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ABSTRACT

The mass migrations following the Second World War and the end of colonialism has resulted in many parts of the Western World being described as multi-Faith and multi-cultural. England is no exception, and the Church of England faces the challenge as to how she relates to this pluralist society.

The focus of this thesis is on the training and educational needs of clergy who today find themselves ministering in a multi-Faith and multi-cultural context. The Diocese of Chelmsford, which is geographically large and socially and religiously diverse, is taken as a case study.

The research is conducted in three areas:

a) An examination of the national policy documents on the selection and training of priests since 1987, with particular reference to ACCM (Advisory Council for the Church’s Ministry) Paper No. 22 and subsequent Advisory Board for Ministry Papers. The purpose of the analysis is to see if there is a national, agreed policy on clergy training and if so, does it allow for training for ministry in multi-Faith areas.

b) Selected material from the theological Colleges and Courses, together with interviews with past students, to find out what the training institutions are currently offering.
c) The analysis of data from 208 (83%) respondents to a questionnaire sent to 250 clergy in the Diocese of Chelmsford. The aim of this questionnaire is to discover the perceived training needs of the clergy. The results of this research show great diversity and a consequent lack of clarity in the purpose of clergy training, the role of the priest and the nature of the Church. The question therefore remains; can a Church as diverse as the Church of England have one model of training, for one model of priest for one model of Church?
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WHAT ARE THE TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR
CHURCH OF ENGLAND CLERGY MINISTERING IN A MULTI-FAITH
SOCIETY?
With particular reference to the Diocese of Chelmsford

Introduction

Background to the research question
My interest in education for Christians who live in a multi-faith society began in 1980 when I went to live in the West London parish of Heston, which is close to the multi-cultural and multi-Faith town of Southall in Middlesex. As a Christian I was theologically challenged by the presence of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs who were moving into the neighbourhood and gradually replacing the white population. I wanted to know two things; first what were the beliefs and practices of these people and secondly, what does the Christian Faith have to teach about its relationship with other Faith traditions?

This questioning led me to follow a degree course in Religious Studies at the West London Institute of Higher Education between 1986 and 1989, and at the same time to take advantage of every opportunity within the Church to learn more about Christianity in the context of religious pluralism. I then spent a year working with the Roman Catholic Westminster Interfaith Programme in Southall, which gave me the opportunity for experiential dialogue and encounter with people of other Faiths. In 1991 I registered with King's College London to do a post-graduate degree in Theology and Education, focusing on lay education for living in a multi-Faith society. In 1994 I took up my present post as Inter-Faith Adviser for the Diocese of Chelmsford.
Over the past five and a half years, as Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser, I have had considerable contact with both the parochial clergy and also those working in chaplaincies and I have become increasingly aware of the need for an appropriate training and education for clergy ministering in multi-Faith communities. As a result, the focus of my research changed from lay education to clergy training and education. Also, because of a greater emphasis in the research upon education rather than theology, I transferred from King's College London to St Mary's College, University of Surrey.

The aim of this research is to assess the training and educational needs of Church of England clergy ministering in a multi-Faith and multi-cultural society.

**Related Research**

It has been difficult to find any systematic research that has been conducted in this area with the exception of the following:

1. A research project conducted by the University of Warwick on *Theological Education for a Multi-Faith Britain*. The Warwick research programme was conducted through questionnaires and follow-up interviews across all institutions used for the training of Church of England ordinands. It collected data about the current extent and nature of both pre-Ordination Training and Continuing Ministerial Education/Post-ordination Training. The findings are yet to be published.

2. A search of the 'RESRELCH' database of the North of England Institute for Christian Education has revealed two pieces of work which are relevant to

---

1A one year (1996-1997) research project of the University of Warwick supported by the Leverhulme Trust and directed by Prof. James A Beckford with Prof. Robert Jackson as Asst. Director and Dr Sophie Gilliat as Research Fellow.
this research. The first was a survey of a small sample of training establishments (McIntyre, 1994). The second is an empirical study within the Diocese of Chelmsford conducted by David Lankshear with the University of Wales. Lankshear looked at the influence of clergy age, qualifications and experience on local church life. While not dealing directly with multi-Faith issues, it is of interest because he is looking specifically at clergy within the Diocese of Chelmsford as does this research.

A survey carried out by the University of Hertfordshire on behalf of the Diocese of St Albans. The results indicated that 57% of the respondents had "confidence in their theological knowledge, training and communication skills" (Diocese of St Albans, 1998). This figure suggests that almost half of the clergy did not have such confidence. I have been unsuccessful in acquiring more detailed information of this study.

The projects mentioned above, which look at clergy training, have gathered their data from the theological colleges and courses. While this research will also make use of such information, it will primarily be based upon the needs as perceived by the clergy themselves. In other words, the data will be collected from the clergy working in the field.

Outline of research
I have decided to focus this research on the Church of England because it is the Church of which I am a member and therefore with which I am most familiar. It is also interesting because of its unique status in England as being 'established in law, firmly identified with the state, the most representative religious body in the

---

2 Under the directorship of Revd Professor J Astley, the North of England Institute for Christian Education has compiled a database of all known research in Britain in the area of Christian and Religious Education for both children and adults including clergy training.

3 Despite telephone conversations with the Diocesan office and a follow-up letter dated 28 June 1998 I have been able to obtain any further information.
country and integral to the history and culture of the English people (Beckford and Gilliat, 1996, p 5). As the national church it 'aims to minister to every person in the land, without distinction of creed or ethnicity' (Beckford and Gilliat, 1996, p 4). Such a status brings both privilege and responsibility. It 'acts as "gatekeeper" and curator of some of England's major institutions. It has the capacity to grant or to deny access to resources, public recognition and, indirectly, public respect' (Beckford and Gilliat, 1996, p 5).

Within the Church of England the research will focus on clergy in the Diocese of Chelmsford for three reasons. First, as Diocesan Inter-faith Adviser I have first hand experience of the situation in that diocese; secondly I have access to key people within the ministry training and education departments, and thirdly, the collection and analysis of data within one diocese is more manageable than working across several dioceses.

The research has been divided into three parts:

Part One, the Context; the Mission and Ministry of the Church of England in the Diocese of Chelmsford, sets the scene. Chapter 1 describes the social context in terms of religious and cultural diversity, focussing particularly upon England and Essex. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the ongoing Theology of Religions debate which is attempting to articulate the relationship of Christianity to other Faith traditions within the context of the world Church and Chapter 3 examines how the Church of England is contributing to this debate. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the Diocese of Chelmsford's response to religious diversity, which led to the appointment of an Inter-Faith Adviser.

Having set the framework for the research in Part One, Part Two-The Clergy, looks at training policies and implementation.
Chapter 5 discusses the national policy documents of the Church of England's Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry and its successor body, the Advisory Board for Ministry. Chapters 6 examines the initial responses of Theological Colleges and Courses to the national policy documents. In Chapter 7, I draw upon curriculum material from the training institutions and interviews with deacons, in order to discover more recent training provision. Where I quote from Church of England policy documents, I follow the pattern of those documents, by not giving the identity of the particular institution. Where I use published curriculum material I identify the training institution. Whenever I quote from an interview with an individual I use italics.

Chapter 8 then looks at Post Ordination Training/Continuing Ministerial Education with particular reference to the Diocese of Chelmsford.

Part Three provides a statistical analysis of initial and continuing education within the Diocese of Chelmsford. Chapter 9 describes the methodology that was used for gathering the data and the analysis is given in Chapter 10. From the 208 respondents, a selected number of follow-up interviews were conducted in order to examine some of the issues in greater depth. Two of these interviews are given in appendix 10.1. Significant data and tables are given within the text, with supplementary tables provided as appendices.

Terminology

The term 'inter-faith' is used in various ways in this research depending upon the context of the discussion. There has been some debate over this term, which is sometimes used interchangeably with 'multi-faith' and 'inter-religious' (Weller, 1997, p 67). In general, however, 'multi-faith' describes a situation where several different religious traditions co-exist or join together for a common
example, a civic service. 'Inter-religious' is sometimes used in preference to 'inter-faith' because the concept of religion is perceived to be wider than faith and more inclusive of non-theistic religions.

'Inter-faith' (hyphenated) implies the existence of a relationship between the Faiths, or people of different Faiths, which is commonly expressed through inter-Faith dialogue. When 'interfaith' appears as a single word it can be perceived as a single identity leading towards syncretism.

In the general text of this research I shall use the term 'inter-Faith'. However, when quoting or referring to specific organisations or individual's posts, I may use the term Inter Faith, Inter-Faith or inter-Faith depending upon how used by that particular organisation or individual. When referring to Faith or Faiths as a religious tradition rather than a personal faith I shall use a capital F.

Throughout the text reference is made to 'other Faiths'. This is another concept which can be seen as contentious and can imply that all Faiths and traditions 'other' than Christianity are measured over against Christianity, which is the norm (Beckford and Gilliat, 1996, p 4). That is not my intention here, but the term has been used in preference to the term 'non-Christian' religions which also has negative connotations.

Finally, I use both a lower case and upper case 'c' for Church, depending upon the context. I use lower case, church, when speaking about local, or parish churches, and upper case, Church, when referring to the Church of England or the world or universal Church.
# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>Advisory Board for Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCM</td>
<td>Advisory Council for the Church’s Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUPA</td>
<td>Archbishop of Canturbury’s Commission on Urban Priority Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>British Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMU</td>
<td>Board of Mission and Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCBI</td>
<td>Council of Churches in Britain and Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>Continuing Ministerial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPF</td>
<td>Council for Relations with People of Other Faiths (CCBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>Commission for Theological Education (ACCM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUF</td>
<td>Church Urban Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWME</td>
<td>Council for World Mission and Evangelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFI</td>
<td>Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies (Sub-unit of the WCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GME</td>
<td>General Ministerial Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOE</td>
<td>General Ordination Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICME</td>
<td>Initial Continuing Ministerial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFCG</td>
<td>Inter-Faith Consultative Group (Board of Mission of Archbishop’s Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNSM</td>
<td>Local Non-Stipendiary Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAG</td>
<td>Ministry Education Advisory Group (Chelmsford Diocese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIFCON</td>
<td>Network for Inter-Faith Concerns (ACC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Non-Stipendiary Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Parochial Church Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>Post Ordination Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPA  Urban Priority Area
WCC  World Council of Churches
PART 1 THE CONTEXT
The Mission and Ministry of the Church of England in the Diocese of Chelmsford

Chapter 1 The Social Context

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to place this research into its social context. The first part will give a brief account of the changes in ethnicity and religious affiliation across Britain, particularly since the Second World War. I shall then look at the Church of England with special reference to its role as the national Church with statutory powers, privileges and pastoral responsibility (Davie, 1994, pp 141-149). Following this I shall describe the social and geographical context of the Diocese of Chelmsford, which is part of the Church of England, and forms the focus of the research. Brief mention will be made of the theological diversity found among the clergy within the Diocese but this topic is covered more fully in Part Three.

Britain as a multi-Faith and multi-cultural society

The Jewish community can be traced back to the 11th Century, with a further influx of Jewish immigrants fleeing the Russian pogroms at the turn of this century. During the 18th Century small numbers of Hindus and Muslims arrived as slaves, but it was not until after the Second World War that people of other Faith communities began to arrive in numbers large enough to make their presence felt by the host community.
The religious landscape in Britain has changed considerably since the Second World War. This was due to immigration policies which a) reflected the need for an increased labour force in the years following the War and b) allowed people into Britain, either to join family members who were already here, or who were fleeing political and economic instability overseas (Davie, 1994, p 25). Other factors included the settlement in Britain of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs following their demobilisation from the armed forces and the ongoing process of decolonisation which frequently caused political and economic instability in the homeland, resulting in migration to Britain and other parts of Europe. The partition of India, for example, resulted in Muslims, Sikhs and Hindus leaving their homeland, some of whom came to Britain. Later, political unrest in Uganda under the regime of Idi Amin in the 1960s resulted in large numbers of Ugandan Asians settling in Britain and America. More recently refugees fleeing religious and political persecution have arrived from Iran, Nigeria and Bosnia. Others have arrived from the war torn area of Somalia and other parts of East Africa.

Reliable statistics for religious affiliation in Britain, with the exception of Northern Ireland, are not currently available. This is primarily because there has been no official Census dealing with religion since the 1851 Census of Public Worship. In the absence of such statistics, data on ethnicity is sometimes used as an indication of religious affiliation, but this method is seriously flawed on the grounds that ethnicity and religion are not necessarily coterminous.

According to the publication *Religions in the UK: a Multi-Faith Directory* (Weller, 1997, p 32) figures quoted in certain official publications are widely used. Despite
having no official census figures and the problems of gathering reliable data, two publications are frequently referred to; *Britain 1997* (Central Office of Statistics, 1997) and the *UK Christian Handbook* (Christian Research Association, 1997). Both of these publications give broadly similar statistics:

### Table 1 Religious Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Britain 1997</th>
<th>UK Christian Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>1,000,000-1,500,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhs</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>no figure</td>
<td>38,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the local level, data extracted from the religious affiliation of school children are sometimes used as a guide to the local religious map, but this is also an unreliable method of computation since it leaves out a large proportion of the population who have no school age children. Another difficulty with religious statistics is the need to differentiate between *active* (worshipping) members and *community* (nominal) members. Faith communities, for example, when asked to provide statistics, will normally give numbers for community or nominal members rather than active worshippers. This can give a false impression of the numbers who regularly attend a form of worship. On the other hand, many Hindus worship regularly at home as do the majority of Muslim women.
It can be seen from the statistics shown in Table 1 that people of other Faiths are still very much in the minority in Britain. Furthermore, "the presence of pluralism in Britain should not be exaggerated; it is an urban phenomenon and differs from region to region" (Davie, 1994, p 25). "There remain large tracts of Britain - even England - where ethnic or religious pluralism (in the most obvious understanding of the term) is virtually unknown" (Davie, 1994, p 66). Religious and cultural pluralism is an urban phenomenon but I would suggest that it is also becoming a suburban one in some parts of the country. (see page 13) However, as Davie points out, large parts of rural Britain are unaffected by this plurality and people who live in these areas would not perceive Britain to be a multi-cultural or multi-religious society.

**The Church of England**

Throughout the country, whether a multi-cultural or mono-cultural area, the Church of England, through the parochial system, has the potential to reach and minister to "...every person in the land, without distinction of creed or ethnicity" (Beckford & Gilliat, 1996, p 4) and it maintains "a unique foothold in English society; providing manpower as well as plant in every part of the country, North as well as South, urban or rural, thriving or striving" (Davie, 1994, p 55). Its network of 13,000 parishes covers the whole of England, the Isle of Man, the Channel Islands, the Scilly Isles and a small part of Wales.

Although the Church has maintained its foothold in society through the parochial system across the country, statistics indicate that the Church membership and attendance has declined over the past few decades. For example, there was a
numerical decline in infant baptisms from 67% (670 per thousand births) in 1950 to 27.5% in 1990 (Davie, 1994, p 52). The Statistics Unit of the Church of England claims that "25 million people living in England today (about half the population) have been baptised into the Church of England"(GS Misc. 513, Feb. 1998). But the Unit gives a figure for infant baptism in 1996 as being less than 25% of all babies. These figures suggest that whereas previous generations considered infant baptism to be important, that is not the case today. According to Davie, confirmations also fell by over 50% between 1960 and 1982 (Davie, 1994, p 52).

Davie makes the point that "Trends which seemed, at first, peculiar to the religious sector, may turn out to be common to other areas of society" (Davie, 1994, p 18). Davie is referring to the observation, which she explores in depth elsewhere, (Davie, 1990, pp 456-69) that religious believing is becoming detached from religious belonging; a trend that is symptomatic of the post-modern cult of individualism. This trend is particularly manifest in the 'pick and mix' variety of religions where individuals try out several types of religious expression, for example the Brahma Kumaris or the Satya Sai Baba group, both of which have Hindu roots. The ability to 'opt in' and 'opt out' appeals to younger people who prefer a flexibility that is more compatible with today's society.

If the statistics on baptisms and confirmations were the sole indicator of the Church's influence in society the picture would be dismal. But because of the Church of England's statutory powers, it has access to communities at all levels, in many subtle ways. For example;
...it is still relatively rare for an English person to die without some form of religious ceremony. At the end of their lives, if not before, the Church of England will take responsibility for those who are not looked after by anyone else, a demanding, difficult and time-consuming ministry. 'Contracting in' may well be edging into the organization of baptisms; the same phenomenon has not occurred up to now in the administration of funerals. (Davie, 1994, p 56)

This special privilege, being the prerogative of a state church, brings with it both power and responsibility. This has been drawn out by Beckford and Gilliat (1996) particularly in relation to chaplaincy work in prisons, health care organisations and in what they term civic religion.

'Chaplaincy', in this context, involves the provision of religious, pastoral and spiritual care to the staff and inmates of prisons as well as to the staff and patients in health care organisations such as hospitals and community care schemes. 'Civic religion' refers to the occasions on which members of the public participate in activities intended to give religious meaning to the life of local communities in the form of, for example, annual services for the emergency services or the local Council, religious services to commemorate the victims of local or national disasters, and the decoration of public places at times of religious festivals. (Beckford and Gilliat, 1996, p 5)

These activities are primarily funded from the public purse. While ministry in this context carries certain power and responsibility, it also demands an element of accountability on the part of the Church in relation to the public which it is expected to serve. "This combination of characteristics makes chaplaincy and civic religion central to an understanding of the Church's capacity to enable members of other Faiths to participate in public life" (Beckford and Gilliat, 1996, p 5).

Apart from the growing trend where a Church of England chaplain finds him or herself ministering to a person of another Faith in a hospital or prison situation, there are now many instances in civic religion where the incoming Mayor will require the chaplain, who in the past has been a Church of England chaplain, to arrange and
conduct services in a multi-Faith context, so reflecting the local community. On the other hand, the Mayor may be a person of another Faith with a chaplain from his or her own Faith community. In this case, the service could take place in a Sikh Gurdwara or a Hindu Temple to which people of all Faiths, including Christians, may be invited to attend.¹

Another important dimension of national life in which the Church of England has influence is in the field of education. In 1995 there were 4,614 primary and 204 secondary Church of England schools serving 731,000 primary and 144,000 secondary pupils. Approximately 1,000 of the 1,300 independent preparatory and secondary schools registered with the Independent Schools Information Service have a Church of England ethos (GS Misc. 513, 1998). In many inner city areas the pupils in these schools are from a variety of Faith backgrounds and parents frequently choose a Church school because of its particular ethos.

The constitution of every Standing Advisory Committee on Religious Education (SACRE), a Local Authority body established in Law (1988 Education Act) to monitor Religious Education in schools, allows for a majority of Church of England representatives on the committee compared with the number of other denominational, or Faith, representatives. This imbalance of representation puts the Church of England into a position of power over the other representatives and with power comes responsibility.

Church of England chaplains have traditionally served in further and higher

¹In June 1991 the Annual Civic Service for the incoming Sikh Mayor of the London Borough
educational institutions. However, because of the secular and multi-Faith dimension of many colleges of further and higher education, there is a discernible move away from Christian chaplaincy towards a more multi-Faith approach to chaplaincy.\textsuperscript{2} This is due to an increase in the numbers of students from other Faith backgrounds.

Despite the fact that Church of England statistics for membership and attendance show a decline, its influence through chaplaincies, education and civic events remains and therefore its potential for ministry, at all levels of society, is still considerable.

The Church of England is also the mother church of the Anglican Communion and events happening world-wide, particularly in relation to religious conflict, impinge upon attitudes within the Church in this country.

