Don’t allow the wording of interpretation questions to put the spotlight on personal opinion rather than the Bible text. Avoid questions such as, ‘What does this verse mean to you?’ This question causes participants to turn inward and promotes excessive subjectivity rather than objective investigation of a passage.”

- **Application:** (45-51)
  - “In what ways can we stay informed concerning the needs of people in this group or in our church?”

  - Ask for anecdotes. Plan questions that draw out personal examples from students. “When has awareness of a biblical promise prompted you to pray for someone?”

  - Probe for possibilities. This is the most often used type of application question. Ask group members to imagine what application of the principle will look like and allow the Holy Spirit to fuel their thoughts. “What can we do to engage our minds more when we pray?”

  - Rhetorical questions. Sometimes it is fitting to ask questions so personal that oral answers are not appropriate. Rhetorical questions challenge the learner to search their hearts and identify concrete responses to truths. “What temptation plagues you most?”

- We don’t always do all the observation questions first, then do all our interpretation questions, and then do applications questions. We may
move through all three types of questions while camping out on a single point.

- Don’t spend much time on observation questions. Leave more time for interpretation and application questions, where more learning and life-change often take place.

  o Effective Questions are Clear, Accurate, Sensitive, and Thought-Provoking (adapted from Terry Powell’s book, *Now That’s a Good Question!*, 52-62)

- **Clear:**
  - Ask a question, then wait for a response. Avoid asking numerous questions without waiting for answers.
  - Avoid long-winded questions. Shorter questions are more easily remembered and answered.

- **Accurate:**
  - We risk inaccuracies in answers to our questions when we ask the students to foster speculation about the text, encourage exploration of irrelevant material, and shift the focus of authority from God’s Word to participants’ opinions.

- **Sensitive:**
  - Don’t ask questions that are intensely personal.
  - Avoid questions that are unrealistic for the typical group member and challenging to a theologian.

- **Thought-Provoking:**
  - Avoid yes/no questions, very obvious questions, and leading questions (“Don’t you think…”, “Isn’t it obvious…”, etc.).

**Break**

- BREAK: …Feel free to take a few minutes to use the restroom, grab some more coffee and take a short break.

**Simulations**

- **Simulation:** Culture Shock, adapted from Marlene LeFever in *Creative Teaching Methods*.

  o “When missionaries go into a new culture, they try to conform to the habits and customs of the people, as long as they don’t violate the principles taught in the Bible.”
“This can be terribly hard, because we are so used to our old cultural habits. Add the pressures of learning a new language, new living and eating situations, and removal from close friends and familiar places. It’s only through God’s help that missionaries survive the first year.

“Today we’re going to go through a culture shock as we pretend to be missionaries entering the unusual country of Flockland. In this simulation, our language will remain English, of course, but in Flockland there are some cultural distinctives and imperatives that are a bit different than ours here in the United States. In your conversations with other Flocklanders, be sure to follow the list of Flockland customs.”

**Cultural Rules:**

1. In Flockland, a cultured person never uses pronouns—only complete names.
2. In Flockland, when people meet, they jump up and down twice and clap once. When they part, they tap each other on the left shoulder three times.
3. In conversation it is very poor manners to laugh or show your teeth in any way. Pleasure is shown by rubbing the tongue quickly back and forth across the lower lip.
4. Conversations in Flockland are limited to one minute. Longer conversations indicate the person is lazy, making poor use of time and vocabulary.
5. When Flocklanders sit, they always keep their left leg approximately six inches off the floor. This is a sign of their virility and strength, even for women.
6. People snap their fingers in a regular rhythm when they are talking with someone of the opposite sex, even a spouse, if they’re in public.
7. A refined Flocklander never covers more than ten inches with each step.
8. A sign of friendship is to pull a hair from your head and present it to the person to whom you’re talking. This can also be a sign that you’re telling the truth.
9. Upon leaving a person, you should always bestow a wish upon him or her. For example, “I wish you rain for your potatoes.”
10. In Flockland, it is considered very rude to look anyone directly in the eyes. Instead, it is proper etiquette during all conversations to stare only at the person’s right ear.

Spend a few minutes (five max) getting acquainted with the cultural imperatives.

Spend another five minutes interacting as Flocklanders, following all the rules therein. When others make mistakes, be sure to correct them.
After these five minutes, quickly debrief. What were some of your feelings going through this exercise? Did you feel silly, frustrated, tired, or incompetent?