The Anglican Communion covers 160 countries. Some of these countries are Islamic; either because Islam is the majority religion, for example Indonesia, or because it is an Islamic State, for example Pakistan. If minority Christian communities living in Muslim countries are denied full religious freedom, this can result in a resentment towards Muslims in particular, and Islam in general. During the 1998 Lambeth Conference bishops from Northern Nigeria spoke of the persecution of Christian minorities at the hands of Muslims, and bishops from Pakistan spoke of the suffering caused to Christians as a result of the enforcement of

\textsuperscript{2} Newham College for Further Education, for example, in response to growing tensions, appointed a Campus Liaison Officer, who happens to be a Muslim, rather than a Christian Chaplain. While it is not the Officer's responsibility to conduct religious services, he does perform many of the traditional functions of a Chaplain.
the Islamic law of that country. These stories fuel resentment in this country towards Islam and add to the growing phenomenon of Islamophobia.

Islamophobia is dread or hatred of Islam and of Muslims. It has existed in western countries and cultures for several centuries but in the last twenty years has become more explicit, more extreme and more dangerous. It is an ingredient of all sections of the media, and is prevalent in all sections of society. (Runnymede Trust, 1997 p 7)

The London Borough of Waltham Forest has the highest number of Pakistani residents (6.3%) in London, the majority of whom are Muslim and a minority are Christian (London Borough of Waltham Forest, 1997). The tensions experienced in Pakistan between Muslims and Christians are reflected in community relations in Waltham Forest, which is part of the Diocese of Chelmsford.

The Diocese of Chelmsford

The Diocese of Chelmsford forms part of the national Church of England. It is therefore influenced by national Church policy and can in turn influence the national Church.

The Diocese, which was founded in 1914, is the second largest of the 44 Church of England dioceses in terms of population (2,640,000) after London (3,352,000) (Church of England Year Book, 1998). It covers an area of 1,531 square miles including the county of Essex, five East London Boroughs, a few parishes in Ely, St Edmundsbury and Ipswich and three parishes in south Cambridgeshire, making a total of 489 parishes with 609 churches divided into 27 deaneries.
The ordained clergy establishment figure in December 1997 was 503, which included 97 non-stipendiary clergy. These clergy are supported in their ministry by 230 Licensed Lay Readers who take responsibility for forms of ministry including preaching and teaching but do not have a sacerdotal role. Five clergy serve the Cathedral Chapter, 30 serve as hospital chaplains, four as hospice chaplains, eleven as industrial chaplains and a further fourteen as chaplains with the Sea Cadet and Air Training Corps. The majority of the chaplains also act as parish priests. It is also common for Anglican clergy to serve as chaplain to the Local Authority Mayor for a period of one year.

The Diocese is also served by administrative staff and a Diocesan Resource Team which works from the Diocesan offices at Chelmsford. The Resource Team comprises officers and advisers specialising in such areas as Ministry Development, Clergy and Lay Training and Education, Children and Youth Work, International and Inter-Faith Relations.

Under the overall authority of the Diocesan Bishop, the Diocese is further subdivided into the three Episcopal areas of Bradwell, Colchester and Barking. (see map on page 13) The Episcopal area of Bradwell incorporates part of the north side of the Thames corridor which is largely industrial, the seaport of Tilbury and the seaside towns of Southend and Canvey Island. It also includes the county and cathedral town of Chelmsford. The eastern coastline of the Episcopal area is largely marshland and is sparsely populated.
The Episcopal area of Colchester to the north of the Diocese is mainly rural but it also includes the University of Essex, Stansted Airport and Harwich seaport.

The Episcopal area of Barking covers the five east London boroughs of Newham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Barking and Havering plus the deaneries of Epping Forest, Ongar and Harlow. The three London boroughs of Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest are urban areas with a high population density and varying degrees of deprivation. According to measures of deprivation used by the Department of Environment's Index of Local Conditions, Newham is rated as "the most deprived of all Local Authorities in England in terms of degree (overall average) deprivation" (Smith, 1995, p 2). All other deaneries in the Barking area are a mix of urban, suburban and rural communities. This Episcopal area also includes parts of London Docklands and the City Airport.

East London has traditionally provided a home for immigrant groups. In the early part of this century many Ashkenazi Jews, fleeing from Russian persecution at the turn of the century, and Nazi persecution in the 1930s and 40s, settled in what is now Tower Hamlets and Newham. The Jewish community has gradually moved further out of inner London into suburbia and other parts of Essex. The majority have settled in the Gants Hill area of Redbridge where they are served by 14 synagogues. Smaller numbers can be found in Chelmsford and Colchester, while the Southend area has 11 synagogues (Weller, 1997).

As the Jewish community left urban East London they were replaced by immigrants from the Indian sub-continent. In the 1950s political and economic refugees arrived
from Bangladesh and Pakistan. These people, who were mainly Muslim from rural areas, have not moved on as did their Jewish predecessors. The Indians, who were largely Sikhs and Hindus, came to England from East Africa during the 1960s as a result of persecution by the then Head of State, Idi Amin. They were business people and professionals, and being better educated, have integrated more successfully into British society than those from Bangladesh and Pakistan. Many from this group, seeking a better standard of living, have gradually moved out of East London into suburban and rural parts of Essex.

The statistics taken from *Religions in the UK Directory* for religious places of worship shown in Table 2 give an indication of the spread of communities.

**Table 2**

Places of worship for other Faith communities in the Diocese of Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hindus</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Sikhs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is noteworthy that while Muslims have remained in large numbers in the more inner London Boroughs of Newham and Waltham Forest, the Sikhs have as many gurdwaras in Redbridge as in Newham, and even more in Barking; both of these boroughs being further out of London and suburban in character.

These figures should be taken as indicative of, rather than accurately recording, the actual situation. It is very difficult to get an accurate figure for Faith communities which are not yet settled and who frequently change their places of worship. Furthermore, where no figure is given, that does not necessarily mean that there is no place of worship in the area. This is because collection of this type of data is
The researchers rely upon responses to questionnaires, the goodwill of local inter-Faith groups, inter-Faith practitioners and volunteers. The co-ordinator of the steering group collecting data for the Atlas of Faiths in East London reported:

progress is slow. 35% of questionnaires are in. We are hoping for 50% plus by Xmas. And a higher rate with contact information verified. There are 371 groups identified. A team of American students are doing many of the remaining interviews in person or by phone. Sagheer is working round the mosques...the contacting is hard work...lack of trust...and fragmentation...buildings registered or not...security fears...information overload...it takes two hours per group. (minutes of Atlas steering group meeting, 23 October 1998)

The Diocese of Chelmsford is geographically and socially diverse and as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the clergy within the Diocese, by self-definition, are from a variety of different church traditions. (see pp 189-195). There is a strong Evangelical wing, containing within itself diversity. For example, the extreme conservative Evangelicals would adopt an almost literalist view of scripture, while the more open liberal Evangelicals would be more open to modern biblical scholarship. Then there are the high Anglo-Catholics or Traditionalists who would place more emphasis upon the sacraments than the Word. In the middle is a large group, perhaps the majority, who see themselves as mainstream Anglicans claiming to follow reason, tradition and Scripture in working out their theological and doctrinal positions. The question of theology, and particularly the theology of religions will be further explored in chapters 2 and 3. There is further diversity in styles of worship and liturgy and divisions along theological lines over issues of women priests and homosexual clergy. The following extract, which was taken from a bishop’s letter in a diocesan news-sheet in 1992, could easily describe the Diocese of Chelmsford:
We come across every rite authorised for use in the Church of England, and occasionally liturgies which seem to have been borrowed from other sources or simply originated in the mind of the incumbent; we move from places wreathed in incense to those in which the unwary production of a stole causes a sharp intake of breath; we lead services in which the congregational response barely amounts to a background murmur, and those in which there are so many participants it is difficult to find something to do; we change musical key from decorous Anglican chant to deafening enthusiastic chorus; we bellow to a handful of 20 scattered throughout a minicathedral, and we whisper through technological devices concealed in our garments to sardine-packed hundreds; we find ourselves in totally impracticable medieval buildings of great beauty, and in modern liturgically-efficient warehouses; we sing from more hymn books and hear the Bible read from more translations than Wesley or Wycliffe ever dreamed of; at the Peace we may give the congregation the most imperceptible half-smile before moving swiftly to the safety of the sanctuary, or we may be expected to greet every member of the congregation like a long-lost relative. (quoted in Davie, 1994, p 54)

Conclusion

The foregoing has been an attempt to put this research into its context. The Church of England, with particular reference to its status as the national Church, was located within the general picture of multi-Faith and multi-cultural Britain. Within the Church of England, the Diocese of Chelmsford was located, drawing attention to its geographical, social and religious diversity and the theological and liturgical diversity found among the clergy and churches of the Diocese. Given this religious and cultural diversity in society outside the Church and theological diversity within, it is evident that the Church faces a challenge when called to proclaim the Gospel. In the following chapter I shall look at how, at various levels, the Church has responded to this theological challenge through the theology of religions debate.
Chapter 2 The Theology of Religions Debate - an overview

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to examine the theology of the relationship between Christianity and other Faiths. This is particularly important in relation to mission and how Christians should witness to people of other Faiths. This will be a general overview of the international, ecumenical debate looking particularly at the three paradigms of exclusivism, inclusivism and pluralism (Race, 1983) followed by comment on the relationship between the particular Jesus Christ event and Christ's universal significance (the Christological question). Mention will also be made of alternatives to these paradigms which are being suggested by different theologians, for example trinitarian universalism which is an attempt to hold together the tension between the particular Christ event and God's universal will through the use of trinitarian analogy and language.

The Theology of Religions Debate - the background

The central issue for most people in relation to people of other Faiths is that of salvation. This is of course also central to the theology of mission. Will the Hindu or Sikh person be saved if he or she does not follow Jesus Christ? If the conclusion is in the negative, that he or she will be denied eternal life, then surely the Christian has a duty to attempt to bring that person to Christ. However, from first hand experience of living and working with people of different Faiths many Christians observe that there are common values shared across the Faiths and that love of God or the Ultimate is not the prerogative of Christians only.
It is this issue of salvation which is at the core of the theology of religions debate. It is not a theology which studies the phenomenon of religion through an analysis of such concepts as faith, belief, doctrines and religious experience: nor is it a comparative study of different religious traditions. Rather it is an attempt to understand how the different religious traditions relate to each other and in this present context I am examining the relationship of the major world Faiths to the Christian truth claims. In other words, I shall be looking at how the major world Faiths relate to Christianity; I shall be looking at them from a Christian perspective. The theologians I will be referring to in this discussion have dealt with other religious traditions as a unity. In other words, they refer to 'other Faiths' as a corporate identity with no attempt to distinguish between a particular relationship between, say Christianity and Hinduism or Christianity and Islam. However, Henry Dupuis has recently suggested that

to be concrete, should not the theology of religions address itself individually to each of the religious traditions in particular? ... that what is required is a distinct Christian theology of Islam, of Hinduism, and so on. (Dupuis, 1997, p 8)

Dupuis has a valid point here because each religious tradition has its own uniqueness and therefore should have its own particular relationship to the Christian tradition. It would then follow that each tradition would have its own relationship with others; that Islam, for example would have a theology for Christianity, for Hinduism, for Sikhism and for Buddhism.

Some Christian theologians have followed this line. For example, J N Farquhar (Farquhar 1913), Wesley Ariarajah (Ariarajah 1991) and Diana Eck (Eck 1993) have looked at the relationship between Christianity and Hinduism and Kenneth Cragg
(Cragg 1986), and Michael Nazir Ali (Nazir Ali 1987) have written on the relationship between Christianity and Islam. But most of the theologians (cf. Knitter 1985, D'Costa 1990, Hick 1977) who are identified with the current theology of religions debate refer simply to 'non-Christians' or 'other Faiths'.

The impetus for the study of the theology of religions in this century came from a need for the Church to rethink and redefine its mission strategy following the experiences of overseas missionaries. Kenneth Cracknell refers to a "sea-change in attitudes towards 'non-Christian religions" as far back as 1910 with the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh (Cracknell 1995, p 1). The aims of the conference were "to consider missionary problems in relation to the non-Christian world" (Cracknell 1995, p 182). Following an analysis of questionnaires received from overseas missionaries, the commissioners wrote of the urgent need for the study of religion in theological education:

Many of our correspondents speak feelingly of the incalculable harm which has been done in the past by the want of this; of the harm which has been done even by faithful and devoted men who, in this respect, were imperfectly equipped. (Cracknell 1995, pp 258-259 quoting from The Missionary Message in Relation to Non-Christian Religions, WMC vol. IV p 269)

It was concluded by the commissioners of the 1910 conference that "provision should be made for thorough teaching in Comparative Religion in all our colleges and training institutes" (Cracknell, 1995, p 259). Cracknell points out that this was intended to apply to all students for Christian ministry, whether they were missionary candidates or not (Cracknell, 1995, p 259).
Another key date in the evolving theology of religions debate was 1938 with the publication of Hendrick Kraemer's *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*. Kraemer wrote this book in preparation for the World Missionary Conference on the eve of the Second World War. He wrote with a sense of urgency:

The tempest of contemporary history is forcing back the Christian Church to fundamentals, to such a radically religious conception of life as is revealed to us in the Bible. We are exploring again the simple but revolutionary meaning of faith. The Christian Church is awakening to its responsibility to give clear and unequivocal answers to the questions that arise out of the thunder of events. (Kraemer, 1938, p 1)

Kraemer's 'non-Christian' world included the worlds of communism, relativism, materialism, false absolutism, secularism, nationalism and to a certain extent, following Barth's thinking, religion itself. (Barth, 1956) He claimed that while the world was in crisis, so also was the Church "on account of the abiding tension between its essential nature and its empirical condition" because "according to its essential nature it is not one of the many religious and moral institutions that exist in the world. It is a divine-human society"(Kraemer, 1938, p 25).

According to Ariarajah, Kraemer's influence is still felt today, particularly among those who would hold to the unique revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The World Council of Churches (WCC) has "tried to preserve and protect the 'uniqueness', 'finality' or 'decisiveness' of Christ"(Ariarajah, 1991, p 208). Even though there have been efforts to encourage dialogue and reduce triumphalistic language, the WCC constituency has made no major attempt to re-examine its Christological assumptions.
As long as its Christological assumptions have not been tested against the challenge of religious plurality and the emerging consensus about the need for a theology of religious pluralism, the Council cannot hope to have a dynamic understanding of mission and evangelism that will carry any conviction in the hearts and minds of the churches which live and witness in religiously pluralistic societies. (Ariarajah, 1991 p 208)

The other arena of debate on the religions has been within the Roman Catholic church. The documents of Vatican II (1962-1965) crystallised much of the thinking which had been taking place over the previous two decades. Of particular relevance was *Nostra aetate* (NA) which stressed "...the importance of interreligious dialogue. At the same time it recalled that the Church is in duty bound to proclaim without fail Christ, the Way, the Truth and the Life, in whom all people find their fulfilment" (Vatican City, 1991, p 210).

The Catholic Church rejects nothing of what is true and holy in these religions. She has a high regard for the manner of life and conduct, the precepts and doctrines which, although differing in many ways from her own teaching, nevertheless often reflect a ray of that truth which enlightens all people. Yet she proclaims, and is in duty bound to proclaim without fail, Christ who is the way, the truth and the life. *(Nostra Aetate, Rome 1965)*

In 1991, following five years of preparation, the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue and the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, published *Dialogue and Proclamation*. This document, which was recommended to the churches for reflection and study, looked particularly at the relationship between "Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" and stressed that the two were not incompatible.

As mentioned on page 16, the theology of religions debate is essentially a debate about who will be 'saved' and who will not. Alan Race, in 1983 in his book *Christians and Religious Pluralism*, first used the terms exclusivism, inclusivism and
pluralism in relation to different Christian attitudes towards people of different
Faiths. These three labels, or paradigms will be explored in greater depth in the
following pages. They have since been adopted by many theologians as a useful tool
for academic debate (Knitter 1985, D'Costa 1990, Ogden 1992). However, they are
no more than tools, or theories for debate, because in reality people are complex and
do not fit comfortably into a label or a stereotype. There is much overlap between,
and movement within, paradigms and whilst a particular theologian may advocate a
particular approach, most would be reluctant to be so labelled or too strongly
identified with a particular paradigm. For example, in my discussions with Schubert
Ogden, a liberal theologian (Dallas, April 1991 and 1992) he said that he would not
call himself a pluralist and certainly does not consider that he has 'crossed the
Rubicon' even though he is uncomfortable with the traditional view of the
Incarnation and claims that there may be many true religions. From his writing he
presents himself as a pluralist but he refused to join John Hick and other authors in
The Myth of God Incarnate (Hick 1977) because he did not want to identify himself
with them as a pluralist who had 'crossed the Rubicon'.

Other theologians have used different paradigms in their discussions. For example,
Frank Whaling refers to Exclusivism, Discontinuity, Secularisation, Fulfilment,
Universalisation, Dialogue and Relativism (Whaling 1986). Paul Knitter relates
attitudes to the confessional model, e.g. the Conservative Evangelical Model,
Mainline Protestant Model, the Catholic Model and the Theocentric Model (Knitter
1985).

---

3 the term 'crossed the Rubicon' is used in this context to describe a theologian who is so unorthodox
in his or her theology that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to ever return to the more
traditional, orthodox stance.
It will not be my intention to give a comprehensive overview of the on-going debate. This has been done elsewhere (Knitter 1985, Dupuis 1997). I will briefly comment on the three main paradigms, because they are the ones mostly referred to.

**Exclusivism**

In theory Christians who hold to the exclusivist paradigm believe that there is only one path to salvation and that is through Jesus Christ. Those who adopt this view are generally, but not always, Evangelicals. In its extreme form Exclusivists will claim that only those Christians who profess to be born again in the Spirit, or baptised in the Spirit, will be saved, so excluding even other practising Christians. Those who hold this view would see other Faiths as misguided, sinful, even the work of the devil. But this is an extreme form and a minority view. There are many Christians to be found in all traditions who hold an implicit exclusivist view. This group would be hesitant to condemn others to hell for not knowing Jesus Christ, but would still maintain, at the end of the day, that salvation is through Christ alone; that "...no-one comes to the Father, but by me" (John 14:6).

In the minds of some Christians, Exclusivism was reinforced with the Roman Catholic dogma of 'no salvation outside the Church'. However, the extreme conservative attitude held by many Evangelicals today can be traced back to the Reformation and the doctrine of justification by faith alone, whereby the sin of humankind is such that only by the grace of God through the atoning death of Jesus Christ can humankind be saved; it is impossible for humankind, through obedience
to religious laws or good works, to be reconciled to God. In other words salvation is through faith and not through works.

This doctrine was emphasised by Karl Barth in response to the growing liberalism and relativism which manifested itself in the aftermath of the First World War. Although not explicitly related to the world religions, Barth's arguments were developed by Kraemer in the theology of religions debate.

In much of the literature on the theology of religions debate Barth has been held up as the archetypal exclusivist, largely because of his understanding of religion itself. All religion, he claimed, including Christianity, is basically sinful, being nothing more than human striving for God. For Barth there was only one true Revelation; Christ himself, against whom all creation stands in judgement.

Karl Braaten, the Lutheran theologian questions this interpretation of Barth. He claims that the usual caricatures of Barth's theology can be exploded by Barth's own words:

We recognize that the fact that Jesus Christ is the one Word of God does not mean that in the Bible, the Church and the world there are not other words which are quite notable in their way, other lights which are quite clear and other revelations which are quite real...Nor does it follow from our statement that every word spoken outside the circle of the Bible and the Church is a word of false prophecy and therefore valueless, empty and corrupt, and that all the lights which rise and shine in this outer sphere are misleading and all the revelations are necessarily untrue. (Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. 4 part 3, p 478)

Braaten says that
when we deal with Barth's Christocentrism, the liberals become nervous; and when we deal with Barth's universalism, the conservative evangelicals protest ...Having developed the most complex and thorough-going Christology in the history of the church, Barth is not able to restrict the confidence born of hope and prayer that God will in the end get his wish that all be saved. In Barth's words, '...there is no good reason why we should not be open to [the] possibility ...[of] universal reconciliation.' (Braaten, 1992, p 97)

It would seem therefore that Barth is fundamentally a universalist who does not deny revelation outside of the Church. Furthermore, Barth does not claim that Christianity possesses Absolute Truth, because Absolute Truth, he says, can only be ahistorical since history itself is basically flawed through humankind's sinfulness. Despite the validity of what Braaten has to say, Barth, if he were to speak for himself today, may well still affirm an exclusivist position in relation to religious pluralism. We will never know. But perhaps Braaten's findings should remind us that 'labelling' people can be a dangerous thing. There will never be a 'pure' Exclusivist, as there will never be a 'pure' Inclusivist or Pluralist because the theory of the paradigm or dogmatic stance does not always match the practice or experience of the individual. As mentioned earlier, human beings are far too complex to be so neatly categorised.

Three problems can be identified with the Exclusivist approach. First, it does not adhere to a balanced trinitarian theology. Within Roman Catholicism it expresses itself through ecclesiocentricism by focussing upon people 'within and without the Church' and in the case of Protestantism it is too Christocentric; 'salvation through Christ alone'. The result is that the Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit is not given full expression and freedom.
Secondly, it is not compatible with experience. For example the conservative Evangelical denial of any "authentic, reliable revelation" apart from "Christ simply does not hold up in light of the faith, dedication, love and peace that Christians find in the teachings and especially in the followers of other religions" (Knitter, 1985, p 93).

Thirdly it is preoccupied with the issue of salvation. This is true with the entire theology of religions debate, but especially so with the Exclusivists. As Lesslie Newbigin says, the theology of religions debate "has been fatally flawed by the fact that it has been conducted around the question, 'who can be saved?'," or rather "'Can a good non-Christian be saved?'"(Newbigin, 1989, p 176). Only God knows who will be saved; he alone is the judge. "It would be tedious to repeat again the innumerable warnings of Jesus in this matter, his repeated statements that the last day will be a day of surprises, of reversals, of astonishment" (Newbigin, 1989, p 176).

Inclusivism

The second label, or paradigm, that of inclusivism, is ultimately another form of exclusivism. An archetypal Inclusivist is the Roman Catholic theologian Karl Rahner who was the first to use the term 'anonymous Christian'. Whilst holding firmly to the uniqueness of the salvific revelation of God in Christ, Inclusivists are prepared to accept that God has always been active outside of the Church, to such an extent that "The human person - every person without exception - has been redeemed by Christ; because Christ is in a way united to the human person - every person without exception - even if the individual may not realise this fact" (Redemptor Hominus 14).
There are three points worth noting. First, Rahner, to the discomfort of some, has gone further than saying that individuals may be saved by virtue of living a God-fearing life or Christ-like life. He says that the religious tradition of that person, whether it be Hinduism, Sikhism, Buddhism or any other formalised religion, can in itself have salvific efficacy; that apart from God's general revelation in creation, God is also revealed through systematic or institutional religion even if that religion is not Christianity. For Rahner, in contrast to Barth, institutional religion as a belief system is a positive phenomenon; is a necessary means for nurturing faith and belief and can be salvific.

Secondly, while some Inclusivists believe that non-Christians can be saved through their own belief systems, they still maintain that Christianity is the definitive, the normative way and that somehow the other religions are only preparatory to fulfilment in Christ. This is the so-called 'fulfilment theory' whereby the other Faiths have only received a partial revelation which is merely a preparation for the one true, final Revelation of Jesus Christ. What is not clear is how and when the other Faiths will be 'fulfilled'. Will it be a question of large numbers of individuals from other Faiths coming to know Christ or will there be mass conversions from other Faiths to Christianity? There is no evidence of either.

The third point relates to the 'anonymous Christian' concept which is so often associated with the Inclusivist view. The more liberal wing of interfaith practitioners claim that the term is a deterrent to dialogue; that it is offensive to suggest that a Hindu or Buddhist may be an 'invisible' or an 'anonymous' Christian. But Rahner
never meant the term to be used within the context of inter-Faith dialogue, at the point of encounter between the Faiths. He was using it strictly within the Christian context, as an aid to intra-faith dialogue between Christian practitioners and Christian theologians. For a Christian to refer to 'anonymous Christians' in an inter-Faith setting would be insensitive unless the relationship was such that the Christian was able to accept that he or she could also be termed an 'anonymous Muslim' or an 'anonymous Buddhist'.

What has to be remembered is that the 'anonymous Christian' theory is only a theory. As Michael Barnes has pointed out:

The theory is part of Christian dogmatic theology, providing an answer to a particular question which is central to the meaningful articulation of Christianity in today's world. It is addressed not to the Hindu or Buddhist but to the Christian whose self-understanding is challenged by the existence of the Hindu or Buddhist. (Barnes, 1989, p 57)

The concept of the 'anonymous' Christian is an attempt to reconcile the uniqueness of Christ's redemptive act with the universal of God's love for all, but it has received much criticism.

Apart from the criticism that inclusivism is ultimately a covert form of exclusivism, the term itself, 'anonymous Christian', leads to ambiguity. Are we referring to the anonymous 'Christian', the anonymous 'Christ' or anonymous 'Christianity'? Rahner himself referred to both the 'anonymous Christian' and 'anonymous Christianity' but we often hear of the 'anonymous Christ' (Panikkar, The Unknown Christ of Hinduism, 1981). The anonymous Christ in divine form could be perceived as
another *avatar*, alongside Krishna, or he could perform the role of a prophet/teacher analogous to that of Muhammed (Kung, 1987 pp 243-244). Whatever the case, to confuse Christ with Muhammed or Krishna does not do justice to Christianity, Islam or Hinduism. Each religion is unique in itself and the Saviour, *Avatar* or Prophet has a unique role within each tradition.

The Inclusivist approach is widespread in all traditions. It permits the Christian to remain loyal to Christ whilst at the same time recognises the salvific value of other religious traditions. Many Inclusivists and probably even more Pluralists, would profess that the externals of religion; the creed, code and cult, are only secondary to the "essential counsels and truth" (Knitter, 1985, p 39). Others would equally disregard the externals and seek a coming together of the transcendental in the heart of the spiritual; that the concrete of particularity, the 'creed, code and cult', can be transcended by the spiritually mature. James Fowler for example identifies a stage of development in Christian maturity whereby an individual moves on from a particular to a universal faith where it is possible to leave behind the particular with all its 'attachments' for the sake of the universal (Fowler, 1981).

By virtue of our own particularity we must always start from that particularity; from our own concrete experience which is temporal, spatial and culturally conditioned. Even if it is possible to move towards an inclusivist, pluralist or universalist position, we are always conditioned by the particularity of our past which is never totally left behind. Many Christians, including clergy, hold tacitly to a theological viewpoint

---

without being aware of the theological or pastoral implications. Some may move to another viewpoint for pragmatic reasons without going through the necessary theological reflection. That reflection may be implicit or explicit; it may be articulate or inarticulate but unless there has been a process of personal challenge and response, the holding of any theological viewpoint is purely arbitrary.

**Pluralism**

We now turn to the most controversial group, the Pluralists. Christoph Schwobel has suggested that the Pluralists are almost reacting in a 'crisis management' situation; they are responding to a sense of urgency, resulting in "reducing the complexity of these tasks too quickly to programmatic proposals which restrict rather than open up creative possibilities of theological reflection" (Schwobel, in D'Costa, 1990, p 31). As with the Inclusivists, there is a sense of rushing ahead, creating complex theories when there is still much theology to be done within the more 'orthodox' arena. Tom Driver echoes a similar discomfort; he asks, is it

...possible or advisable for Christians to move beyond inclusivism to something else, usually called pluralism? What do we mean by pluralism? What is meant by the term? Is it intelligible? How is it to be understood in conjunction with the mission of Christianity on the one hand, and the world situation on the other? (Driver, 1987, p 204)

A satisfactory definition of all three paradigms is difficult, but even more so with pluralism by virtue of the great diversity found among those who could be termed pluralists. For example, there is very little consensus over what is meant by 'salvation', whether or not there is a 'common essence' within all
religions, whether or not there are conflicting truth claims and what point of reference, if any, is used for judging such truth claims.

There are, however, three general areas where Pluralists would appear to agree. First, and particularly those who would claim to have 'crossed the Rubicon', subscribe to a 'Copernican' revolution as suggested by John Hick (Hick, 1977). Here Hick called for a revolution in Christian theology whereby God and not Christ, or Christianity, should be seen as the centre of the universe of Faiths. In other words, he advocated a move from Christocentricism or Ecclesiocentricism to Theocentricism.

Secondly most Pluralists would say that there are many true paths to the one God or Ultimate Reality. Schubert Ogden challenges Pluralists on this issue:

Like exclusivism, it is logically an extreme position. This is evident from the fact that it counters exclusivism's claim that there cannot be more than one religion that is formally true, not with the contradictory claim that there can be, but with the contrary claim that there is, that there are many religions that are true in this sense of the word. The difficulty with extreme contraries on any issue, however, is that, while both cannot be true, both can be false. Therefore it is entirely possible that pluralism's claim that there are many true religions is as false as the claim of exclusivism that there cannot be more than one. (Ogden, 1992, p 78)

Ogden's point would appear to affirm the criticism levelled against the Pluralists by both Schwobel and Driver; that the so-called pluralist model is ill thought out by theologians who are acting in a 'crisis management' manner to a new situation.

Not all Pluralists, however, would say that each religious path is equally salvific. For example, Hick says that the salvific test for any religious belief system is its ability to
transform people's lives from self-centredness to God or Reality-centredness. In this sense some belief systems may be more effective than others.\(^5\) The difficulty here is one of discernment; how do we judge such transformation?

Although any such transformation must indeed bear fruits both in individual moral behavior and in the structures of society and culture, it itself takes place solely in our inner-most self-understanding, and, therefore, can never be either simply identified with its fruits or validly inferred from them. (Ogden, 1992, p 68)

A third area of agreement among Pluralists would be the denial of any absolute truth claims. They argue that the unique and universal significance of Christ as the only saviour cannot be upheld in the light of historical relativism, modern biblical scholarship, observation and experience.

According to the theologian, Raimundo Panikkar, pluralism is more than acknowledgement of plurality or wishful thinking for unity; it accepts both the irreconcilable and the common aspects; it affirms truth neither one nor many and it does not admit to any universal system. "Pluralism adopts a nondualistic, advaitic, attitude that defends the pluralism of truth because reality itself is pluralistic."

(Pannikkar 1987, p 109)

The pluralist approach has elicited considerable criticism from the more orthodox theologians (D'Costa 1986, 1990). For example, does the 'theocentre' of the universe of Faiths represent God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit worshipped by Christians? If it does, then pluralism is still essentially based upon a Christian, Western, imperialistic view of universal salvation, the very thing that most Pluralists are

\(^5\)John Hick in his lecture to the Modern Churchpeople's Union. (High Leigh, July 1992)
wishing to distance themselves from. If, on the other hand, Pluralists do not mean a Christian trinitarian theocentre, then where is the basis for assuming any benevolent Reality which wills the salvation of all humankind? (D'Costa, 1986). Another problem with the pluralist view from an orthodox perspective is its understanding and treatment of the life, death and resurrection of Christ. Where does the Christ event fit in? Is Christ simply one of many great teachers, prophets, incarnations or saviour figures? If so, how does this affect the mission of the Church in terms of proclamation?

As with inclusivism and exclusivism, pluralism seriously challenges our understanding and experience of the Christian faith. But pluralism is theological speculation and to be fair to pluralist theologians that is how they see themselves. The editors of The Myth of Christian Uniqueness claim to be working "Toward a Pluralistic Theology of Religions" (Hick and Knitter, 1987). They are not claiming to have discovered the Christian answer to religious plurality but they are prepared to be open, to engage in dialogue with reality as they experience it from within the context of their understanding of the historic Christian faith.

The Christological Question

The theology of religions is essentially about salvation and whether or not non-Christians can be saved. In other words, does a person have to have an explicit knowledge and faith in Jesus Christ in order to receive eternal life? The three paradigms that have just been discussed answer that question differently. Put simply, the Exclusivists would say 'yes, you must have a personal relationship with
Jesus Christ'; the Inclusivists would say 'you do not necessarily need to know Christ personally even though He is your saviour' and the Pluralists would say 'you do not need to know Christ because your own Faith tradition has salvific value enough for your personal salvation'. From this it is clear that the 'stumbling block' is the Christological issue; who is Jesus Christ and does he have universal significance for the salvation of all; and if so, how? As Wesley Ariarajah rightly states that this has still not been seriously addressed by the WCC constituency which has remained fundamentally exclusivist. The conservative Evangelicals, who are overtly exclusivist, could be accused of being too Christocentric at the expense of the sovereignty of the Father and the Holy Spirit. It is difficult to discern the Christology of the Inclusivists and some Pluralists appear to have abandoned Christology altogether. In other words, the Exclusivists over-emphasise their Christology, the Inclusivists have a very vague Christology and some Pluralists have no Christology. Since Christ is the cornerstone of the Christian faith and since the Christian understanding of God is equally Father, Son and Holy Spirit, all three paradigms are unsatisfactory approaches to religious pluralism from an orthodox Christian perspective.

There are some theologians, who are perhaps not central to the theology of religions debate, but who are nevertheless rethinking their Christology in the context of religious pluralism. Ogden, for example puts forward what he refers to as a 'fourth option' to the traditional three paradigms. He claims that Christ's life, death and resurrection do not constitute redemption, but are merely re-presentative of God's reconciling action. That it is God, and not Christ, who wills the reconciliation of creation to himself and that "...the possibility of salvation that is decisively re-
presented through Jesus Christ is always already constituted for each and every sinner by God's very being as love" (Ogden, 1992, p 99). He makes the point, however, that the possibility of salvation does not infer universal salvation for all. The possibility is available to all, but a response to God or the Divine by way of a God-centred or Divine-centred life, is required as a pre-requisite to salvation. If we follow Ogden's line of argument, however, we are still left with the Christological problem in that the historical Christ event does not appear to be essential for redemption. What then is the significance of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ apart from being a representative of God's love? Surely we could point to many 'representatives' or 'manifestations' of God's love. Ogden, like Hick, is totally theocentric, but with both we are left with the question, 'has the historical Christ lost universal salvific significance'?

Keith Ward may well answer that question in the affirmative. He questions the traditional view of the incarnation. He puts forward a notion of Jesus as "a human being who is transparent to the divine", which he refers to as a 'revisionist' view, rather than a divine being who takes on a human nature, which is the traditionalist view (Ward, 1991, p 56). Ward questions the doctrine of the incarnation from the basis of Scripture. He asks;

"How do I know Jesus is God?" I only have the Gospels as evidence. But if the Gospel beliefs are sometimes false; if in fact their whole picture of the world, or at least a very important part of it, is false, or at best deeply alien to our own way of seeing the world, the evidence looks rather shaky. It seems to me that, if Jesus is ever in error, and if God never errs, then Jesus cannot be God, in any straightforward sense. (Ward, 1991, p 54)

Hick also points to the fallibility of Jesus;
Jesus's role as eschatological prophet ceased to be relevant as his expectation of an early end to ordinary human history proved to be erroneous. (This fact is not always fully faced by upholders of traditional orthodoxy.) How could God the Son have been so massively mistaken? (Hick, 1993 quoted in Church Times, 1 October 1993)

Maurice Wiles has called for a "radical revision of traditional theologies". He suggests that any new theology for dialogue must be provisional in character to such an extent that it cuts out the possibility of claims to finality or exclusiveness of revealed truth. But that ... does not entail as radical a revision of the central doctrines affected as is often assumed to be the case. (Wiles, 1992, p 77)

Another substitute for traditional Christocentrism is the 'regnocentric' or 'soteriocentric' model as proposed by Knitter who claims that "...all religions propose a message of salvation or human liberation" (Dupuis, 1997, p 194). Here the "theology of religions is no longer centered on the Christ-event but on the Reign of God, which builds itself up through history and is destined to reach its fulfilment in the eschatological time" (Dupuis, 1997, p 194).

I have briefly looked at theologians who are presenting new Christologies in the context of religious pluralism. While Olden proposes a representative role for Christ, Ward suggests a divinely inspired human role; Wiles calls for an end to claims of finality and exclusiveness and Dupuis has identified the Reign of God as a focus for debate. How compatible these 'new' Christologies are with an orthodox understanding of the Incarnation and Holy Trinity is open to question.
Trinitarian Universalism

I have looked at the exclusivist view which is becoming increasingly difficult for many Christians to adhere to in the context of religious pluralism; the Inclusivist view which is widely held but has its theological problems, and the pluralist view which may be attractive to the liberally minded but unacceptable to those who wish to remain loyal to Christian orthodoxy. I have also looked at theologians who are suggesting radical new Christologies.

Each of these different theological approaches attempt to reconcile the tension between God's universal salvific will and Christ's particular, unique act of redemption, but none has satisfactorily done so. Basically this is because they all present a distortion of the Triune God. The Exclusivists and Inclusivists are either too Christocentric or ecclesiocentric and the Pluralists are too theocentric. Where is the Holy Spirit? Apart from minor mention by certain Inclusivist theologians, the Holy Spirit has been given very little attention in the theology of religions debate so far (Khodr, 1971; Barnes, 1989; D'Costa, 1990, Dupuis, 1997).

The Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit may offer another approach to religious pluralism but it can only satisfactorily do so if it remains firmly within the context of trinitarian theology. A growing number of theologians are now looking at the doctrine of the Trinity as a way forward (D'Costa, 1990; Schwobel, 1990; Lai, 1994).

I believe that the Trinitarian doctrine of God facilitates an authentically Christian response to the world religions because it takes the particularities of history entirely seriously. This is so because the doctrine seeks to affirm that God has disclosed himself in
the contingencies and particularities of the person Jesus. But the Trinity also affirms by means of the two other persons, that God is constantly revealing himself through history by means of the Holy Spirit. (D’Costa, 1990, p 17)

The Christian doctrine of the Trinity teaches that the three Persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, are of the same substance, are consubstantial; they are interdependent, being of one will and one conscience and they are in a constant state of interpenetration, referred to by the theologians as *perichoresis* or *circumincessio*. It is a dynamic relationship of love. Jurgen Moltmann and Leonardo Boff both stress the social nature of the Trinity; that all three Persons are in communion with each other and that they are all equal in divinity and status (Moltmann, 1980; Boff, 1988).

When the Trinitarian God relates to creation it is through the mission of the Son and the Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit who speaks to the human spirit. It is the Holy Spirit who points to the Son who in turn points to the Father. But although it may appear that at times the Son or the Holy Spirit are taking the initiative, the Son and the Spirit will always be in communion, of common will. Through their "...reciprocal perichoresis of mutual indwelling Christ becomes the 'life-giving Spirit' and the Spirit becomes 'the Spirit of Jesus Christ' (Moltmann, 1992, p 67). The Son and the Spirit will always be in communion, of common will, with the Father. All three always act together. In the words of St Basil:

> As he who grasps one end of a chain pulls along with it the other end to himself, so he who draws the Spirit draws both the Son and the Father along with it. (Geevarghese, 1990, p 36)

If Christians can accept that the Holy Spirit manifests herself outside of the Church and in the lives of people of other Faiths, or indeed of no faith at all, then it follows, according to trinitarian orthodoxy, that God and indeed Christ is manifest outside of the Church because where the Spirit is, so also is the Father and the Son.
Many Christians would have no problem in recognising the activity of the Father and the Holy Spirit outside of Christianity. There is ample evidence of both in Scripture. However, the Son incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ is more problematic unless we adopt a totally Trinitarian view of God.

The main strength of this approach is that it adheres to Christian orthodoxy. Equally important, in the context of religious plurality, it offers a perfect balance between the particular and the universal because it is grounded in Trinitarian theology. In other words, it allows for God's universal love and will for the salvation of all creation, and it also allows for the particular Christ event. On the other hand it could also be described as another form of inclusivism in that the Son is seen to be implicitly working in other Faiths.