Now divide everyone into two equal groups. One group facing one way, will be native Flocklanders, following all the cultural imperatives. The list of imperatives will be situated in such a way that they can see it. The other group will not be able to see it.

The second group will be missionaries trying to befriend the Flocklanders, following all the cultural imperatives. However, they will not be able to see the imperatives.

Whenever a missionary makes a mistake, the Flocklander should simply walk away from him.

This interaction takes 5-8 minutes.

At the end of the simulation, share some debriefing questions. How do you feel you did at laying a friendship base? Did you concentrate more on making friends or following the cultural imperatives? Do you think it’s realistic that nationals will not listen to the Gospel if a missionary violates their cultural rules? What part should the Holy Spirit play in this? What have you learned from this simulation that you can use in your spiritual interactions with those living in your city and neighborhood?

Simulation: Important Points from Handbook on Adult Education (139-142)

Definition: A simulation is a structured experience that seeks to imitate some piece of reality.

Astronauts go through many simulations to help prepare them for the rigors of space travel.

Why use simulations?

1. Reality is not available or desirable. For example, we may want to learn about death without experiencing it!
2. Reality is often too expensive. It’s too costly to take a class to a foreign country to experience what missionaries experience.
3. Reality is often too dangerous. To train police men in the field could be deadly.
4. Reality takes too much time. Taking a trip to Turkey would take a week!
What are the benefits of simulation?

1. A simulation creates disequilibrium or disequilibration for the learner. This is the crux of transformational learning and is essential in teaching adults. Disequilibrium is when “students discover discrepancies between what they believed and what God says, or between what they are doing and what God says they ought to be doing. Disequilibrium is the moment of pause, the moment of truth, the moment of choice” (141). As Perry Downs puts it in *Teaching for Spiritual Growth*, “the teacher should introduce new concepts or facts that the existing cognitive structures cannot accommodate. This disruption of the cognitive equilibration may cause a certain degree of discomfort, but it is necessary to the learning process. The slight level of anxiety generated by being disequilibrated provides the ‘energy’ necessary for learning” (89). Creating disequilibrium in our learners intentionally puts them in a “crisis” situation where their belief or belief system is challenged. They have to deal with the new information or experience. The learner is forced to process the new information. They either reject it and continue in their prior thinking, or they restructure and reform their thinking to accommodate this new knowledge or information. This is where learning is achieved. Howard Hendricks puts it simply in *Teaching to Change Lives*, “there is no learning…without tension. Tension is absolutely indispensible to the process” (39). Simulations are excellent ways to create disequilibrium or disequilibration and learning.

2. Simulations are enjoyable. They’re much more fun than listening to a lecture.

3. Learning from simulations tends to be more permanent. Because simulations are concrete experiences, it is not soon forgotten. Most retain only about 10% of factual material in lectures.

4. Simulations create a stronger sense of ownership among class members. Everyone is involved in the process actively.

5. Simulations stimulate intrinsic motivation. Learners make the choices and experience the consequences. Participation is a strong internal motivator. What they learn (or choose not to learn) should have value to them since it is based in the reality in which we live.

- Simulations take time to think through and create, but they can very effectively bring about the life change and understanding that we want for our learners.

- Make sense? Questions on simulations?

- Other Inductive teaching and andragogical techniques

- Case Studies
Problem Solving

Experiential learning

Practicum

- I thought it would be beneficial after you’ve learned some theory and practical details on inductive teaching that you have a chance to practice putting some together.

- So for the next hour we’d like you to work specifically on some inductive teaching methods on a particular passage and present it to the rest of the group in no more than 4 minutes. Now this is TT2, which builds upon TT1, so I want you to do this in the construct of the HBLT structure. So you’ll need to begin by coming up with a Big Idea, Pedagogical Idea, and Lesson Aims. Then think through how you can teach the actual lesson inductively. Maybe you focus on a good inductive Hook or Took. Maybe the whole lesson is one big inductive lesson and you rearrange the HBLT components (possibly HLBT?). You decide the specifics, but I really want you to think inductively for this practicum.

- We’ll all be doing passages from the book of 1 Peter. As you’re presenting, our assistant will be taking good notes and next week will email or send everything we’ve all created to the rest of us (who signed up when you came in with your name and contact info). That way, after today we’ll all have good starts on a series from 1 Peter.

- On your tables you’ll find some paper and pens to write down what you’ve come up with. So, work together as a table and we’ll see how far we get. You have forty minutes to work together and then for the last twenty minutes you’ll do four-minute (max) presentations to the rest of class. So make sure you have one person from your group as a spokesperson.

- Let’s get started!