Conclusion

The modern theology of religions debate began at the beginning of this century out of the need for the missionary organisations to rethink their mission theology in the light of their experience of living and working with people of other Faiths, mainly in Africa and Asia. A watershed in the debate followed Kraemer's *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* in 1938 which was a conservative reaction against growing liberalism. Vatican II marked a fresh liberalism in Roman Catholic theology, particularly with the reinterpretation of the doctrine 'outside of the Church no Salvation'. Alan Race's publication in 1983, *Christians and Religious Pluralism* was an attempt to systematise the various Christian approaches to other Faiths, which resulted in the three paradigms of exclusivism, inclusivism and pluralism.
These three paradigms have since formed the basis of discussion, but while they have been a useful tool they have their shortcomings. As a result other models have been suggested, ranging from revisionist Christologies to trinitarian universalism but these more recent models have not yet penetrated the discussion beyond the academic circle.

The study of the theology of religions has been the preserve of the scholars and has had very little influence within the ranks of the Church, despite the fact that as early as 1910 the commissioners of the Edinburgh conference urged for more training within the seminaries. The provision of this type of training within the seminaries and colleges will be the subject of Chapter 7.

Since this debate is essentially about the universal significance of the particular Christ event in relation to salvation, it obviously strikes at the heart of Christian identity and Christian proclamation. It is therefore incumbent upon all Christians, and particularly the clergy, to reflect theologically upon the issue.

In this chapter I have examined the ongoing ecumenical, international debate. In the next chapter I shall look at how far the Church of England has been influenced by the debate and what efforts have been made to formulate its own particular theology for its own context.
Chapter 3  The Theology of Religions and the Church of England

Introduction
The Church of England, at General Synodical level, entered the debate surrounding religious pluralism for two reasons. The first was in 1972, in relation to the sale of church buildings to people of other Faiths. The second was as a response to the growing amount of literature published by the World Council of Churches (WCC, 1979) and the British Council of Churches (BCC, 1981), later known as the Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland (CCBI), which was recommended to churches for consideration and comment.

Theological reflection on the theology of religions in the Church of England was very much influenced by the WCC and BCC/CCBI documents. In this chapter I shall examine some of the WCC documents which led to the BCC/CCBI publishing its own papers, in relation to the British context. Since the Church of England is the mother church of the Anglican Communion and is influenced by events happening in the world-wide communion (see Chapter 1 page 8) I shall make reference to the Lambeth documents which are relevant to this discussion. I shall then explore how the Church of England, at General Synodical level, used these various documents to formulate its own particular response to religious pluralism.

As an Episcopal church which functions through a synodical structure, the Diocese of Chelmsford takes its doctrinal lead from General Synodical documents. It would therefore be helpful to examine the synodical debates and documents because they influence Diocesan theological understanding which can in turn affect policy decisions regarding the selection and training of the clergy which will be the subject of Part Two.
The World Council of Churches

In 1971 the Central Committee of the WCC meeting in Addis Ababa decided that the exploration and development of the concept of 'dialogue' as the "primary mode of relating to people of other faith traditions" should be undertaken. (WCC, 1979, p v)

As a result of this decision a new sub-unit, 'Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies', (DFI) was set up. The aim of this sub-unit was to encourage the meeting of people of different Faiths at national, regional and international levels. The DFI was also required to support and encourage the churches by providing biblical and theological guidelines for the churches in relation to people of other Faiths.

In 1977, during a Theological Consultation in Chiang Mai, Thailand on 'Dialogue in Community', the basis of Guidelines for Dialogue were agreed. Following this, in 1979, the DFI published its first set of guidelines, *Guidelines on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies*. This document, which was received by the Central Committee and sent to all the churches for "their consideration and discussion, animated testing and evaluation" (WCC, 1979, p v), covered the theological significance of religious diversity and offered guidelines to the churches for study and action.

Section 5 of the Guidelines is particularly relevant to this study and is worth quoting in part:

In many cases Christians, utilizing the experience of dialogue, must take the initiative in education in order to restore the distorted image of the neighbours that may already exist in their communities and to advance Christian understanding of people of other living faiths and ideologies.

Even in those situations where Christians do not live in close contact with people of the various religious, cultural and ideological
traditions, they should take seriously the responsibility to study and to learn about these other traditions. (WCC, 1979, p 18)

And even more relevant for clergy training:

Member churches should consider what action they can take in the following educational areas:

(ii) Teaching programmes in theological seminaries and colleges to prepare Christian ministers with the training and sensitivity necessary for inter-religious dialogue.

(iii) Positive relationships with programmes in university departments and other institutes of higher learning which are concerned with the academic study of religion. (WCC, 1979, p 18)

The next publication of significance from the DFI was the study guide My Neighbour's Faith - and Mine: Theological Discoveries through Interfaith Dialogue, which was the culmination of three consultations and published in 1986. The study guide invited the churches to reflect upon what it means to be a Christian in a religiously plural world by studying the themes of Creation, Scripture, Jesus Christ, Salvation, Witness, Spirituality, Community, Hope and Vision. The DFI invited all those who took part in the study to respond and comment and it was the intention of the authors that an international conference would be held in 1989 to analyse and circulate the findings.

In 1988 the WCC bookshop reported the sale of 6,300 copies of My Neighbour's Faith and Mine. These were in English, German, Indonesian, Hindi, Marathi, Urdu, Malayalam, Tamil and Burmese with translations forthcoming in French, Swedish, Dutch, Arabic, Sinhalese, Telugu and Bengali, making a total of 16 languages, "...all of which point to an enormous interest in the study process itself" (WCC, 1988, p 39).
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Despite the sales record, however, the DFI was disappointed in the lack of response from the churches:

I must confess, however, that despite the questionnaire we sent to all who ordered the booklet (in bulk of more than 5 copies) and knowing that a number of study groups have taken up the study, no reports have yet come in. There are many who have promised to report including those who have organized church-wide studies locally (United Church of Canada, Presbyterian Church of Ghana and the Lutheran Church of Norway). (WCC, 1988, p 39)

In an attempt to move dialogue from theory to practice, the DFI arranged a Multicultural Dialogue Meeting in New Delhi in 1987 in order "to engage representatives of different religions in dialogue so as to give them an experience of dialogue and also to set the process of dialogue going in a concrete form" (Cracknell, 1987, p 1). Delegates discussed conflict between different religious groups and identified "the ignorance of people and communities about their neighbours, their customs, beliefs, cultural practices, ways of life" and the "absence of self-criticism within a religious community" as possible causes (Cracknell, 1987, p 5). Other debates related to the question of minority and majority consciousness and the need for people to be able to define themselves and not be subject to labelling: "In inter-religious dialogue, as in all other forms of intra-personal relationships, people should be free to define themselves. Only then does the richness of what they have to give become accessible to us" (Cracknell, 1987, p 11). It is worth pointing out that questions of ignorance, self-identity and identity of the other can only be engaged by people becoming better informed through a process of the appropriate education.

The formal Report of that Multi-Faith Dialogue meeting in 1987 highlighted the enormous educational task:

It will be necessary to find out new ways of enabling both ourselves and our own communities to learn to see the world from the point of view of our neighbour. This we see as a massive educational task using the skills of human scientists as well as of poets and artists. Meanwhile it is a task laid upon us to continually raise the question of
how does it looks from the point of view of others, whether they be Jew or Sikh, Muslim or Hindu, or of groups like the slum-dweller or rural landless. (Cracknell, 1987, p 12)

Among its Recommendations for Practical Action the Report stated:

We wish to call for (where they do not already exist) and to encourage and support (where they do) study centres within the world religious communities which will give sustained attention to the renewed understanding and the authentic reinterpretation of their own tradition in the light of religious pluralism. We see this as an urgent theological task for every community.

Equally we wish to support, and to ask our communities to sustain by adequate funding, all existing study centres and departments in colleges and universities based upon interreligious commitment. (Cracknell, 1987, p 13)

In 1988, the DFI working group in Baar, Switzerland, decided to go ahead with an interim consultation in mid 1989 to "gather up the information and share experiences of people who were involved in the study process in their local situations, along with a few 'academic theologians'"(WCC, 1988, p 7). This was despite the fact that no written responses had been received to the booklet My Neighbour's Faith and Mine. It was also decided to invite a group of theologians to a further conference to look at specific theological questions relevant to dialogue issues:

- to formulate a theological statement on questions such as: is there salvation outside Jesus Christ/Church?

- to draw resources from our own faith to undergird the stance of a Christian theology of religions.

As the methodology question for this consultation was not fully resolved [it was] tentatively agreed to:

(a) try to go beyond questions to look for concrete theological substance;

(b) to liberate ourselves from being captive purely to abstract philosophical/theological pre-occupations and make attempts to combine the head (intellect) and the heart (experience);
At this same meeting in 1988, the DFI working group discussed the forthcoming General Assembly of the WCC to be held in Canberra in 1991. It was agreed that the DFI and the Council on World Mission and Evangelism (CWME) jointly design a preparatory document on Witness which "would enable Assembly participants to begin to understand the wide range of 'Issues for Further Study' developed at the Tambaram 1988 Consultation" (WCC, 1988, p 15), with the further aim of encouraging participants "to become aware and discuss at the Assembly the numerous perspectives that are emerging out of the experience of dialogue and mission in a pluralistic world" (WCC, 1988, p 16).

Given the pluralistic world in which Christians live with ever greater awareness today, the preparatory document would examine how we see God's purpose amongst all persons, how God calls us to be witnesses to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ amidst persons of other faiths, and how we encounter the Holy Spirit moving in all of God's creation. Faced with the reality of witness (on the part of people of other faiths) to an experience and relationship with God, the document must seek to explore these accounts in light of a Trinitarian understanding of God and with the goal of seeing the unity and renewal of the whole human community as a purpose of the church's mission. It is hoped the study will enable us to develop a unified eschatological vision of the oikoumene while recognizing our differing perspectives on the universality of the salvation offered through Jesus Christ. (WCC, 1988, p 16)

I have spent some time looking at the WCC documents because they form the background to much BCC/CCBI work, to which we now turn.

The British Council of Churches and the Council of Churches in Britain and Ireland

The Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths (CRPOF) was set up by the British Council of Churches in 1978 with the aim of "helping Christians in Britain in the opportunities of living in a multi-faith society" (BCC, 1981). The Assembly of
the British Council of Churches passed a resolution in November 1979 reaffirming "its conviction that the presence in Britain of people of other faiths in significant numbers is within the gracious purposes of God" and "welcomes the Guidelines on Dialogue commended to member churches by the Central Committee of the WCC" (Cracknell, 1980, p ii).

In response to the Guidelines on Dialogue, the Secretary to the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths (CRPOF) of the BCC, Reverend Kenneth Cracknell, wrote the pamphlet *Why Dialogue?* a first British comment on the WCC Guidelines. The pamphlet was recommended to the British churches by the Chairman of CRPOF, with the caveat that "the Committee, still less the British Council of Churches, are not committed to the particular interpretations of Scripture and Christian doctrine which appear in its pages" (Cracknell, 1980, p v).

Cracknell stressed that "British Christians perhaps look for guidance much more from the Bible than from tradition or theology, and it is increasingly clear that 'Biblical criteria' would be the most helpful things to suggest" (Cracknell, 1980, p 7).

While my own experience with British Christians affirms the primacy of biblical criteria, there are also many Anglicans and probably Roman Catholics who would also look to tradition and theology. Perhaps Cracknell was speaking from his own Methodist perspective and had taken less account of the other Christian traditions in Britain.

With an emphasis on the biblical material Cracknell stressed that 'dialogue' was a thoroughly biblical word. He pointed to the universal covenants of the Old Testament and St Paul's encounters in the New Testament. However, as a word of caution he quoted New Testament scholar Krister Stendahl;

> The questions facing us ... as to Dialogue with people of other faiths and ideologies are hardly the questions in the minds of the biblical writers. But they are valid questions of importance... A Christian
theology of religion cannot be pieced together by direct biblical quotations. It is a new question. (Theological consultation on "Dialogue in Community", 1977, Chiang Mai, Thailand)

In his final section, headed 'Towards a Theology of Religions' Cracknell condemned what he called 'theologizing' about other religions and people of other Faiths "on the basis of total ignorance". Instead he advocated the experiential encounter "that takes place when two or more people of different religious commitment really begin to listen to each other" (Cracknell, 1980, p 23).

In 1981 CRPOF published Relations with People of Other Faiths; Guidelines for Dialogue in Britain. This document was based upon the WCC Guidelines but written for the British churches. It was widely discussed by the churches and while some were able to give "ready assent to the main lines suggested in its pages, ... others ha[d] yet to declare their mind on the stance they would wish to take in responding to a multi-faith society" (BCC, 1981, p 1). The General Synod of the Church of England gave support in principle to the guidelines but asked for further theological work to be done. I shall be returning to this point later.

Once more the importance of education was highlighted and the British document quoted in full section 5 of the WCC document (See pages 41-42 above).

The British document also added sections on Hospital Chaplaincies and the Pastoral Care of Sick People of Other Faiths; Inter-Faith Marriages; Religious Education in the Local Authority School; Denominational Schools in a Plural Society and the question of inter-Faith services and the use of church property; all issues that are particularly relevant to British society.

The relationship between interreligious dialogue and witness, or the proclamation of the Gospel, has been a constant theme running through all consultations, discussions
and documents since the 1910 Edinburgh conference. The central question is whether or not inter-Faith dialogue is compatible with witness to the Gospel, or whether indeed the two are mutually exclusive. This question came to the fore at the beginning of the Decade of Evangelism and prompted the publication in 1991 of a discussion document entitled *Christian Identity, Witness and Interfaith Dialogue* by the Theological Issues Consultative Group of CRPOF. The document was only eight pages in length and drew on the WCC Guidelines and the Baar Statement of the WCC Dialogue Sub Unit 1990. It did, however, make the point that although the social context of mission had changed, there still remained a deeply rooted cultural superiority and paternalism on the part of the British churches (CCBI, 1991, p 4).

The document also pointed to Eugene Stockwell's observations at the WCC San Antonio Conference in 1989:

Too often the church has confused proclamation with words alone, forgetting the integral witness of worship, deed and life.

Too often the church has confounded witness with the imposition of a gospel wrapped in cultural trappings that obscures the living Christ.

(CCBI, 1991, p 4)

In the same year, 1991, the Vatican published *Dialogue and Proclamation; Reflections and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*. This document, comprising 49 pages, was far more comprehensive than the CRPOF document. It stated that dialogue and proclamation were two authentic, necessary forms of mission (p 206); that "proclamation has priority over every other form of the Church's activity, while dialogue is one of the integrating elements" (p 207).

Again the theme of education received special mention:

It is also important that specific studies on the relationship between dialogue and proclamation be undertaken, taking into account each religion within its geographical area and its socio-cultural context.
Episcopal Conferences could entrust such studies to the appropriate commissions and theological and pastoral institutes. In the light of the results of these studies, these institutes could also organize special courses and study sessions in order to train people for both dialogue and proclamation. Special attention is to be given to young people living in a pluralistic environment, who meet the followers of other religions at school, at work, in youth movements and other associations and even within their own families. (Vatican City, 1991, p 250)

The BCC/CCBI incorporated much of the WCC material into its own documents and guidelines but with special reference to the British context. At the same time the Roman Catholic church has produced comprehensive documents around the question of dialogue and proclamation. I will now turn to the Lambeth documents, which came out of the Lambeth conferences of 1988 and 1998 and are relevant to this discussion.

The Lambeth Conference

Every ten years bishops representing dioceses from across the world come to England for the Lambeth Conference. The Church of England, as described in Chapter 1, is the mother church of the Anglican Communion. While on the one hand it functions as a national church within the context of England, it also has a very strong relationship with the Anglican Communion (ACC) which represents 500 dioceses in 164 countries of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is the Head (Church of England Year Book, 1998, p 261). Increasingly events occurring across the Communion are affecting the thinking of the Church of England. This was evident at the Lambeth 1998 conference over the issue of both inter-Faith relations and human sexuality when the resolutions taken at the Conference were very much influenced by bishops from Africa and Asia.

The document Towards a Theology for Inter-faith Dialogue (BMU, 1984) was recommended to all the dioceses of the ACC for study and reflection in preparation
for Lambeth 1988. Lambeth 1988 also called for the establishment of a Network for Inter-Faith Concerns (NIFCON) for the purpose of sharing ideas and resources between provinces across the Communion.

During the preparation for Lambeth 1998 it became apparent that the question of inter-Faith relationships was an issue for most parts of the Communion, and particularly those countries where Christians lived as a minority in a majority Muslim country. It was therefore decided that inter-Faith issues should be incorporated into all four Sections of the conference. Section Three: 'Called to be a faithful Church in a plural world' looked specifically at inter-Faith relations. Under item III.11 'Religious Freedom' it passed the following resolution:

This Conference challenges Anglicans, as servants of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour:

(a) to respect the rights and freedom of all faiths to worship and practise their ways of life;

(b) to work with all people of good will to extend these freedoms of worship, religious practice and conversion throughout the world;

(d) to enter into dialogue with members of other faiths, to increase our mutual respect and explore the truths we hold in common and those on which we differ;

(f) to equip ourselves for our witness, dialogue and service by becoming better versed in the teaching and practice of our own faith, and of at least one other faith. (ACC, 1998)

These resolutions attempted to reconcile a pastoral role; point (a), with loyalty to the uniqueness of Christ; point (b) which specifically referred to conversation. Point (f) also emphasised the need for education, both in the Christian Faith and in one other Faith.
The Resolution from the inter-Faith team, VI.1 'on relations with people of other faiths', reiterated much of the above with a special request that "(ii) the ACC consider how to resource NIFCON adquately both in personnel and finance; (iii) all the other official Anglican networks should be encouraged to recognise the interfaith dimensions to their work" (ACC, 1998). The Anglican Communion is a consultative council and has no jurisdiction over any particular Anglican province. However, at a time of general globalisation there is an increasing awareness of the need for co-operation, support and understanding across the Communion. This trend has recently been highlighted with the appointment of the new Secretary to IFCG whose revised terms of reference include networking with Lambeth Palace and other agencies within the Anglican Communion. Such a move reinforces the partnership between the Lambeth Palace and the Archbishop of Canterbury as Head of the Anglican Communion and the Church of England as the national Church.

The Church of England

T.H.N. Kuin, in her article 'Perfect Partners or Uneasy Bedfellows? (Kuin, 1997, Studies in Interreligious Dialogue 7) has provided a useful analysis of the 'Anglicans and Religious Pluralism in the Late 20th Century' by making an in depth study of synodical Reports of Proceedings. She claims, as mentioned on page 40, that it was the question of the sale of redundant church buildings to non-Christian communities which forced the question of the relationship of the Church of England to other Faith communities onto the agenda of the General Synod. In July 1972 the following motion was tabled:

That Synod take note of the following resolution passed by the diocesan synod of Wakefield: 'In view of the widespread interest and concern raised by the question of the future use of St. Mary's Church,

---

6 At the Lambeth Conference 1998 bishops called for support from their Western colleagues, particularly where Christians are facing religious persecution.
Savile Town, Dewsbury, this Synod requests that the General Synod debate the principle of the use of consecrated building which have been declared redundant'. (Kuin, 1997 quoting Report of Proceedings (RP) 7/723/3,442)

Synod was united in the opinion that such a question could not be solved by debate but needed an in-depth investigation into the theological, pastoral and social implications of the future of use redundant church buildings, particularly by non-Christian communities. However, there was clearly a division of opinion between those who called for Christian charity; "it is a matter of urgency that an unequivocal expression of Christian charity ... be made by Synod" (Rev Dr G F Cope, RP 7/723/3,453) and those who wished to defend the uniqueness of Christ; "how would it in any way bring that Muslim community nearer to the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ?" (Mr J W M Mullimore, RP 7/723/3, 459).