Conclusion

- Questions?

- Prayer at tables for ABFs/HABFs

- Evaluations
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TEACHER-TRAINING 2 STUDENT HANDOUTS:
INDUCTIVE TEACHING AND
ANDRAGOGY

Cultural Rules
(Student Handout)

1. In Flockland, a cultured person never uses pronouns—only complete names.

2. In Flockland, when people meet, they jump up and down twice and clap once. When they part, they tap each other on the left shoulder three times.

3. In conversation it is very poor manners to laugh or show your teeth in any way. Pleasure is shown by rubbing the tongue quickly back and forth across the lower lip.

4. Conversations in Flockland are limited to one minute. Longer conversations indicate the person is lazy, making poor use of time and vocabulary.

5. When Flocklanders sit, they always keep their left leg approximately six inches off the floor. This is a sign of their virility and strength, even for women.

6. People snap their fingers in a regular rhythm when they are talking with someone of the opposite sex, even a spouse, if they’re in public.

7. A refined Flocklander never covers more than ten inches with each step.

8. A sign of friendship is to pull a hair from your head and present it to the person to whom you’re talking. This can also be a sign that you’re telling the truth.

9. Upon leaving a person, you should always bestow a wish upon him or her. For example, “Jeff Martell wishes Dane Allphin rain for Dane Allphin’s potatoes.”

10. In Flockland, it is considered very rude to look anyone directly in the eyes. Instead, it is proper etiquette during all conversations to stare only at the person’s right ear.
1. My biggest take away from the morning was ……

2. I would repeat the following things next year ……

3. Overall worth my time (one being the lowest, ten being the highest)
   - Informative
   - Organized
   - Appropriate length of time
   - Relevance to ministry
   - Enjoyable experience
   - Sustained my attention throughout

4. I wish that next time we would ……
APPENDIX 13

TEACHER-TRAINING 3 TEACHING NOTES:
LEARNING STYLES

Introduction

• **Mike Krietemeyer**: We were finishing my basement last year and I was doing it with my father-in-law. I should explain that I am not a particularly handy guy, although I’m learning. My father-in-law Mike, however, is probably the handiest person I’ve ever met. I think he could fix or build anything. He’s pretty amazing. So we were putting a full bath downstairs and we had everything measured out and framed it out and it was looking pretty good. So then we got to the point of getting the tub in place. We pulled out the instructions and in them were really two sets of instructions: a step-by-step instruction using words specifying exactly what to do, and a picture that showed what should go where and how it all should look when finished. When Mike was doing his part he would look almost exclusively at the step-by-step worded instructions and I would look almost exclusively at the picture. Interesting…

• So, again when we’re doing stuff around the house I’m pretty much clueless so I’m always calling him to ask him how to do things or fix things and he just calmly explains step by step over the phone to me and I’m like…that doesn’t help! Show me! Please!

• **Patty Martell**: *Explain how creative my mom is and how she’s always thinking what things should become, like inventions, stories, silly voices, etc).*

• **Recap TT1**: In our first Teacher Training we went through the basics of creating a Bible lesson. We talked about the Big Idea, the Pedagogical Idea, Lesson Aims, and Hook-Book-Look-Took. We said this is a good structure to generally follow, but not every time. Variety is good.

• **Recap TT2**: In our second Teacher Training we focused on andragogy and specifically Inductive Teaching. Inductive reasoning generally means to go from specific to general. So Inductive Teaching similarly begins with something specific and concrete and progressively generalizes and culminates with broad sweeping conclusions. You may then get specific again with some clear applications for us today at the end. But part of inductive teaching and andragogy in general is that the learners really participate and actively engage in the learning. They are not passive
learners who simply listen to the teacher lecturing. Instead, they are actively involved.

- **Intro TT3**: So TT1: How to create a Bible lesson. TT2: How to teach adults creatively and effectively. Today, we’re going to focus on the nature of our learners, our students. Just like my father-in-law Mike and my mother Patty learn differently than I do, so our learners are each wired differently and often learn best in different ways. Today during the first half of our time we’re going to learn how students learn, and then spend the second half of our time creating lessons geared towards those learning styles.

### Learning Styles Defined

- What I think is the best book our there on learning styles is called *Learning Styles: Reaching Everyone God Gave You to Teach*, by Marlene LeFever. For future reference in your folders I’ve included a copy of a free overview chapter of *Learning Styles* that gives a quick summary of what the book’s about. Her book is an excellent one that’s not difficult to read and extremely practical. It’s probably a book worth investing in if you’re able.

- So let me take a few minutes and give you a brief summary of what LeFever says in her book about how students learn. She begins by saying that effective learning follows a natural process:
  1. Learners begin with what they already know or feel or need. What happened before must provide the groundwork for what will happen now. Real learning cannot take place in a vacuum.
  2. This real life connection prepares them for the next step—learning something new.
  3. Learners use the new content, practicing how it might work in real life.
  4. Learners must creatively take what they have learned beyond the classroom (15-16)

- She then recognized that different learners excelled at and felt most comfortable in different parts of the learning process. Some share really easily from their past experience and provide a context for learning. Others thrive on learning something new, and are always wanting more knowledge and information. Others have to see if what they’ve learned makes sense now, in real life. And others are more concerned with how to use this new information in creative ways outside the classroom. Even as this is true, however, every student still needs to go through the other parts of the learning process for effective learning to have taken place.

- So, these different learning styles that students possessed were named and defined.
  1. **Imaginative Learners** easily share from their past experience, providing a context for learning.
  2. **Analytic Learners** need to learn something new in the lesson.
3. **Common Sense Learners** need to see if what they learned makes sense now.

4. **Dynamic Learners** find creative ways to use what they’ve learned.

(16)

- Everyone has a learning style and no one fits perfectly into the definition of any particular learning style that we’ll look at today. In fact, we all probably will see bits of each learning style within our students and ourselves. We’re all different. And one learning style does not make one person smarter or more intelligent than another. They just make us different. And as teachers with a lot of different kinds of people in our groups it’s important that we understand these differences and (imperfectly) work to help ALL our students feel valued and learn as effectively as possible.

- LeFever writes that when we value all the different learning styles and affirm them we help our people:
  1. Believe that God made his or her mind right.
  2. Be motivated to learn.
  3. Actively participate in class.
  4. Learn faster.
  5. Understand others better and find ways to communicate effectively with them.
  6. Affirm personal gifts and talents that he or she can use for God’s service.
  7. Relate better in group situations.
  8. Make career choices in which he or she has the best chance to be successful.
  9. Build tolerance and empathy for those who are least like him or her (21)

- And aren’t these things we want for our people?

- So the question naturally arises of how to teach a 30-45 minute lesson to all the different learners styles so that everyone in the class really learns. LeFever’s answer is that as we go through the four steps of the learning cycle, every student will have an opportunity to excel and feel comfortable in a particular segment as well as experience all the other segments to learn deeply.

  1. The **FIRST STEP** in the cycle is a natural fit for imaginative learners. It deals with the questions, “Why study this lesson?” or “Why do I need to know this?” As teacher you draw on the past knowledge and experiences of the learners. The imaginative learner can help the class see how this relates to what they already know and why it’s important to pay attention and learn what’s coming next (25-26).

  2. The **SECOND STEP** in the cycle is a natural fit for analytic learners. It deals with the question, “What do I need to know?” In this section the teacher brings in new facts and info that will help them deal more effectively with the subject (26-27).

  3. The **THIRD STEP** in the cycle is a natural fit for the common sense learners. It deals with the questions, “How do I use what I know?” and “How does what I’ve studied actually work today?” This is where common sense learners can help the class pick up on the practical side of the problem. These learners help focus everyone on putting this new information into action (27).
4. The final **FOURTH STEP** in the cycle is a natural fit for the dynamic learners. It deals with the questions, “What can this become?” and “What if I added this—or that—to what I know?” Dynamic learners can help the class add themselves to what they’ve learned and find creative ways to take the lesson home with them. These learners want to enlarge what they’ve learned with creativity and ideas, and amidst the plethora of thoughts can often hit on something that excites the whole class to action (27).

- As you have all this churning around in your heads, think about how what we’ve learned in the first two teacher trainings meshes with all this. These four steps can fall in line quite nicely with the whole **Hook** (Imaginative)-**Book** (Analytic)-**Look** (Common Sense)-**Took** (Dynamic) lesson construct. It also is quite conducive to andragogy and inductive teaching, pulling the students in to the discussion to actively engage, take ownership, and participate. As we progress this morning and as you grow in your teaching as you leave here think about how you can mesh all these components work together to make you a more effective teacher and your students more effective learners.