Although the British Council of Churches had produced several documents on the subject (The Use of Church Properties for Community Activities in Multi-Racial Areas, 1972; Church Property and People, 1973; The Community Orientation of the Church, 1974; The Use of Church Property in a Plural Society, 1980) and General Synod had produced Memorandum of Comment on the interim report in 1973 (GS 135), it was not until 1996, twenty-four years after the issue was first raised, that the Church of England published Communities and Buildings: Church of England premises and other faiths (GS 1185). This document was long awaited and provided not only guidelines for both the disposal and use of church buildings to other Faith communities, but also stated clearly the legal situation under Canon Law.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the other issue which brought inter-Faith issues onto the General Synod's agenda, was the need for a response to the WCC documents and particularly the BCC's Relations with People of Other Faiths: Guidelines for Dialogue (BCC 1981). In November 1981 Synod commended the
Guidelines to the dioceses and at the same time asked the Board for Mission and Unity to prepare a report on the "theological aspects of dialogue" (BMU, 1984, p 1).

In response to this request the Inter-Faith Consultative Group (IFCG) of the Board for Mission and Unity produced the report Towards a Theology for Inter-Faith Dialogue (BMU, 1984). Being a "new and sensitive area for Christians in England" the group were also "conscious that this was the beginning of a journey and that any theology which was written had to be provisional" (BMU, 1984, p vii).

The report, which was recommended to all the dioceses of the Anglican Communio for study and reflection in preparation for the Lambeth Conference 1988, began by outlining the changed religious context and pointed out that;

Britain, perhaps, more than any other country, has been affected by the international changes that have taken place since the end of the second world War. In 1945 London was still the metropolis of a vast empire, and counted as subjects of His Majesty were nearly all the Hindus in the world, all the Sikhs, a vast proportion of the Muslims and enormous numbers of Buddhists. In 1945 our great missionary societies were still at work in China, in Burma and in many other lands now closed to us. (BMU, 1984, p 3)

Using Race's typology, the report then briefly (in three pages) outlined the three paradigms under the section 'Christian Responses to Other Faiths: Exclusivism, Inclusivism, Pluralism'. Kuin suggested that this was a simplistic and unhelpful approach.

The 'exclusivism' section is entirely theology-based, referring to truth, revelation and salvation. There is no suggestion of a sympathetic approach to other faiths, only the stark portrait of rigid particularism. 'Inclusivism' is a mixture of theology and attitude: or perhaps a restatement of a theology formed by experience. 'Pluralism' is treated in much the same way, although the conclusions reached on the key issues of salvation, revelation and truth are different. The impression is that it is the 'inclusivists' and 'pluralists' who have the right attitude to other faiths; indeed, that it is not possible to hold an 'exclusivist' position and be hospitable to and interested in other faiths...It is not
surprising that many 'exclusivists' who had lived and worked with other faiths rejected the threefold model. (Kuin, 1997, p 189)

This section was followed by the 'Bible as source of authoritative guidance' and 'the Biblical process'. The largest section of the report, 'Biblical pointers', referred to (i) the creating God, (ii) the covenancing God, (iii) the electing God, (iv) the Incarnate God, (v) God as Spirit, (vi) the Saving and Judging God. It is interesting to note that the biblical theme of creation, reflecting the WCC guidelines, (WCC, 1979) was chosen by the authors as a starting point. It is important to note that the authors, in their Final Reflections, claimed to have "found a consensus" for theological understanding. "It can be described as being inclusivist with an exclusivist loyalty to Jesus Christ" (BMU, 1984, p 35).

Kuin suggested that "the starting point chosen by the IFCG, creation rather than the fall, emphasised the universal rather than the particular nature of the atonement" and reflected the particular 'prejudice' of the committee (Kuin, 1997, p 187).

This was not what the 'exclusivists' had anticipated when they had called for "further investigation into the theological aspects of dialogue." When the report came to be debated, the reaction was hostile. Race's model was disliked by those who felt "compartmentalized" by it (RP 7/8415/2, 791, 801). The report was criticised as being far too one-sided: "an inclusivist manifesto," "unbalanced" and "narcotic in its sweet reasonableness" (RP 7/8415/2, 806, 811, 793) (Kuin, 1997, p 188).

During the debate on the report there were attempts to replace the word "commend" to the theological colleges by the word "submit" and also reinforce an emphasis upon the "uniqueness of Christ". However, these moves were defeated and the report was passed and commended for use in churches and theological colleges by 138 votes to 117. Few reports are passed with so narrow a margin... the length of debate, number of amendments and necessity for a counted vote, register the displeasure of the 'exclusivists'. It appeared that in passing the report, Synod had given its first explicit backing to an articulated 'inclusivist' approach to religious pluralism. (Kuin, 1997, pages 188-189)
Unease over the report was also reflected at the sixth meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC-6) held in Nigeria in 1984:

We thought the book needed a greater emphasis on the doctrine of redemption, and we questioned some of its biblical exegesis, as well as the selectivity of biblical texts. People from non-Western societies, especially found the approach too academic and cerebral, and thus it was classified as largely irrelevant to them. (ACC-6, 1984. report Bonds of Affection. pp. 84-86)

The next report of significance, in relation to people of other Faiths, to come from the Church of England was the report of the Doctrine Commission *The Mystery of Salvation* (MS 1995). This was the third in a series of three; the others being *We Believe in God* (1987) and *We Believe in the Holy Spirit* (1991). They were all published under the authority of the House of Bishops and commended by the House to the Church for study. Chapter 7 of *The Mystery of Salvation*, 'Christ and the world faiths' addressed "the ways in which Christian understanding of salvation bears upon other faiths". The authors admitted that this was one of the subjects "at which we had to work the hardest"(MS, 1995, p xi).

Although Race's typology was once more referred to, there was an attempt to move beyond these paradigms, which had proved unhelpful in earlier debates, (see pages 53-54) towards 'an open and generous exclusivism', 'a Christocentric inclusivism', or a 'trinitarian pluralism'(MS, 1995 p 171). Reference was also made to D'Costa's 'Trinitarian Christology' (MS, 1995, p 177). But these were all brief references with no attempt at any in-depth analysis. However, the report was well received by Synod in July 1996 and carried with the following motion:

That the Doctrine Commission report *The Mystery of Salvation* be warmly commended for study and use especially by the teaching institutions of the Church, and that it be recognised as a substantial contribution to the Church. (Prof Anthony Thiselton, in RP 7/9627/2,453) (Kuin, 1997, p 196)
The report looked at the theology of salvation and the "'exclusivists' hoped that their desire for dogmatic theology would be satisfied by the Doctrine Commission. However, in recognition of the 'privileges and responsibilities' of being a National Church, the report is once again set in the context of pastoral realities"(Kuin, 1997, p 193). This tension between orthodoxy and pastoralia prevails throughout the theology of religions debate, and particularly so for the Church of England as a national church with a pastoral responsibility for the wider community. Dealing with this tension creates ambiguity. For example, the report stated that:

a) God will save ultimately those who are willing to be saved, by their penitence and acceptance of the love which stretches out to them, in the way that it meets them in their lives and within their traditions. (MS, 1995, pp 193-184)

This statement, which acknowledges the grace of God within the lives and traditions of people of other Faiths, shows a pastoral awareness which is reflected by a pluralist/universalist theological stance.

b) There is only one way, but that way is one that is without barbed wire or boundary fences, so that all may join this way. (MS, 1995, p 184)

This is an inclusivist approach affirming the theology of 'one way' but allowing that all may be included in this way. It mirrors the consensus arrived at by the authors of *Towards a Theology for Inter-faith Dialogue* that "it can be described as being inclusivist with an exclusivist loyalty to Jesus Christ" (BMU, 1984). (see page 54)

c) We believe that God has chosen to provide the fullest revelation of himself in Christ, and the fullest revelation of his love for all humanity in the cross and resurrection. Hence we naturally pray that God will bring all people, including those of other faiths, to explicit faith in Christ and membership of his Church. (MS, 1995, p 184)

This statement reflected a more explicit exclusivist theology with no recognition of the salvific value of other Faith traditions.
Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to examine the theological response of the Church of England to religious pluralism. In order to do this it was necessary to go back to the WCC and BCC/CCBI documents because these formed the foundation to the Church of England's thinking.

Although theological questions in relation to mission and people of other Faiths had been on the agenda of the ecumenical mission bodies since Edinburgh 1910, the impetus for an explicit theology of religions began with the establishment in 1971 of the Dialogue with People of Other Faiths and Ideologies (DFI) sub-unit of the WCC in Geneva. This was followed, in Britain, by the establishment in 1978 of the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths (CRPOF). The Church of England's Board of Mission established the Inter-Faith Consultative Group in 1980 and the Roman Catholic church had established a similar body, the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue following Vatican II in 1965.

The role of all of these bodies was similar: a) to encourage dialogue with people of other Faiths and ideologies, b) to provide guidelines for dialogue and living and working with people of other Faiths and ideologies and c) to resource and encourage theological reflection. The original guidelines published by the WCC in 1979 were received by the BCC and the BCC guidelines subsequently commended by the General Synod of the Church of England in 1981.

While the Church of England commended the BCC guidelines to the churches, in view of earlier heated debates over the issue of church buildings (see page 52, 54), it called for further reflection on the theological issues of religious pluralism. This resulted in the document Towards a Theology for Inter-faith dialogue (BMU 1984). The Synodical debates following this document highlighted the inadequacy of Race's
three-fold typology and the discomfort of many with the idea of 'labelling'.

According to Kuin:

...'exclusivism' was defined solely in terms of dogmatic theology, while 'inclusivism' was a mixture of theology and experience. In practice, the Church of England wanted to re-state the exclusive nature of its faith in the context of its responsibility to the non-Christian citizens in Britain. (Kuin, 1997, p 197)

This tension between dogmatic theology, or orthodoxy, and pastoral responsibility and experience runs through all the debates and documents that we have examined, resulting in theological ambiguity and at times a reluctance to give authority to the document.

There has been no follow-up document to *Towards a Theology for Inter-faith Dialogue* and no call from Synod for further theological reflection, which led to that document, since 1979.7 'Open and generous exclusivism' and 'Christocentric inclusivism' among other concepts have been mentioned as alternatives to the three paradigms of 'exclusivism', 'inclusivism' and 'pluralism' but these "are concepts which need rigorous theological investigation and cannot, in their present form offer an alternative systematic approach to the questions raised by religious pluralism" (Kuin, 1997, p 198). In the meantime Synod, clergy and ordinands in theological colleges still work with the Race model. While this model was a useful tool with which to begin the debate in the early 1980s, it now appears to be less helpful because the theoretical paradigms just do not match people's experience.

All the documents that I have examined have stressed the importance of education, and especially theological education. I will return to theological education and particularly training, in Parts Two and Three of this research. Before doing so I will

---

7 This was confirmed by the Secretary to IFCG on 11 October 1998
look at the Diocese of Chelmsford’s Response to Religious pluralism, which is the subject of the following chapter.
Chapter 4  The Diocese of Chelmsford’s Response to Religious and Cultural Diversity

Introduction

Chapter 1 situated this investigation in the context of the Diocese of Chelmsford in multi-Faith Britain. Chapters 2 and 3 examined the theological reflection that has taken place within the World Council of Churches, the wider Church and in Britain. The aim of this chapter is to examine how the Diocese of Chelmsford has responded to the challenge of religious pluralism with particular reference to how a national report led to a parish initiative which in turn resulted in a centralised Diocesan strategy for inter-Faith work.

The Archbishop of Canterbury’s Commission on Urban Priority Areas (ACCUPA) report *Faith in the City* highlighted many issues and stimulated innovative projects, one of which was the Faith in Community Project in the parish of St Barnabas in Newham Deanery. The aim of the project was to encourage and develop relationships between people of different Faiths in the parish. This in turn led to the appointment of the Bishop of Chelmsford’s Adviser for Inter-Faith Relations and the beginning of a Diocesan strategy for inter-Faith work.

I will attempt to evaluate and assess the Faith in Community project in particular and inter-Faith work in general as a Diocesan response to religious and cultural diversity.

*Faith in the City*

In 1983 the then Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Reverend Dr Runcie, appointed an 18-member Commission, drawn from a wide range of backgrounds, with the following terms of reference:
To examine the strengths, insights, problems and needs of the Church's life and mission in Urban Priority Areas* and, as a result, to reflect on the challenge which God may be making to Church and Nation: and to make recommendations to appropriate bodies (*The term Urban Priority Areas is used to include inner city districts and many large Corporation estates and other areas of social deprivation) (ACCUPA, 1985 Preface iii)

The 398 page report of the Commission, which was published in 1985 as *Faith in the City*, was wide-ranging. Following visits to major cities and having taken evidence which painted a disturbing picture, the report made recommendations to the Church about its place and responsibilities in Urban Priority Areas (UPAs), including involvement in public policy issues related to unemployment, housing, social and community work, education, policing and urban policy.

The report stated that:

...the Christian doctrine of humanity presupposes that we exist in a network of personal and social relationships in which the God-given potential of each one of us is developed, and that we have a deep-rooted solidarity with all other human beings which finds expression in mutual service, sacrificial self-giving and love....A Christian community is one that is open to, and responsible for, the whole of the society in which it is set... (ACCUPA 1985, p 59)

It went on to state that:

This emphasis on 'community' may also help us to come to terms with an important and often conspicuous feature of UPAs in Britain today: the presence of adherents of other faiths. Their arrival in this country has presented the members of Christian churches with theological problems which they have not yet been able to resolve. Does the truth of the Christian gospel exclude all other truth and oblige us to preach against other faiths and seek to convert all their adherents? (ACCUPA 1985, p 60)

The Report concluded that "the Church of England has not yet been able to reach a common mind" on the theological issues (ACCUPA 1985, p 60). However, it stressed that Christians should not withdraw from multi-Faith areas but maintain
their presence and "respect the religion of their fellow citizens as much as they respect their persons, while faithfully witnessing to the truth and primacy of the Christian revelation" (ACCUPA 1985, p 61). It stated that "when people of different faiths find opportunities for practical collaboration and mutual discussion they begin to discover for themselves the riches of our shared humanity and the solidarity created by our common quest for God" (ACCUPA 1985, p 61).

Following this report, the Archbishop of Canterbury set up the Church Urban Fund (CUF), which was to be used specifically for financing local projects in urban areas and particularly UPAs. The Diocese of Chelmsford was successful in acquiring finance from the CUF for several urban initiatives, one of which included the Faith in Community Project.

Faith in Community

As stated in Chapter 1 page 4, large parts of the Diocese of Chelmsford are urban, and some parishes were therefore officially classified as UPAs, so being eligible for funding from the CUF. One such parish was St Barnabas, Manor Park, in the Deanery and Borough of Newham. Newham also happened to be the most multicultural and multi-Faith deanery in the Diocese (Smith, 1995, p 2). However, it was recognised that while people may know their neighbours of other Faiths on a personal level, it was clear that the Faith communities had very little relationship with each other and there was a need to provide opportunities for open and honest dialogue. The Diocesan response to this need was to set up a project with the following aims:

1. to provide opportunities for people in Manor Park to meet, to get to know one another and develop relationships based on trust.
2. to enable Faith communities to educate others about their Faith.
With support from the then Bishop of Chelmsford, the Rt. Revd John Waine, the parish of St Barnabas was successful in securing funds from the CUF to cover the salary for a project worker, to include housing and running costs, for a period of three years. In September 1988 the Faith in Community Project was officially launched at the Commissioning Service of the first Project Worker. At the service the Bishop of Chelmsford spoke of the need to break down the barriers between people of different Faiths and cultures, and to work towards discovering shared values. He stressed that: "It is right for the Church to seek to foster links and promote understanding between people of different religious backgrounds" (Faith in Community, 1990, p 2). This event marked the beginning of the Diocese of Chelmsford's commitment to promoting good inter-Faith relations.

In 1989, during my final year at the West London Institute of Higher Education (see Introduction) I carried out some research into inter-Faith activity at the parish level and I was advised by the Director of the newly formed Inter Faith Network for the United Kingdom that the Manor Park Faith in Community Project was one of the very few parish initiatives of which he was aware. He said that it was exciting and innovative and had the full backing of the parish and Diocese.

I visited the project and met the Co-ordinator and I also sat in on one session of a six week course entitled 'Christianity among other Faiths'. This was attended by approximately 30 people from local churches representing Roman Catholic, Anglican, Methodist and Baptist traditions and included people from a variety of theological backgrounds. "I was left with the impression that everyone attending both enjoyed the experience and found it useful and enlightening" (Davison, 1989)
50). I further concluded that: "These sorts of initiatives may well serve as encouragement to others who are contemplating taking their first steps on this 'unfamiliar journey'" (Davison, 1989 p 50).

Since 1988 Diocesan commitment, at the official level, has increased. Following Diocesan support for the Faith in Community Project, which was a parish based initiative funded solely by the CUF, in 1991 the project was extended to include the whole of the Newham Deanery representing an increase from one parish to 19 parishes. At the same time the co-ordinator also became the Bishop of Chelmsford's Adviser for Inter-Faith Relations. These developments reflected a growing awareness of multi-cultural and multi-Faith issues in areas beyond the boundaries of Manor Park and Newham and an increasing need for the Bishops, clergy and laity in other areas across the Diocese to be resourced.

In 1994, when I joined the Diocese as Inter-Faith Adviser, the brief of the project was further extended to cover not only the Borough of Newham but also the Boroughs of Redbridge ad Waltham Forest, an increase from 19 to 67 parishes. In the same year, the five-year funding for the project from the CUF had ceased and further funds could only be made available for a new project. Therefore alternative sources of funding had to be considered. However, during this process of seeking funds, specific aims, objectives, evaluation processes and management control had to be clearly laid down and neither I nor the Diocese were very clear about any of these issues. For example, the proposal which was put forward for funding purposes stated that a second project worker should be employed to 'promote understanding and cooperation between people of different faiths in Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest'. However, it was never made explicit as to how this should be achieved, evaluated or monitored.
In view of these uncertainties the process of fund-raising ceased and I spent the year of 1994/5 evaluating the current level of inter-Faith co-operation in these three boroughs as part of a larger process of addressing the needs of the Diocese as a whole and working towards a Diocesan strategy for inter-Faith relations.

During this time, through a process of visits to organisations, interviews and consultations, I discovered that many people in these boroughs, and particularly in Newham, were already working in an inter-Faith mode by virtue of the ethnicity of the areas. Therefore dialogue at the level of the 'dialogue of life' and co-operation, if not explicitly Faith related dialogue, was already happening in many forms and in many contexts, albeit implicitly rather than explicitly. This prompted me to question the focus of the work of the project, the main aim of which was to bring people of different Faiths together (see pages 62-63). Furthermore, the needs as perceived by the Parish of St Barnabas in 1988 were not necessarily the same as the needs of the three boroughs in 1995. The Diocese therefore had to decide upon the wisdom of putting valuable resources into an area of work when it was already happening naturally.

During 1994/5, I became aware, through parish contacts, of the need for more work to be done in the area of education at all levels, with both clergy and laity if they were to respond adequately to the ACCUPA report which called on Christians to "respect the religion of their fellow citizens as much as they respect their persons, while faithfully witnessing to the truth and primacy of the Christian revelation" (ACCUPA, 1985, p 61). If Christians are to "respect the religion of their fellow citizens" and "faithfully witness to the truth and primacy of the Christian revelation",

---

8For example, the Newham Association of Faiths, the Inter-Faith Consultative Committee at Newham College, the Newham Borough Churches Liaison group and Youth, Women's and Elderly People's Clubs.
then they need to be well informed both about the beliefs and practices of those other religions and also confident about the Christian revelation.

After full consultation with the Diocesan Bishop and the project management committee, it was decided that the Faith in Community project should cease to exist and that all Diocesan inter-Faith work should be overseen by a full-time Bishop's Adviser for Inter-Faith Relations, funding for which should be the sole responsibility of the Diocese. In this way inter-Faith work within the Diocese was to become central to Diocesan strategy and not a peripheral initiative.

The Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser

The job description for the Adviser (see appendix 4.1) included the following:

1. to enable the Bishop's understanding of inter-Faith issues to be deepened;
2. to be available to deaneries and parishes as a resource on inter-Faith issues;
3. to help the laity and clergy reflect on the theological, pastoral and social implications of life in a society of manyFaiths;
4. to encourage and support clergy and stipendiary workers in multi-Faith settings, including those in chaplaincy roles, Diocese-wide;
5. to organise study days, courses and conferences for Christians on inter-Faith issues and generally keep abreast of inter-Faith matters by reading and attending conferences.

Each of the above points needs further comment. While the first point, ‘to enable the Bishop's understanding of inter-Faith issues to be deepened’, has remained essentially the same since 1995, the requirement now is that all bishops, the Diocesan and the three Area Bishops, should be kept informed of issues. This happens through regular written reports, occasional meetings and response to specific requests.
In practice, points 2 (to be available to deaneries and parishes as a resource on inter-Faith issues) and 4 (to encourage and support clergy and stipendiary workers in multi-Faith settings, including those in chaplaincy roles, Diocese-wide) combine in the form of talks and presentations to parishes, deaneries or chapters or else in response to specific requests for advice from clergy, both those in parishes and those in chaplaincies.

Point 3 (to help the laity and clergy reflect on the theological, pastoral and social implications of life in a society of many Faith) and 5 (to organise study days, courses and conferences for Christians on inter-Faith issues) are also combined in an educational programme. However, whereas in 1994/5 I arranged my own conferences and workshops, this educational process has now come under the umbrella of the central Diocesan programme for both clergy and lay education and training. In other words I am the resource person giving the input while the Diocesan education staff administer and organise the workshops and conferences. There are two advantages to this way of working. First the Adviser is relieved of the time-consuming administrative work and secondly, of more importance, it is an indication that inter-Faith issues are becoming more mainstream to the life of the Diocese. Rather than being seen as a fringe activity organised by a fringe member of staff at the extreme western edge of the Diocese, inter-Faith issues are now clearly part of the mainstream teaching being organised and run by the central Diocesan office.

In relation to points 3) and 5) above and a centralised training programme, the need for further education and training in inter-Faith issues can be illustrated by the following two examples; the first taken from a county town/rural area and the second from a suburban area.
1  A priest in Chelmsford had been approached by a young girl of 17 with a request to have her four month old baby baptised. She had previously requested permission to marry her Turkish boyfriend in the church. When asked what religion he was, she did not know. Furthermore, the boy's legal residential status was not clear. The priest was faced with two problems. First, he suspected that the boy was using the girl as a way of remaining in the country. Second, he was worried that if the boy was Muslim there might well be serious repercussions for them. From my conversation with the priest he appeared to know very little about Muslim belief and practice in general and issues related to mixed marriages in particular.

2  The second case involved a priest in the suburban area of Ilford who was new to the parish. He and his wife were keen to reach out to the community by way of the playgroup and a pram service for young mothers. However, the area in which he lived had a very large Jewish population and he had already perceived some hostility from some Jewish mothers following an invitation by him to a Christingle\(^9\) service. He admitted to me that he did not know how to proceed. He did not know the religious make-up of the parish. Although he knew there were a large number of Jews he did not know, in his own words, 'how to work with Jews'. From the conversation he seemed to be unaware of how much Christianity and Judaism could share without any form of compromise and, perhaps even more important, the need for sensitivity in Jewish/Christian relations. Coming from an evangelical tradition he admitted to living with a tension between pastoralia and orthodoxy. For example, at the death of a person who was not Christian, how does he respond to the bereaved over questions about salvation, heaven and eternal life? Pastorally he said he would wish to assure the bereaved of some form of life after death, but his understanding of

\(^9\) A service which originated in the Moravian Church, Germany in 1747. It is very popular with children and uses the symbolism of the orange as the world and a candle as the light of Christ. Today the Children's Society promotes the service in many churches for fundraising purposes.
Christian orthodoxy from an evangelical perspective would incline him to deny any salvation to a non-Christian.

These are just two examples which illustrate the point made in the introduction regarding an appropriate training for the clergy and which led to this research.

An area of work that has developed between 1996 and 1998 is the interface between the Church and secular organisations. For example, at the time of this research a great deal of co-operation was taking place between the religious leaders of all Faiths and the London Boroughs of Newham and Waltham Forest. This had come about for two reasons. First, the desire that communities, embracing all sections of society, should work together for the benefit of all, and secondly the increasing number of occasions when a civic ceremony has a multi-Faith perspective. As Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser to the Church of England, which has an all-embracing statutory role as described in Chapter 1 page 6, I participate in consultation processes with secular organisations and advise on, and take part in, multi-Faith services.

The role of the Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser has changed significantly since 1991 when the Diocese officially appointed the project worker as Inter-Faith Adviser. This is partly due to the changing context and consequent changing needs, but also reflects the vision, perception and opportunism of the post-holder. In response to these changes a new job description, which also includes an international dimension, has now been agreed. (Appendix 4.2)

Conclusion

The report Faith in the City highlighted many of the issues facing urban ministry, including the theological implications for Christians in relation to people of other Faiths. Following the report the Church Urban Fund was established and the
Diocese of Chelmsford was successful in securing funds in order to employ a co-ordinator for the Manor Park Faith in Community Project.

For the first two years (1988-1989), the project focused solely on the parish of St Barnabas in Manor Park and relationships were established with the local mosques, Hindu temples and the Sikh gurdwara, all being within the boundary of the parish. Courses for local Christians, which included the Roman Catholics, Methodists, URC and Baptists, were organised and generally seen to be successful when I visited the project as part of my research (see page 63).

Looking back over the past ten years it can be seen that overt Diocesan commitment to inter-Faith work has increased. It is also clear that there needs to be an ongoing process of evaluation in a field of ministry that is new and is rapidly changing. Success is extremely difficult to evaluate, as it is in any area of Christian ministry apart from membership and electoral role numbers. Although the Faith in Community project ceased to exist, viewed from the Diocesan perspective the project was successful; it was the seed from which the Diocesan strategy grew.

In terms of education, while a process of education began at an early stage of the project among the local laity, (see page 63) this only happened within the Christian community, whereas the original vision of the project (point 2 on page 62) was 'to enable Faith communities to educate others about their faith'. While there is no evidence of education about other Faiths happening within other Faith communities, the process of education within the Church has continued and has now become mainstream. However, as pointed out above (see page 68) there is evidence of a need for more clergy training in this area.
In summary, 1) inter-Faith issues in the Diocese of Chelmsford have become much more mainstream to the Church both in terms of education and theological awareness; 2) dialogue of life, or interaction between people of different Faiths, is happening naturally in many different contexts rather than in contrived situations; 3) there is a growing partnership between all the Faith communities and the secular and civic organisations and 4) there is a continuing and growing need for education and training for laity and particularly clergy.

From the experience of the Faith in Community Project and with an awareness of the sociological changes described in Chapter 1, I would suggest that constant evaluation, particularly in relation to context, is necessary; that aims and objectives for any project or post-holder should be realistically set and that 'success' should be looked for within the process, perhaps as the achievement of modest goals rather than as a final aim.

The need for theological reflection and particularly an appropriate training for ministry in a multi-Faith society were highlighted where I gave two examples of priests who were struggling with this issue. In Part Two I shall examine the general training policies of the Church of England with particular reference to multi-Faith and multi-cultural ministry.
PART TWO - THE CLERGY
Training Policies

Introduction

In this section I shall be exploring the training policies for Church of England clergy as at the end of 1998. The provision of clergy training is inevitably linked with the question of ministry and what type of ministry is appropriate for today's society, bearing in mind the social changes referred to in Part One, Chapters 1 and 4.

In response to these social changes, various types of ministry within the Church of England have evolved over the past twenty years. Alongside full-time parochial stipendiary ministry there is now full-time and part-time non-stipendiary ministry, local non-stipendiary ministry, a growth in all forms of chaplaincy and sector work, Reader ministry, accredited and non-accredited stipendiary lay ministry and numerous other lay ministries which may or may not be formally recognised by the Diocese.

This research is only concerned with training for ordained ministry but the existence of all other forms of ministry, particularly a growth in lay ministry, affects the perception of the role of the clergy. The parish priest today may function as a discerner, facilitator, enabler or a manager of other people's ministries; possibly across several parishes. This style of ministry requires the ability to work in a team, often referred to as collaborative ministry, or ministry as partnership, and demands the acquisition of particular knowledge and skills that have not traditionally been part of clergy training. Collaborative ministry also raises the question of the nature of the priesthood and the relationship of the ordained ministry to the ministry of the whole People of God.
The need to clarify the rationale of theological education was stated clearly by the Archbishop of Canterbury at an address given at Great St Mary's, Cambridge on 26th September 1986:

The time has come for us to grasp the nettle. The rationale of theological education in the Church of England has never been made fully explicit. Will we ever be able to equip people to exercise ordained ministry properly in the Church of England until we have come to a clearer understanding of the sort of ordained ministry the Church of England requires?...

The need to clarify satisfactorily the aims of our theological education will need much greater agreement... Debate on these matters is nothing new but I believe the opportunity now exists for a focusing of this debate in a way that has not happened before. (Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry [ACCM] 1987, p 7)

Reference was also made in this address to the changes that had taken place over the previous twenty years in the content and style of academic theology, the effects of university cuts and the rising costs of academic fees, which called for a reassessment of the relationship between colleges and university faculties of theology.

The urgent need for a reassessment of clergy training in the Church of England in 1986 was taken seriously and resulted in the report *Education for the Church's Ministry: the Report of the Working Party on Assessment*, ACCM Occasional Paper No 22, January 1987 (henceforth referred to as ACCM 22). This paper was adopted by the House of Bishops and has had far-reaching effects on the subsequent provision of clergy training.

The provision of training that is appropriate for a multi-Faith and multi-cultural society is the main concern of this research. Ideally this provision should be integral to overall training and not an 'optional extra'. This section therefore looks at the
overall provision of training for clergy with multi-Faith and multi-cultural ministry in mind.

The document ACCM 22, which will be the subject Chapter 5, provides an overview of policies prior to 1986, together with recommendations for future training policy. In Chapter 6 I will examine the initial responses from the Colleges and Courses to these recommendations and Chapter 7 will be an analysis of more recent curriculum material. In Chapter 8 I will look specifically at provision for Post Ordination Training (POT) and Continuing Ministerial Training (CME) together with the implications of the current training provision for the Diocese of Chelmsford.

Reference is made throughout Part Two to Colleges and Courses. By way of clarification, 'colleges' have traditionally been understood to be providers of full-time training for ordinands in a residential setting, while 'courses' offer training on a part-time, non-residential basis. However, ACCM Occasional Paper 38, *Residence - An Education*, 1990 stresses that this is a simplistic view.
Chapter 5  The National Policy

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explore the development of clergy training in the Church of England with particular reference to the outworking of policies proposed in ACCM 22 and subsequently adopted by the House of Bishops for implementation. Extensive reference will be made to this Report, including relevant quotations. This is necessary because of the influence the Report has had on training policy. The in-depth analysis is necessary here in order to appreciate fully the discussions which will follow in subsequent chapters.

This discussion will include the history of the General Ministerial Examination (GME) leading to its demise in 1987 and the subsequent decentralisation of curriculum planning and assessment procedures, together with attempts to arrive at an agreed general policy for clergy training.

The Demise of the General Ministerial Examination (GME)

The traditional pattern for those training for ministry in the Church of England for many years was for the academically able to read theology at a university following which the ordinand would either be attached to a parish in an 'apprenticeship' role under the direction of an experienced priest, or more commonly would attend a theological college where he would study such subjects as doctrine, worship and the sacraments, preaching and pastoralia.¹⁰

¹⁰The pronoun 'he' is used here because at the time referred to there were no women priests in the Church of England, although there had been some debate about the status of 'ordained' deaconesses in relation to ordained deacons. (see Deacons in the Ministry of the Church: a Report commissioned by the House of Bishops. pp 18-22, Church House Publishing 1988).
The rationale for this pattern was that in the university the biblical and historical groundwork for theology was firmly laid, while in the theological college the further confessional, vocational and practical needs of the ordained were catered for. (Baelz, 1983, p 5)

In 1921 the House of Bishops, in order to regularise clergy training, decided that all ordination candidates should sit the General Ordination Examination (GOE). This was based on a common syllabus and provided a central means of assessment. The examination included Holy Scripture, Doctrine, Church History and Worship.
"Ethics was not always included and there has only been a formal assessment of Pastoral Studies since 1978" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 15). At the discretion of the College principal, graduates were exempt from those subjects which they had studied at university. By 1960, candidates over the age of 30 were permitted to submit essays for assessment. This became known as the 'Essay Scheme' and was used by most part-time students. By 1978 the GOE was also used for assessing candidates for lay ministry including the training of Deaconesses and so the examination was renamed the General Ministerial Examination (GME).

Although the GME was meant to provide a centralised, common syllabus and means of assessment, Colleges (and subsequently Courses) were permitted to submit their own assessment schemes "for recognition by ACCM as offering a standard of assessment equivalent to GME " (ACCM 22, 1987, p 16). However, "In most instances no provision [was] made for regular review of either the syllabuses or assessment procedure of these recognised equivalents or for reporting examination or assessment results to ACCM." (ACCM 22, 1987, p 16)

By 1987, when the Working Party on Assessment produced the report ACCM 22, 15 out of the 16 Colleges which were recognised for training, offered alternative programmes to the GME. These were offered to candidates under 30 and assessed by a body other than GME. The findings of the Working Party showed that very few
candidates sat the GME and many of those over 30 did not do the Essay Scheme (ACCM 22, 1987, p 17).

The Working Party concluded that:

the low regard in which GME is held by many colleges and the desire of many colleges and courses to offer alternative programmes leading to the award of certificates, diplomas and degrees, suggested that it would be unsatisfactory merely to look at methods of assessment for GME, whether for candidates under 30 or over. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 17)

Other factors were noted, for example:

the lack of agreed expectations for ministry and therefore for theological education. This is reflected in the scarcity and generality of agreed statements about what is to be achieved or assessed in theological education. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 17)

the syllabus is not explicit about the qualities most desirable in a minister, nor do the assessment procedures provide either satisfactory means of assessing the development of those qualities...the syllabus and assessment procedures were originally drawn up on a piecemeal basis and they are largely (if not completely) academic. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 18)

the syllabus itself is problematic. It has developed over many years and contains widely varying styles of presentation. Still more seriously the development of its parts, and the addition of new parts, have not taken into account either the time available for study, either two or three years, in residential colleges, or the different pattern of study followed in non-residential courses. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 19)

little is said in the GME syllabus about educational method...too much emphasis has been placed on the presentation and assimilation of information by lectures, with little use of methods which may bring more reflection...little attention seems to have been paid to the need to be aware of the particular ways in which adults may be motivated to learn...people are taught principles, and then left to reflect on them privately, with little opportunity for critical discussion...people fail to learn to deal theologically with experience, either their own or others'. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 20)
It is against this background and at the request of the Moderator of GME, that the Working Party was appointed by the Committee for Theological Education (CTE) of the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry (ACCM). The task of the Working Party was to consider "the present procedures for assessment of centrally selected candidates for accredited lay and ordained ministry under and over 30 years of age" and "how methods of assessment of GME might be further co-ordinated with the programmes and subject matter of teaching in colleges and courses..." (ACCM 22, 1987, p 11).

The Working Party concluded that:

We were clear that any proposals we made must recognise the need to clarify the aims, objectives and practices of theological education and its means of assessment, and must attempt to regularise and rationalise the present procedures for recognising and monitoring alternatives to GME, in order that they might provide appropriate patterns of education and assessment for candidates for the Church's ministry. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 17) (my emphases)

Considering the low use of the GME and the criticisms expressed by the Working Party, it is not surprising that the Report ACCM 22 recommended that “there should no longer be a centrally defined syllabus and assessment procedure" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 25). The recommended alternative to the GME was that:

the responsibility for devising appropriate programmes of training schedules and assessment within parameters formed by agreed policy should be devolved to the staff of colleges and courses and be closely supervised and monitored by the appropriate ACCM committees and a Board of Examiners. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 25) (my emphases)

As previously stated, (see page 73 above) this recommendation, as contained in ACCM 22, was adopted by the House of Bishops for implementation. Such a radical change in training policy, namely the abolition of the GME and any form of centralised curriculum planning and assessment procedures and the devolution of these responsibilities to the Colleges and Courses, has stimulated a great deal of
theological reflection on the purpose of theological education and the type of ministry that the Church of England seeks. ACCM 22 was a turning point in clergy training policy. This provided an opportunity for a theological review with the potential to include training needs for multi-Faith and multi-cultural ministry. The extent to which this has been achieved will be discussed in the following chapters.

Devolution of Responsibility to the Colleges and Courses
Although in theory, as mentioned above, the GOE and GME system provided a centralised training policy, the Working Party which produced ACCM 22 discovered that in practice there was great diversity in curriculum planning and forms of assessment, with very few students actually taking the GME. The decision to decentralise and give responsibility to the colleges and courses under the supervision of ACCM was a recognition and ratification of an existing practice.

Diversity in training provision had evolved over a period of time as a result of new forms of ministry and reflected a need to provide for older ordinands, both men and women, who were training on a part-time basis. However, such diversity highlighted the need for a clear rationale for clergy training. ACCM 22 states that:

Underlying most of the problems ... is a failure of those responsible in the Church adequately to specify the kind of theological education it expects and needs; a consequent failure of those responsible for theological education to formulate what is required to meet the Church's needs, and to communicate with each other in achieving what is needed; and a failure to monitor and supervise the content, method and balance of the education as well as its assessment. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 22) (original emphases)

Although the authors of the Report appeared to be critical of those responsible for training, there was at the same time recognition of the value of many of the initiatives that were taking place in the Colleges and Courses, particularly where these involved developing relationships with universities and other providers of
theological education. It was agreed that such initiatives should be encouraged within the framework of a clear rationale for theological education (ACCM 22, 1987, p 23).

In order to develop a clear rationale, ACCM 22 stated that three issues had to be considered jointly by ACCM and the Colleges and Courses. These issues were:

1. What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?

2. What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?

3. What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for ordination to exercise this ministry? (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24)

ACCM 22 recommended that through the Committee for Theological Education (CTE, a sub-committee of ACCM), a general policy for each of the above questions should be agreed between ACCM and the corporate body of Colleges and Courses. In order to facilitate this process, suggested outline answers to these questions were given in the Report (ACCM 22, 1987, pp 27-50). Following this general policy, it was proposed that each Course and College should agree their specific policies with ACCM for the implementation of its own educational programme, and that all proposals and programmes should be subject to review by ACCM at regular five year intervals (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24).

These proposals were:

intended to clarify the procedures for devolution of responsibility and to define clearly the accountability of colleges and courses to the Church and the supervisory and regulating role of ACCM. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 25) (original emphases)

It was anticipated that this process, whereby ACCM agreed the general policy with all Courses and Colleges, and each College and Course developed specific proposals

In looking to the future, the authors recognised that:

the acceptance and implementation of such policy and procedures will have wide-ranging implications (for ACCM, theological colleges and courses and their staff and students) which are not discussed in this report, and that these also will need to be considered by the Committee for Theological Education. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 53)

The success or failure of this radical change in policy was dependent upon the overall agreement by ACCM and the Courses and Colleges on the general policy, the basis of which was to be the answers to the three fundamental questions outlined above, namely:

1. What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?

2. What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?

3. What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for ordination to exercise this ministry? (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24)

The first question that has to be addressed is "What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?" The following two questions depend upon the answer to the first. Given the diverse nature of the Church of England in theology and churchmanship and taking into consideration the social context as described in Part One, this question, which had never seriously been addressed before (see pp 73, 79), presented a challenge to all involved in theological education. An evaluation of how the Colleges and Courses have responded to ACCM 22 will be the subject of Chapter
6. In the meantime, and because of the radical nature of ACCM 22, it is worth considering the key points which were suggested as guidelines for the Courses and Colleges in their initial response to the above questions; this being part of the process towards agreeing a general policy.