- Another component to these learning styles involves modalities of learning. These modalities are really preferences each person has in learning. The three modalities are auditory (hear), visual (see), and tactile/kinesthetic (do). These are the sensory channels through which we receive information. And we all have preferences. Back in my opening example about my father-in-law and myself, he’s much more of an auditory learner and I’m more visual.
  - **Auditory**: listening, singing, clapping, dramatic reading, hearing music (32).
    - *(How I learned how to spell breakfast, memorizing scripture through song)*
  - **Visual**: seeing what they’re learning through words, pictures. Drawing, coloring, photographing, patterns, forms (32).
    - *(These slides, pictures and movies that tell stories and evoke emotion/feeling, maps of Paul’s spiritual journey)*
  - **T/K**: Movement as part of the learning process. Methods that involve physical action as part of the learning process (32).
    - *(If you’re teaching on the spiritual disciplines, how about fasting? Serving together. Prayer walking)*

- Now it’s probably important to point out that this isn’t saying that to be a good teacher you always follow this linear process 1-2-3-4. Just like you don’t always follow the H-B-L-T process linearly. But those components are good and essential. And part of being a good teacher is teaching with variety, especially if you’re teaching the same group week after week.

- **Hemisphericity: Right/Left Mode**: Let me throw in one more thing to the equation for you to think about. I think for some it can be just enough to convolute the whole process and make you say, “Well, I’ve never worried about any of this stuff in the
past and people tell me I’m a good teacher, so forget all this garbage!” But try not to do that. It definitely makes sense and gets easier as you practice it more.

- **The 4MAT System** (Bernice McCarthy): Along with all this other stuff, hemisphericity—right and left mode (or brain) thinking—also is distinct in each person. You’ve heard of this, right? Someone’s really left brain in their thinking or really right brained in their thinking. I usually think of accountants as the typical left-brain folks and artists as the typical right-brain folks. Most teachers, in public schools, in churches, in the business world—everywhere—most naturally teach to left-mode learners. Something to be aware of…

  - **Left-Brain Learner**: (211) *(teachers are often comfortable here)*
    
    Does verbal processing
    
    - Likes sequence
    - Likes Structure
    - Analyzes
    - Controls feelings

  - **Right-Brain Learner**: (211) *(teachers are often uncomfortable here)*
    
    Does visual-spatial processing
    
    - Like random patterns
    - Fluid and spontaneous
    - Synthesizes
    - Free with feelings

- So McCarthy’s model (shown in LeFever’s *Learning Styles*, 211), which LeFever bases her model on, has 8 steps instead of 4. McCarthy doesn’t have the “See, Hear, Do” component explicitly a part of her model, but she just is intentional about using teaching techniques that hit the “See, Hear, Do” modalities. So, within each of the 4 steps of learning that we discussed earlier, there is a right-brain component and a left-brain component. In the first two steps (“Why do I need to know this?” and “What do I need to know?”) McCarthy begins with the right brainers and then goes to the left brainers. In the second two steps (“How does this work today?” and “What can this become?”) she begins with the left brainers and moves to the right brainers. **Think of it as just vacillating between analysis and synthesis as you go through the learning process, using techniques that hit the visual learner, the auditory learner, and the T/K learner.**

- Does this make sense? Questions?
Creating a Learning Style Case Study

- So here’s what I’d like us to do. I’d like us to look at the characteristics of each of
  the four learning styles, but instead of me just giving you the information from the
  book, I want you all to give the information to us. On your tables you have numerous
  copies of a page of characteristics of a particular learning style as defined in
  LeFever’s book, Learning Styles. I’d like each of you to quickly read the list and as a
  team develop a case study, or story, describing a person who has the learning style
  you are assigned. Perhaps this is fictitious, perhaps it’s bits and pieces of real people
  you know with this learning style. Your story can be no longer than the front of one
  page in length, and when we’re done someone from your team will read the case
  study to the rest of us. Pen’s and paper are also on your table. You have 20 minutes.
  Questions? Begin!

- (After 20 minutes each team will read their case study, but will not tell what learning
  style they had. Afterwards I will ask listeners which learning style the group had and
to pull out parts of the story that they noticed were specifically indicative of the
  learning style the group studied. After all the teams presented their case study a slide
  of the characteristics of each of the learning styles will be shown on screen and
  quickly discussed)

  - **Imaginative Learners:** (48)
    - Talk in broad overviews
    - Learn by listening and sharing ideas
    - Answer questions “Why?” and “Why not?”
    - Are sociable, friendly, sensitive
    - Are empathetic
    - Keenly observe human nature
    - Enjoy listening and talking
    - Work best in a noisy setting
    - Dislike long lectures, memorizing, working alone
    - Are idea people
    - Are in tune with their feelings
    - See facts in relationship to people
    - Learn by talking
    - Like the feeling of “my gang”
    - Get smarter the longer they talk
    - Enjoy role-play, simulation, mime
    - Dislike win/lose situations
    - Value people above product, friendships above grades
    - Love a colorful working situation
    - Define themselves in terms of friendship

  - **Analytic Learners:** (56)
    - Like information presented logically and sequentially
    - Value facts, figures, and the theoretical
• Debate to logically prove the correct stance or answer
• Value smart and wise people
• Set long-range plans and see their consequences
• Are curious about ideas
• See themselves as intellectual
• Have a high tolerance for theory
• Think in terms of correct and incorrect answers
• Value being right
• Enjoy listening and taking notes
• Like teachers who are information givers
• Prefer a quiet learning situation
• Learn from traditional methodology
• Dislike situations and methods where no one wins
• Define themselves by how smart they are
• Enjoy reading the Bible for concepts and principles
• Need competition
• Are impersonal
• Prefer to work alone

• **Common Sense Learners:** (64)
  • Move during the learning process
  • Value action, product development, “how-to”
  • Are realistic and practical
  • Deal with logical consequences
  • Are goal-oriented
  • See skills as knowledge
  • Value instruction managers
  • Prefer to work alone
  • Are impersonal
  • Do not enjoy lecture
  • Value strategic thinking
  • Restrict judgment to concrete things
  • Grade success by how well projects work
  • Resent being given answers
  • Excel in problem solving
  • Enjoy “how-to” reading
  • See Christianity in terms of action
  • Read the Bible to get hands-on information
  • Dislike sitting quietly in a learning setting
  • Teach and learn through demonstration
  • Can be mechanically and computer literate

• **Dynamic Learners:** (74)
  • Lead
  • Have experimental attitudes and behaviors
  • Cultivate a well-developed sense of humor
• Demand flexibility
• Take a long time to complete an assignment
• Need options
• Like student directed classrooms
• Are curious and insightful
• Enjoy teachers who facilitate and stimulate creativity
• Are future directed
• Want to do anything that is different or breaks the mold
• Make decisions based on hunches
• Enjoy people
• Communicate with great skill
• Enjoy dramatics, or any art form that allows them to assert individuality
• Are unpredictable and willing to take chances
• Value creativity
• Have strong intuition
• Can see numerous ways of approaching a situation or problem
• Work to make things better or different.

Understanding Our Own Learning Style

• In your folders you have a sheet titled “What’s My Learning Style” which is taken from LeFever’s book (29). I’d like you to take a few minutes to fill that out to find out which learning style you most connect with.

• Are you surprised by your learning style? Anyone very clearly one? Anyone feel like you are a hybrid of 2-3-4?

Break

• Feel free to take a few minutes to use the restroom, grab some more coffee and take a short break.

Practicum

• I thought it would be beneficial after you’ve learned some theory and practical details on learning styles that you have a chance to practice putting together some components of a lesson with those in mind.

• So for the next hour I’d like you to work on some components of a lesson, taking into consideration learning styles, on a passage from 1 John. When you’re finished I’d like you to present it to the rest of the group. Normally, when preparing a lesson you’d begin by figuring out the Big Idea, Pedagogical Idea, and Lesson Aims. Since
our time is limited, I’ve written those for you so that you can jump right into preparing a lesson following the 8 Steps of the process, with Hear, See, and Do in mind as well.

- So look at the material in your folders and the four steps of the learning process—with right and left mode components—and the questions to ask and answer as you go through the steps. Try to think through creative ways (using auditory, visual, and T/K modalities) to reach the four learning styles.

- Each table will be focusing primarily on one of the learning styles and steps in the learning process.

  
  (Assign a learning style for each table)

- On your tables you’ll find some paper and pens to write down what you’ve come up with. So, work together as a table and we’ll see how far we get. You have 30 minutes to work together and then for the last twenty minutes you’ll do four-minute (max) presentations to the rest of class. So make sure you have one person from your group as a spokesperson.

- Let’s get started!

  
  (After 30 minutes have each group present their work during the remaining 20 minutes)

**Conclusion**

- Questions?