Towards a General Policy - What Ordained Ministry does the Church of England Require?

The fundamental question that has to be faced by the Church of England and all those providing clergy training is: "What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?". In other words, "What is the Church of England training people for?" or "What is the aim of clergy training?". In order for any movement towards a general policy to take place, there must be some consensus among ACCM and the Colleges and Courses as to how to answer this question. More particularly, each College and Course must be clear about its aims and objectives in order to development its own training programme.

In order to assist the Colleges and Courses in this exercise, ACCM 22 suggested that a helpful approach would be to start with "the task and nature of the Church as the basis of ministry." It further suggested that "training and assessment is for the ministry of the Church, and only secondarily training for the diverse situations in which those trained by colleges and courses will serve" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). It did, however, concede that "Such diversities will no doubt need to be considered in the context of particular colleges and courses, but as a whole the Church must manifest its own nature in its ministry, and determine to train its ministry accordingly" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27) (original emphases)

Regarding the task of the Church, the document stated that it was:
to serve the mission of God in the world. So, regardless of the diversity of situations within which it does so, its task is fundamentally twofold: to proclaim the creative activity of God by which the world is constituted in its proper nature by God, affirming the world so far as it reflects its proper nature; and to proclaim the redemptive activity of God by which the world is once again given its proper being, thereby to be fulfilled according to God's purposes. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27) (original emphases)

The authors of the Report affirmed that this task is a ministry of the whole people of God and "the Church of England is committed therefore to a ministry of the whole people of God and within that to an ordained ministry" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 28) (original emphases). Furthermore, these two kinds of ministry are interdependent; that the corporate task of the Church as the people of God on the one hand, and ordained ministry on the other, "animate each other, each focusing the activity of God - the work of the Holy Spirit - in the other; each therefore 'brings the other to be' in the way which God's mission in the world requires" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 28).

In this process of interanimation between corporate and ordained ministry,

the ordained minister has the task of focusing the ministry of the whole Church, but is charged also to do so by recognising, coordinating and distributing the ministry of others. It is a mistake to see this work in purely managerial terms or through the ideology of leadership or social position. The ordained minister is to be seen as seeking to bring the creative and redemptive work of God to fruition in the ministry of others in the world. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 29) (original emphases)

This form of ministry, with an emphasis upon facilitating the ministry of others, and particularly the laity, has resulted in a move towards collaborative ministry and demands specific leadership skills.\textsuperscript{11} Whether or not the acquisition of these skills has become part of clergy training will be discussed in later chapters. In 1987, however, authors of the Report claimed that:

The proper relationship between the ministry of the whole people of God and that of ordained ministry joined in the service of God's

\textsuperscript{11}The term 'collaborative' is not universally popular within the Church. Some see it in a perjorative way when related to collaboration during the Second World War. The term 'partnership' is then used in preference.
activity in the world, has proved difficult for the Church to maintain not least at present. There have been constant tendencies for the tasks of one in practice to be allowed to subsume those of the other. (ACCM 22, 1987, p.29)

Apart from demanding specific skills, collaborative ministry also raises the question of whether or not 'lay training' and 'ordination training' should take place separately or jointly. ACCM 22 made no attempt to answer this question but simply stated that wherever training takes place, whether in a College or on a Course, that "training should be of such a kind as to produce interdependent ministry" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 30).

The Report stated that the task of the Church is "to proclaim the creative activity of God by which the world is constituted in its proper nature by God, affirming the world so far as it reflects its proper nature; and to proclaim the redemptive activity of God by which the world is once again given its proper being" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). Such a task necessitates ongoing engagement with the world and prompts the question, "can there be education for ministry which sets this task aside for the duration of training?" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 30). This raises the question, which is discussed at length in the ACCM Occasional Paper No 38 Residence - an Education 1990, regarding the best context for training; a 'residential' College or a 'non-residential' Course? There are arguments for and against both forms of training which are discussed later. (see pages 105-106)

Reference was made earlier to the primary aim of ordination training as being to equip clergy for "the ministry of the Church, and only secondarily for the diverse situations in which those trained will serve" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). It was suggested that the diverse situations could be the responsibility of particular Colleges and Courses. (see page 82) It was also recognised that:

The number and kinds of situations in which the Church is called to serve in the mission of God in the world are virtually without limit,
and, by virtue of its commitment to be the Church in England, the Church of England attempts to fulfil its task in all of them. [see Chapter 1 pages 4-8] Confronted with an endeavour of this magnitude, however, there is some danger that the Church will conceive its task in terms both too narrow and too wide to focus its work effectively or to measure its progress... It may therefore seek to train omnicompetent ordained ministers who will become preoccupied with concerns which are not central to the task of the church or who will take upon themselves tasks which are those of the whole people of God. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 30)

Apart from developing "a basis for co-operation in ministry with other churches" the document identified a "need for a 'typology' of the situations with which the Church should be most concerned, and a differentiation of those who are to be responsible in them, whether the whole people of God or the ordained ministry"(ACCM 22, 1987, p 32). (original emphases) This is a task which would require theological, spiritual and practical discrimination. It was not made clear as to whether the responsibility for such prioritising, or forming a 'typology', should fall with the 'general' policy makers, being ACCM and the corporate body of Colleges and Courses, or the 'specific' policy and programme makers being the individual Colleges and Courses.

In view of the pluralistic nature of English society, including the multi-Faith and multi-cultural dimension, and the diverse situations which were "virtually without limit", the Colleges and Courses, whether jointly or individually, faced the difficult task of prioritising

ACCM 22 posed the question, "What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?" as a starting point towards a general policy, or strategy, for theological training. The Report placed the ministry of the clergy within the ministry of Christ in the Church and stated that training "is for the ministry of the whole Church" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). The importance of the interdependence between the corporate ministry of the people of God and the ministry of the ordained clergy was
stressed, together with the need to co-operate with other churches and prioritise between different situations or contexts for ministry.

This kind of ministry, which is interdependent, collaborative and able to prioritise and differentiate between different situations and types of ministry, "calls for people who are committed" and "who are prepared in ministry in this task" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 33). Such preparation, or formation for ministry is personal, but not individualistic, and should aim to develop intellectual, spiritual and practical qualities in their inter-relatedness (ACCM 22, 1987, p 33). They are qualities which will continue to develop throughout ministry as a "lifelong process of personal development" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 34). (original emphases) This concept of clergy training as continuing development, places great importance on the provision of POT and CME and will be discussed in Chapter 8.

The foregoing is an account of how a strategy for clergy training could be approached by answering the question: "What Ordained Ministry does the Church of England Require?" Having suggested this approach, ACCM 22 then moved to the second question: "What is the shape of the Educational Programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?"

Towards a General Policy - What is the shape of the Educational Programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?

The Report began by stressing that "the purpose of the educational programme of a theological college is theological and to provide for the ministry of the Church of England" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 35). Prior to 1987 the choice of subject-matter and method had been conditioned by certain inherited conventions which "lie at the
roots of the present difficulties of theological education" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 35).

(original emphases) The authors of ACCM 22 discovered

a bewildering variety of 'essential' subjects and accompanying methods - biblical (including varieties of critical method and the study of Greek), doctrinal (including philosophical questions), historical (including institutional issues), liturgical (including the meaning, history and setting of ritual) and practical (including basic and applied ethics and general pastoral studies with placements).

(ACCM 22, 1987, p 35)

Over the years each of these subjects had become overly academic resulting in "the intellectualization of the subject and the loss of its connection with other subjects" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 35). In order to counter-balance this intellectualization, many subjects developed 'practical' counterparts, such as 'practical' hermeneutics, 'experience-based' doctrinal themes and pastoral placements. However, this led in some cases to "anti-intellectual skill-dominated notions of ministry" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 36).

The result of these tendencies has been a Babel-like profusion of variations, combinations and recombinations, generating an ever-larger body of knowledge and expertise with which no-one can keep abreast. Even 'experts' in any field find it more and more difficult to find and formulate their 'subject', 'method', and 'practice' whether for themselves or for their students. In other words the very conventions by which subjects have been chosen for theological education have produced the difficulties of present theological education. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 36)

While on the one hand this growth in both academic and practical subjects could have been seen as a sign of health, on the other hand it presented a dilemma in that the Colleges and Courses still operated within certain constraints, particularly given the time available for teaching. Prioritising and choosing which subjects to fit into the programme became very difficult.

One symptom of this difficulty is the perennial dissatisfaction on all sides - by students, college and course staff and examiners, for example - with the demands being made; the particular interest one serves - academic or practical, this subject or that, this method or that - is never well-enough served The possibility for dissatisfaction is the
greater because so many of the expectations are left implicit; one does not know what should have been done until after one has failed to do it. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 36)

ACCM 22 suggested that a way out of that unsatisfactory situation was to "step behind the conventions which dictate the choice of subjects, methods and practices, and to arrive at a shared understanding of what theological education is for, and where it leads" and that the fundamental aim of theological education should be "to enable the student to grow in those personal qualities by which, with and through the corporate ministry of the Church, the creative and redemptive activity of God may be proclaimed and realised in the world" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 37). (original emphases) Such personal qualities included a knowledge of God's activity in the world and the ability "to respond to it, participate in it, be animated by it in relationships with others" and the thrust of theological education should be on "the wisdom and godly habit of life and how they are to be exercised in and through the corporate ministry of the Church of England for the world (ACCM 22, 1987, p 37). (original emphases) It would be interesting to know just how these personal qualities were to be assessed.

The objectives suggested by ACCM 22 for Theological Education were threefold:

(i) Interpretation of the Christian Tradition for today

This would necessitate "a deep and intelligent inquiry into the Christian Scripture and tradition...while also relating that to present circumstances" (ACCM 22, 1987, pp 39,40). (original emphases)

(ii) The formation of Church Life

ACCM 22 suggests that any programme must include "a deep inquiry into the condition of the Church's life as called by Jesus Christ and living from the energy of the Holy Spirit" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 40). (original emphases)
The central issue is how a new social order is re-established by God's activity within the damaged order of existence in the world...how is this new social order formed through the redemptive activity of God, how is it structured in its life, how is it realised through the relationships which constitute the Church, how are these maintained and spread through corporate and ordained ministry? (ACCM 22, 1987, p 40)

Any attempt to answer these questions will require theological understanding and consideration of ecclesial and personal issues, church history, worship, ethics, sociology and psychology (ACCM 22, 1987, p 41). This is a wide range of subjects, including sociology and psychology which had not been traditionally part of clergy training.

(iii) Addressing Situations in the World

If the task of the Church is to serve the mission of God in the world (see page 83), then theological education should aim to "form the ordinand in a wisdom and habit of life by which to identify the situations in which the Church is formed and to which it must address itself" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 41). (original emphases) The importance of the need for discernment in identifying both the situations and the appropriate form of ministry, i.e. lay or clerical, was stressed above (see pages 84-85). Here, under objective (iii) of Objectives for Theological Education, the Report suggested that such an inquiry can be done at the generalised level and at the more particular, localised level. Before any form of discernment or prioritising can take place it is essential that ordinands and those already in ministry, have a clear understanding of both the general and the local context. In this respect the content of Part One, chapter 1 of this thesis is crucial.

Towards a General Policy - What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for the exercise of this ministry?

The Working Party on Assessment, in preparing ACCM 22, discovered a great variation in assessment procedures prior to 1986. (see page 76) Agreement on a
general policy for assessment across all Colleges and Courses, including those which used external validation procedures, was an essential element in the proposed new strategy for training.

Colleges and Courses were asked to take the following points into consideration when formulating their strategy for assessment:

- assessment procedures in pre-ordination training should be seen to relate to the sort of ordained ministry exercised in the Church...

- assessment procedures should seek primarily to ascertain whether the overall aim of the course, particularized in the objectives of the course and its component units, has been achieved by students...

- assessment must be distinguished from 'feedback' which should take place during the learning-process. (ACCM 22, 1987, p 45)

- assessment...is concerned with the matter of judging the student's performance on pre-identified tasks which are made clear in the statement of objectives for the course as a whole and in the objectives for each unit of the course...

- objectives, both for the course as a whole and for particular units, should state what a student should be able to know or do or be by the end of the course or unit (ACCM 22, 1987, p 46).

The recommendation was for a Board of Examiners to be set up whose primary task was to approve the assessment procedures and schedules proposed by individual Colleges and Courses in order to ensure that they complied to the general policy, and to appoint external examiners who would approve individual units and assessment methods together with the moderation of students' work. "The specific policies and programmes of the College or Course concerned would then be subject to review at regular intervals of five years. Each year detailed procedures for assessment (essay titles, examination papers, etc.) would need to be agreed and monitored by the GME examiners as specified" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 52).
Conclusion

The ACCM 22 Report, *Education for the Church's Ministry*, was approved by the House of Bishops in May 1986. After further consideration by the Committee for Theological Education, a Steering Group was established charged with the responsibility of implementing the recommendations contained in the Report. The implications arising from this implementation will be discussed in the following chapter.

The aim of this chapter has been to explore national training policy with particular reference to the key document, ACCM 22. This report provoked the first serious theological reflection on clergy training and resulted in a complete review and subsequent change in the programme planning and assessment procedures in the Church of England. The most radical change was the demise of the centralised General Ministerial Examination and subsequent devolution of responsibility for programme planning and assessment to the individual Colleges and Courses under the supervision of ACCM.

Following approval by the House of Bishops of the recommendations contained in the Report, each College and Course was asked to submit a proposed strategy for approval by ACCM. To help them in this exercise it was suggested that responses should be based upon the following three questions:

1. What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?

2. What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?

3. What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for ordination to exercise this ministry? (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24)
In the context of this particular thesis, which looks at the training needs for clergy who minister in multi-cultural and multi-Faith areas, several points deserve to be mentioned.

ACCM 22 proposed the formulation of a general policy which would have to be agreed by ACCM and the corporate body of Colleges and Courses, and a particular policy which would have to be agreed by ACCM with each individual College and Course. The Report stated that ordinands should be trained to serve the whole Church and that particular types of ministry in diverse situations might be the concern of individual Colleges and Courses. In other words, general policy will not be concerned with diversity. This would seem to present the following problems:

a) English society, nationally, is culturally and religiously diverse as discussed in Part One, chapter 1. If this diversity is not to be reflected in the general training policy it could be seen as of secondary importance. Furthermore, it does not do justice to the requirement that "Training should be of such a kind as to bring engagement in the Church's service of God's creative and redemptive activity in the world" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 31).

b) ACCM 22 recommended that training for diverse situations should be the responsibility of individual Colleges and Courses and that each institution should exercise "theological, spiritual and practical discrimination" when prioritising over areas of ministry and who should be responsible for them. If each individual College and Course decides on such priorities, it is possible that such decisions will simply reflect either the teaching expertise/interests of staff within the College or Course, or the resources available in the locality. While this is entirely understandable there is a danger that some types of ministry will be excluded altogether.

c) The Report suggested the need for a 'taxonomy' of the variety of situations in which the Church may minister, but it did not specify who should be responsible for drawing up such a taxonomy. If this were to be done nationally, by ACCM, this may
go some way towards avoiding the exclusion of certain subjects and allow for the possibility of students attending another institution for a particular unit, for example, in inter-Faith relations.

d) Church of England clergy are mobile, often moving four years after the first curacy and thereafter maybe every five, seven or ten years. There are some who remain in one parish for up to 20 years, but the general trend is to move more frequently. Moving from one type of ministry, for example from rural to urban, may highlight the need for training for the new situation. While it is impossible for all situations to be covered in pre-ordination training it might be possible to include some basic guidelines for changing ministry in the general policy, while particular training for new situations should be addressed by POT or CME. This point will be discussed further in Chapter 8.

ACCM 22 challenged all providers of theological education in the Church of England to reflect theologically on training for the ministry and it requested all Colleges and Courses to respond with a clearly articulated strategy for such training. Only those institutions which provided a satisfactory response would be recognised as providing an appropriate training for Church of England clergy. These responses and the implementation of recommendations contained in ACCM 22 will be discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 6  The Colleges and Courses – An Initial Response to ACCM 22

Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to examine the initial responses from the Colleges and Courses to the Report ACCM 22, which was discussed at length in the previous chapter, and to see how the recommendations contained in that Report have been implemented.

Three years after its publication in 1987, an interim evaluation, entitled *Ordination and the Church's Ministry: An Interim Evaluation of College and Course Responses to ACCM Paper No 22*, ABM Ministry Paper No 1 (ABM 1) was published. This Report offered a theological evaluation of the responses received from the Colleges and Courses to the first question posed in ACCM 22; "What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24). A further Report, *Integration and Assessment: An Interim Evaluation of College and Course Responses to ACCM Paper No 22*, The Report of an ABM Working Party on Educational Practice, ABM Ministry Paper No 3 (ABM 3) was published in March 1992. This second Report focused on the second and third questions posed in ACCM 22, "What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?" and "What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for ordination to exercise this ministry?" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24). These two Reports will provide the background for discussion in this chapter.

What ordained ministry does the Church of England require? - an initial response
The Working Party which produced ABM 1 recognised "that the Colleges and Courses [had] never been asked to articulate a theological rationale for their
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12The Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry (ACCM), was renamed the Advisory Board for Ministry (ABM) in 1990
programme of training" and it was "sensitive to the difficulties faced by Colleges and Courses in doing this ... partly due to the diversity of views to be found in the Church of England, and current uncertainty about handling this diversity constructively" (ABM 1, 1990, p 4). When considering diversity, whether theological, cultural or religious, many of the responses made reference to the doctrine of the Trinity as a theological basis for understanding such diversity, the implications of which will be discussed below. (see pages 98-101,125-128) The Trinity and religious pluralism was discussed in Part One. (see pages 36-38) The Trinity also featured in many responses as a basis for mission and ministry.

The authors of the Report were much impressed by the quality of the responses received and considered that the Colleges and Courses had attempted "with some considerable success to meet what was asked for in ACCM paper No 22" (ABM 1, 1990, p 4).

In seeking to address the question "What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?" the Report stressed the need to begin with the Church, because ordained ministry must be located within the nature and theology of the Church, which in turn "needs to be placed in the wider context of how God's being and purposes are best served in the world" (ABM 1, 1990, p 5). "The Church of England will only be able to think more clearly about the ordained ministry when it has laid hold of a clearer theological understanding of its identity as a church" (ABM 1, 1990, p 8).

Some College and Course responses had begun with the Trinity, which "might imply a view of the Church as somehow to be understood through a theology of the ministry - an ecclesiology built from outlines of the tasks and responsibilities of ordained ministry" (ABM 2, 1990, p 7). The authors believed that this could result
in a limited notion of what the Church is, and a restricted notion of ministry in the context of the mission of the Church and ministry of the whole people of God which includes the laity (ABM 1, 1990, p 7).

In the context of the mission of the Church and the preaching of the Gospel,

The responses from Colleges and Courses do not always give very much emphasis to the task of understanding the world and society on their own terms as part of the task of preaching the Gospel. It was not always clear if and how the Church of England is accountable to society or to any contexts outside of the Church. An appreciation of the cultures operative in Britain in their own terms seems essential because these are the contexts in which the communication of the Christian faith in action and word takes place. (ABM 1, 1990, p 8)

The importance of context and cultures was discussed in Chapters 1 and 4 of Part One and is also stressed in this Report, which claims that "an appreciation of the cultures operative in Britain...seems essential" (ABM 1, 1990, p 8). If this is the case, then there is further argument for an awareness of cultural and religious diversity in ministry to be part of the general training policy, as was discussed in the previous chapter. However, it is also important for the Church to see itself as

"part of the mainstream life of its culture. The Church and its clergy are part of the culture; but they interpret the culture in a different way, against a different horizon, and this different dimension of interpretation is what the Church offers in its public life and language." (ABM 1, 1990, p 11) (original emphasis)

Cultural awareness is inextricably linked to an understanding of mission. The authors of the Report noted:

the lack of an emphasis upon mission in a good number of the responses, which seems to result partly from a self-definition of the Church which takes little account of the needs and perceptions of those in its environment. This may reflect the apparent lack of an interactive picture of the Church's relation to its social and cultural setting. (ABM 1, 1990, p 8)
The issue of accountability to society and to contexts outside of the Church raises many questions for Church of England clergy ministering in a parochial setting where non-churchgoers, who are nevertheless parishioners, can have high expectations of their local vicar. This was touched upon in Chapter 1, pages 5-6 and has been highlighted by research undertaken for the Rural Church Project, co-directed by Dr Douglas Davies of Nottingham University.