- Prayer at tables for ABFs/HABFs

- Evaluations
Learning Styles Characteristics
(From Marlene LeFever’s Learning Styles, 48, 56, 64, 74)
(Student Handout)

**Imaginative Learners:** (48)
- Talk in broad overviews
- Learn by listening and sharing ideas
- Answer questions “Why?” and “Why not?”
- Are sociable, friendly, sensitive
- Are empathetic
- Keenly observe human nature
- Enjoy listening and talking
- Work best in a noisy setting
- Dislike long lectures, memorizing, working alone
- Are idea people
- Are in tune with their feelings
- See facts in relationship to people
- Learn by talking
- Like the feeling of “my gang”
- Get smarter the longer they talk
- Enjoy roleplay, simulation, mime
- Dislike win/lose situations
- Value people above product, friendships above grades
- Love a colorful working situation
- Define themselves in terms of friendship

**Analytic Learners:** (56)
- Like information presented logically and sequentially
- Value facts, figures, and the theoretical
- Debate to logically prove the correct stance or answer
- Value smart and wise people
- Set long-range plans and see their consequences
- Are curious about ideas
- See themselves as intellectual
- Have a high tolerance for theory
- Think in terms of correct and incorrect answers
- Value being right
- Enjoy listening and taking notes
- Like teachers who are information givers
- Prefer a quiet learning situation
- Learn from traditional methodology
- Dislike situations and methods where no one wins
- Define themselves by how smart they are
- Enjoy reading the Bible for concepts and principles
- Need competition
- Are impersonal
- Prefer to work alone

**Common Sense Learners:** (64)
- Move during the learning process
- Value action, product development, “how-to”
- Are realistic and practical
- Deal with logical consequences
- Are goal-oriented
- See skills as knowledge
- Value instruction managers
- Prefer to work alone
- Are impersonal
- Do not enjoy lecture
- Value strategic thinking
- Restrict judgment to concrete things
- Grade success by how well projects work
- Resent being given answers
- Excel in problem solving
- Enjoy “how-to” reading
- See Christianity in terms of action
- Read the Bible to get hands-on information
- Dislike sitting quietly in a learning setting
- Teach and learn through demonstration
- Can be mechanically and computer literate

**Dynamic Learners:** (74)
- Lead
- Have experimental attitudes and behaviors
- Cultivate a well-developed sense of humor
- Demand flexibility
• Take a long time to complete an assignment
• Need options
• Like student directed classrooms
• Are curious and insightful
• Enjoy teachers who facilitate and stimulate creativity
• Are future directed
• Want to do anything that is different or breaks the mold
• Make decisions based on hunches
• Enjoy people
• Communicate with great skill
• Enjoy dramatics, or any art form that allows them to assert individuality
• Are unpredictable and willing to take chances
• Value creativity
• Have strong intuition
• Can see numerous ways of approaching a situation or problem
• Work to make things better or different.
What’s My Learning Style?
(From Marlene LeFever’s Learning Styles, 29)
(Student Handout)

Directions: After reading each sentence, indicate if that statement is:

VM Very much like me
MM Moderately like me
SM Somewhat like me
NM Not at all, or very little like me

After completing the statements, decide what predicts most closely the way you learn. For example, if you have three VMs in Imaginative and none in any of the other categories, you may be an Imaginative Learner. This prediction may confirm what you already know about how you learn best.

Imaginative
_____ I do my best work when I’m with other people.
_____ I like a colorful working environment.
_____ I like to give essay-type answers to questions, rather than specific fill-in-the-blank answers.
_____ I see myself as a friend to my students.
_____ The worst thing that could happen in my class is that students wouldn’t get along well together.
_____ People describe me as a really nice person.
_____ Part of my self identity is wrapped up in the number of friends I have and the strength of those relationships.
_____ Three words that describe me are friendly, sharer, hugger.

Analytic
_____ I do my best work alone, after gathering information I need from books or other teachers.
_____ I like to work at a desk or table.
_____ I like to solve problems by finding the right answers.
_____ I see myself as an information giver to my students.
_____ The worst thing that could happen in my class is that students won’t learn the basics of their faith.
_____ People describe me as a really smart person.
_____ Part of my self identity is wrapped up in how smart others think I am.
_____ Three words that describe me are rational, analytic, smart.
Common Sense

_____ I do my best work alone, putting together information so it will work.
_____ I like to work with my hands as well as my mind.
_____ I like to solve problems by checking out my own ideas.
_____ I see myself as a trainer, helping my students do what needs to be done.
_____ The worst thing that could happen in my class is that students wouldn’t learn to live their faith in practical ways.
_____ People describe me as a hard worker, a results-oriented person.
_____ Part of my self identity is wrapped up in how well my creations work.
_____ Three words that describe me are active, realistic, practical.

Dynamic

_____ I do my best work brainstorming new ideas and trying things not many people would dare to try.
_____ I like playing with new ideas, making intuitive guesses on what works.
_____ I like to solve problems by making guesses or following hunches.
_____ I see myself as a facilitator or idea-stimulator for my students.
_____ The worst thing that could happen in my class is that students wouldn’t take what they learned and make this world a better place.
_____ People describe me as a highly creative person.
_____ Part of my self identity is wrapped up in how many new ideas I have.
_____ Three words that describe me are curious, leader, imaginative.

Based on these predictive lists, I suspect:

- My strongest learning style is: ________________.
- This quadrant may be your “home base,” the place where you are most comfortable teaching and learning.
- The students I am most likely to miss are those who are strongest in these two learning style quadrants: ___________ and ___________.
I thought it would be beneficial after you’ve learned some theory and practical details on learning styles that you have a chance to practice putting together some components of a lesson with those in mind.

So for the next hour I’d like you to work on some components of a lesson, taking into consideration learning styles, on a passage from 1 John. When you’re finished I’d like you to present it to the rest of the group. Normally, when preparing a lesson you’d begin by figuring out the Big Idea, Pedagogical Idea, and Lesson Aims. Since our time is limited, I’ve written those for you so that you can jump right into preparing a lesson following the 8 Steps of the process, with Hear, See, and Do in mind as well.

So look at the material we’ve discussed today, the four steps of the learning process—with right and left mode components—and the questions to ask and answer as you go through the steps. Try to think through creative ways (using auditory, visual, and T/K modalities) to reach the four learning styles.

Each table will be focusing primarily on one of the learning styles and steps in the learning process.

On your tables you’ll find some paper and pens to write down what you’ve come up with. So, work together as a table and we’ll see how far we get. You have 30 minutes to work together and then for the last twenty minutes you’ll do four-minute (max) presentations to the rest of class. So make sure you have one person from your group as a spokesperson.

Let’s get started!
Practicum: 1 John 3:1-10
(Student Handout)

Target Group

The target group for this lesson plan was the students of your ABF/HABF at The Chapel.

Passage and Cross-References

The passage examined in the lesson was 1 John 3:1-10. Cross-references for the passage include John 1:12-13; John 3:16; Acts 20:16-38; Romans 4:12; Romans 7-8; 2 Corinthians 7:1; Hebrews 2:14; Hebrews 9-10; 1 Peter 1:19; 1 John 1:8-10.

Exegetical Idea

True children of the pure and holy God must seek to purify themselves, discontinue sin, and do what is right and loving to others in following the example and essence of their Father.

Pedagogical Idea

As beloved children of God, believers should seek to be like their Father (sin-free and loving to others) by spending regular time with Him.

Lesson Aims

Cognitive Aim

Students will process and understand that it is inconsistent with the Christian’s nature to make a practice of sinning by examining 1 John 3:1-10.

Affective Aim

Students will feel and experience anew the significance and privilege of their positions as children of God by the comparison of human love between parents and children.

Behavioral Aim

Students will wrestle with ways they most naturally and powerfully “be” with their Father and leave excited to spend time with Him by reflecting on how God designed them and writing down specific ways they will commit to “being” times with their Father after they leave class.
Teacher Training III
(Student Handout)

1. My biggest take away from the morning was ……

2. I would repeat the following things next year ……

3. Overall worth my time (one being the lowest, ten being the highest)
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

4. Informative
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

5. Organized
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

6. Appropriate length of time
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

7. Relevance to ministry
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

8. Enjoyable experience
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

9. Sustained my attention throughout
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

10. I wish that next time we would ……
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ABSTRACT

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ANDRAGOGICAL TEACHING IN ADULT BIBLE FELLOWSHIPS AT THE CHAPEL, AKRON, OHIO

Jeffrey Ronald Martell, D.Ed.Min.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011
Faculty Supervisor: Michael S. Wilder, Ph.D.

This project evaluated the effectiveness of andragogical teaching in adult Bible fellowships at The Chapel in Akron, Ohio. The project found that andragogical teaching was more effective than pedagogical teaching in students learning factual content on Ephesians. Both andragogical teaching and pedagogical teaching had no effect, or even a negative effect, on the students’ intentionality in applying the main ideas of the Ephesians passages to their lives during the project. Students that learned under andragogical teaching felt more confident that it was an effective methodology than students who learned under pedagogical teaching. Finally, students who learned under andragogical teaching felt that the discussions, in which they were involved as part of the learning process, were the most memorable part of the lesson, while students who learned under pedagogical teaching had much more variety in which part of the lessons was most memorable to them.
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