This research indicates that non-churchgoing as well as churchgoing laity have clearly defined expectations of the clergy of the Church of England. The clergy are expected to provide a public ministry in the local community, a ministry available to non-churchgoers as well as churchgoers. (ABM 1, 1990, p 5). (an extract from this research is given as Appendix No 6.1)

Accountability is also very much an issue for those working in chaplaincy roles in hospitals, prisons and other public service contexts where ministers may be paid from the public purse. (see page 6-7)

The Church is also an institutional reality, but generally Colleges and Courses did "not reflect or consider very fully their own life and institutional arrangements" (ABM 1, 1990, p 12). ABM 1 therefore recommended that each College and Course "reflect upon how it incorporates the varied expectations held of it, and how it distributes within its life responsibility, control, authority and power" (ABM 1, 1990, p 13). The training institution should provide a model for its ordinands for their future ministry and therefore issues such as responsibility, control, authority and power and how these are exercised, is vitally important. The Report conceded that no human institution is perfect. However, such institutions can still be used by God:

"it must be possible to believe wholeheartedly that God uses a College or Course as an institution, without at the same time giving absolute value or expectations of perfection to the institution. There is a note of sadness in some responses which speak of the College or Course giving a goal or vision to the ordinands, which is not then matched in their experience of parochial ministry." (ABM 1, 1990, p 14)
The responses also revealed a tension between preparation for ministry in the Church of England as it is and the Kingdom which is to come. This tension could lead to:

- a strongly perceived discontinuity between the Church and the Kingdom, which can generate uncertainty. For example, if the model of the Church and the world offered by a training institution is fairly consciously at odds with what is current within the Church and the world, then this will need careful handling. There is the danger that the ordained could adopt a form of elitism because their model of the Church is not shared by others. (ABM 1, 1990, p 14-15)

If this perceived discontinuity, either between the institution and parochial ministry, or between the Church as it is and the Kingdom that is to come, is to be addressed, it is essential that the Colleges and Courses themselves are fully aware of the cultures that operate outside of their institutions.

As has already been mentioned (see page 95), many responses suggested that the doctrine of the Trinity could provide a "theological foundation for an understanding of God's mission, and therefore of the Church's ministry and mission" (ABM 1, 1990, p 17). However, the Report stated that "other starting points have value and an exclusive emphasis upon a developed treatment of the Trinity could overlook some important aspects of the Church in its mission and ministry" (ABM 1, 1990, p 17). For example, the Ordinal refers to the ordained minister as having authority to preach, and the priest authority to pronounce absolution. A small number of responses referred to a ministry that "follows Christ" or "imitates Christ" or shares in the reconciling work of Christ (ABM 1, 1990, p 17). Whatever the starting point, or approach taken, the Report warned that there was a danger of "over-simplifying complexity" (ABM 1, 1990, p 17).

The doctrine of the Trinity is an example of a complex doctrine that can become over-simplified. While it can provide a valuable model for relationships between...
individuals within the Church, the Church and the world, and the world and the Creator God, this is only true if understood and applied correctly. The Report stated that:

the nature of the relationships to be found within the Trinity is understood differently in various of the responses. Some seem to view the Trinity as a relationship between the one who administers power and those who obediently receive and accept this exercise of power. The relationships of the Trinity are understood in hierarchical terms (the Father who Commands, the Son who obeys), so that the relationships are not fully mutual or reciprocal. The responses have an understanding of relationship in the Trinity, but the way in which some of the responses envisage and understand relationships is problematic. A few of the responses do not sufficiently emphasise the mutuality of the divine persons, and evoke a picture of the Trinity as one of a cluster of individual entities rather than persons in relationships. This can suggest tritheism rather than trinitarianism. (ABM 1, 1990, p 18)

In analysing the responses in relation to the Trinity and pluralism, the authors of the Report identified two particular dangers. First, an over-simplification of the doctrine of the Trinity can lead to an assumption that "clear propositional principles are given in revelation and these are to be applied to the situations in which the Church finds itself" (ABM 1, 1990, p 23). However, the authors made the point that:

Revelation is not identical with total clarity. However, there is a strength in emphasising the revelation of God as a starting point, because Christian revelation is mediated in the particularity of our history as found primarily in scripture and tradition, and also in the world around us. It could be said that Christ gives through scripture and tradition the key for identifying how the world around us provides points of access to revelation. (ABM 1, 1990, p 23)

The second danger was one of an over-emphasis upon mystery, hiddenness, ambiguity and paradox which could lead to a "reduction or marginalisation of the content of Christian theology" (ABM 1, 1990, p 23). Such a marginalisation of content could result in an over-emphasis upon experience and an endorsement of "the
already pervasive individualism in styles of training or ministry" (ABM 1, 1990, p 24).

Of particular interest to this thesis, which focuses upon religious pluralism and ministerial training, is the variety of attitudes towards religious pluralism which were identified from the responses. It is worth quoting from the Report in full:

One approach is essentially pastoral, stressing that it is important for the ordained to appreciate and be patient with those who hold different views. Where there is a difference of view, the matter is therefore reduced to one of pastoral care, rather than a treatment of the issues at stake.

Another, perhaps less generous approach, is that of toleration. It may be assumed that, although as a matter of fact there is a diversity of views, the one view held by the College or Course and perpetuated through its students is the single correct view; and that it is important for the ordained to be extremely tolerant of those who, it is supposed, are wrong or misguided. Tolerance is ambiguous insofar as it suggests someone possesses the truth unequivocally.

An alternative approach, which allows real pluralism, may also be less than satisfactory. This approach could be called the 'coexistence' paradigm. What it fails to do is to provide a means for evaluating each view critically, or to show ways in which the different views can interact with one another. This kind of approach is not true to the nature of the Trinity as explored in this chapter. We have suggested that persons exist only in relationship, a relationship in which there is necessarily interaction, mutual critique, mutual formation of the persons. (ABM 1, 1990, p 25) (original emphases)

The doctrine of the Trinity can provide a very useful theological foundation for all relationships because it allows for unity in diversity, for interdependence and accountability, for "mutual inter-action and reciprocal gift and reception" (ABM 1, 1990, p 18). It is particularly useful as a model for relationships within training institutions between staff and students, for collaborative ministry within parishes, for ecumenical work and for inter-Faith and inter-cultural understanding. But this will
only happen if the doctrine is well-thought out, otherwise it could produce a hierarchical understanding of power where all authority rests with the principal/staff, bishops/priests, the Established Church of England over against other Christian denominations, or Christianity over against other Faiths.

If the doctrine of the Trinity is to form a theological foundation for the Church's mission and ministry in the world, then it "needs patient and painstaking scholarly attention and presentation...An insecure or ill-founded doctrine of the Trinity would weaken the theological foundation of how the Church and its ministry are conceived" (ABM 1, 1990, p 19). Furthermore, study of the doctrine must be given priority in the curriculum of the Colleges and Courses. This did not appear to be the case in 1990 when the Working Party produced the Report ABM 1, which stated that:

We recognise that Colleges and Courses have attempted the task of replying to ACCM paper No 22 with no extra staff resources, and that not all Courses or even Colleges will have a teacher of Christian doctrine or systematic theology as a full-time or half-time member of staff. (ABM 1, 1990, p 18)

In view of the emphasis placed on the doctrine of the Trinity by the Colleges and Courses in their initial responses to ACCM 22, it will be interesting to see later in the following chapter, and in Part Three of this thesis, if the study of the doctrine of the Trinity is covered in the more recent curriculum material. It will also be interesting to see if any of the Colleges and Courses make use of the work of modern theologians such as Gavin D'Costa, who has written about the Trinity and religious pluralism (see pages 36-38).
What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry? - an initial response

Following the publication of ABM 1, in 1990, which evaluated the responses from the Colleges and Courses to the first question posed by ACCM 22, “What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?” the Advisory Board for Ministry published a second document in 1992. This was entitled Integration and Assessment: The Report of an ABM Working Party on Educational Practice, ABM Ministry Paper No. 3 (ABM 3, 1992) and was an interim evaluation of the responses to the second two questions posed by ACCM 22.

The first aim of the Report ABM 3 was "to provide an aid, to be used by Colleges and Courses in conjunction with Ordination and the Church's Ministry [ACCM 22], in carrying forward developments in their responses for the next five-year period" (ABM 3, 1992, p 2). A second aim was "to set out as clearly as possible some of the discernible patterns and components which [were] found in the responses" (ABM 3, 1992, p 3). The authors of the Report were asked specifically to consider, from the responses, how "integration" and "inter-action" were attempted and understood (ABM 3, 1992, p 3), and "how integration in the assessment of ordinands can best be achieved through the procedures involved in pre-selection and selection, in ministerial training and post-ordination training" (ABM 3, 1992, p 4). This last point regarding post-ordination training will be discussed further in Chapter 8.

The responses revealed a "breadth and variety of perspectives and approaches" to integration which are not necessarily mutually exclusive (ABM 3, 1992, p 9). These different approaches were listed in the Report as follows:

a) **Sustaining Mission and Ministry** whereby the ordained is part of a Church which is participating in the mission of God. This "includes understandings of
integration that make for co-ordinated means of training candidates which involve preparation in being as well as in doing and knowing" (ABM 3, 1992, p 11).

b) **Integration of Aims, Objectives, Educational Programme and Forms of Assessment** as outlined in ACCM 22. This "is based on a concern for the close interweaving of aims and of objectives with the educational programme and forms of assessment" (ABM 3, 1992, p 11). The authors of ABM 3 commented that "this concern for close interweaving will prove to be one of the most significant points of impact of ACCM Paper No 22. There is evidence that this is being attempted in a serious way" (ABM 3, 1992, p 12).

For example, one response notes that, in preparing the submission for ACCM Paper No 22, the decision was made to make an overall reduction of 20% in the requirement for written forms of formal assessment. This was undertaken to that assessment could be designed to encompass knowledge, skills, qualities and attitudes. (ABM 3, 1992, p12)

The Report recognised that many Colleges and Courses were at a fairly early stage in "exploring how best to achieve the kind of interweaving envisaged in ACCM Paper No 22" and some training institutions were "being constrained from making more creative developments due to the particular requirements of their local university" (ABM 3, 1992, p 13).13

c) **The Ordinand's Personal Integration** where:

The ordinand was viewed as a whole person, with integration needed between their theological development, pastoral development, personal formation and spirituality. Placements were seen to have some part to play in this integration of the person (ABM 3, 1992, p 15).

The integration of being alongside knowing and doing, (point a) above) should lead towards a personal integration which becomes very important when facing
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13Many training institutions have their courses validated by local universities.
adversity, struggle and conflict. ACCM 22 stressed the necessity for the Church to engage with society in responding to God's mission (ACCM 22, 1987, pp 10-11, 14-15). However, society is a complex plurality of race, culture and religions, where "there is disintegration and where for some personhood is denied" (ABM 3, 1992, p 15). The authors of the Report ABM 3 noted that:

It is interesting to note how little this capacity to deal with struggle is stressed in many of the College and Course responses, which may reflect implied notions of the Church as fairly self-contained in relation to local communities (ABM 3, 1992, p 15).

Ordinands need to be helped to "engage critically in handling conflict and diversity, including the diversity they meet in their places of work and churches ... this needs to be built into the curriculum" (ABM 3, 1992, p 17). Some Colleges and Courses offer placements, particularly in urban areas, as a means of encountering the tensions of plurality. However, the Report stresses the need for:

full and adequate supervision so that placements should be seen as part of a process of spiritual formation. There is the danger that activism is fostered which could mean that there is a lack of reflection upon experience and a lack of weaving together learning from placements with learning from theological disciplines. (ABM 3, 1992, p 16)

d) Community Life as Integrative both through shared common life and corporate worship can be a means of integration. The ideal of an integrative community life may be assumed to be more achievable in a 'residential' College setting, where students actually live together, rather than on a 'non-residential' Course. There seems to be the expectation that in a College setting "the meeting of minds and the interaction of personalities ... will occur automatically simply by virtue of the students' being there" (ACCM 38, 1990, p 17). However, that is not necessarily the case. The variety of subjects being taught in a college:

makes it difficult to create a single community of theological learning, in which at all sorts of levels, formal and informal,
students and staff are learning from each other ... it becomes hard to achieve that reflection and integration which are two of the ideals for all ministers of the Gospel. (ACCM 38, 1990, p 17)

While it may be assumed that Colleges offer greater potential for community life, Courses are perceived to be disadvantaged because their periods of residence are limited to occasional weekends and a summer school:

yet the testimony from Course staff and students is that these periods of residence, and the strong commitment needed to meet the demands of a Course on personal time and freedom help the students to discover a strong sense of cohesion and to forge caring relationships. (ACCM 38, 1990, p 17)

Whether community life is set within a College or a Course, "the creation of corporate life and of opportunities of learning within it, requires systematic attention" (ACCM 38, 1990, p 17). Perhaps the Courses appear to be more successful at integration because they have to work harder at creating opportunities for students to come together, while the Colleges take this aspect for granted.

The above different, but not mutually exclusive approaches, to integration in ministerial training, were identified by the authors of ABM 3 from the initial responses to ACCM 22. Integration was a key theme running through the Report ABM 3 and the authors made a differentiation between the words integration and interaction. Integration suggested a "linkage and reconciliation so that wholeness or integrity is restored" in a way that different strands did not lose their identity but where "variety and difference can exist within an integrated whole" (ABM 3, 1992, pp 48-49). Once more, the doctrine of the Trinity is a good model. Interaction, however, suggested a dynamic relationship between different strands which:

may not produce or be capable of arriving at interweaving, synthesis or wholeness. All that is meant and presupposed is that the strands engage in some way with one another. There may be tension and even contradiction in these relationships. (ABM 3, 1992, p 49)
As an aid to the Colleges and Courses towards the following five year's planning, the Report suggested four typologies of integration:

i) **Subject-matter** where the integrative task is one of curriculum design (ABM 3, 1992, p 49).

ii) **Theory and practice** which is "probably the one which is most desired among ordinands and clergy and yet the most elusive" (ABM 3, 1992, p 50).

iii) **Pre-training experience with training experience** where the student is enabled to 'make sense of' his or her life experience as a whole (ABM 3, 1992, p 51).

iv) **Personal and individual** integration including personal development and spiritual growth, where the student is enabled to "aware of a fitting together of the disparate elements in the training process, including previous experience" (ABM 3, 1992, pp 51-52).

The Report ABM 3 also highlighted some specific educational issues in relation to the training programme:

a) ACCM 22 stressed the need for engagement with a society "characterised by a complex plurality of race, culture and religions" where there is an encounter with pain and suffering (ABM 3, 1992, p 47):

   *This means that approaches to ministerial formation should take seriously how students grow in faith, in character, in prayer and in being, and not just how they grow in intellectual knowledge and understanding* (ABM 3, 1992, p 47). (my italics)

b) Changes in society have affected changes in the Church and "it is probably true that there is no longer a single confident style or role for the clergy", but a plurality of views or models of what the ordained minister is (ABM 3, 1992, p 47).
It seems essential that the ordained minister is prepared so as to be able to handle a number of different models of the Church, rather than be familiar or content with only one or two models. (ABM 3, 1992, pp 47-48) (my italics)

c) While it was not possible to fully prepare ordained ministers in advance, even by the most careful methods of integration, it was a realistic aim that they should have the necessary tools to participate in mission and ministry (ABM 3, 1992, p 53).

Preparation which includes integrative objectives and methods help to contribute to these working tools...ordained ministers will gain from meeting and using a variety of teaching methods. (ABM 3, 1992, p 53) (my italics)

If it is generally acknowledged that it is impossible to prepare fully an ordinand for ministry during the initial training period, then the importance of life-long learning and adequate CME provision is paramount. This latter point will be the subject of Chapter 8.

d) While there was a discernible shift away from a narrowly academic model of learning there appeared to be a hesitancy over an alternative.

The relative lack of explicit discussion of how adults learn, and the hesitancy in some cases in embracing more explorative teaching methods, together with the only gradual incorporation of learning from pastoral studies and practice into the main educational programme, are all signs that the shift is often happening piecemeal. (ABM 3, 1992, p 54) (my italics)

e) There is a need for more theological expertise.

It is probably true that in many cases those now entering training in a College or Course have a more limited grasp of the content of Christian understanding than was the case even 10 or so years ago...This has also created a priority for initial training, as well as for post-ordination training... theological expertise, as well as skills in adult education, are required in staff. (ABM 3, 1992, pp 54-55) (my italics)
In the context of this thesis, which is examining clergy training for a multi-cultural and multi-Faith society, an integrated approach to training which addresses seriously the issue of context, which makes links across different subjects and enables the ordinand to grow in self-awareness so as to be able to deal with complexity, diversity and conflict, is vital. The authors of the Report ABM 3 endorsed these developments, and while not prescriptive, certainly encouraged the Colleges and Courses to adopt an integrative approach in their forward planning.

What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for the exercise of this ministry? - an initial response

ACCM 22 and ABM 3 made a distinction between feedback, which is part of the ongoing learning process that takes place between the learner and the teacher, and assessment, which is more formal and measures how the student has achieved the criteria according to the stated course objectives. The Report stated that an External Examiner appointed by ABM would act as a moderator for the assessment procedures and report annually to ABM (ABM 3, 1992, p 2).

A further process of evaluation of the whole educational programme was to be part of a regular appraisal procedure, which involved External Examiners and Colleges and Courses. The evaluation would lead to an official validation of the course for the training of Church of England clergy. A new submission for validation should then be made by the training institution every five years.

The authors of ABM 3 found that some responses tended to move from "aims, set at a general level, to very specific pieces of curriculum" when there was a need to
"devise objectives which are the bridge points between the aims and elements in the educational programme" (ABM 3, 1992, p 14).

Without clear objectives, which are drawn from the stated aim, or rationale for the training, a satisfactory assessment cannot take place:

The lack in some cases of specific objectives ... seems to explain some of the difficulties met in carrying out assessment. General statements of aim are hard to assess unless they are translated into objectives which can in some degree be measured or assessed with regard to particular students or groups of students. (ABM 3, 1992, p 14)

ABM 3 reported a hesitancy on the part of the staff over the question of assessment. Whilst self-assessment was a valuable tool to be developed and used for future ministry, "the staff also need to provide a measure and check that places self-assessment into perspective when viewed by reference to the objectives of the educational programme" (ABM 3, 1992, p 64). Overdue emphasis upon self-assessment can lead to an individualism that is contrary to the philosophy of ACCM 22 which stressed that "the task and nature of the Church is the basis of ministry" and that "training and assessment is for the ministry of the Church" (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). This tendency towards individualism was also highlighted in the discussion of the Trinity above. (see pages 99-100)

Assessment procedures therefore need to combine two elements:

by reference to what is required by the Church in a person's ministry; and assessment with scope to measure an individual's own need for growth in terms of their strengths and starting points at the time of entry to training. (ABM 3, 1992, p 64)

Much has been said in the ACCM and ABM policy documents about the need for an integrative approach to educational programmes. If this is an approach that is aimed at by Colleges and Courses, there should be a set of objectives by which assessment
in integration can be measured. As an example of an integrative approach, ABM 3 quoted from one response which gave the following objectives for assessment at the conclusion of a course in mission and ministry:

i) Students should have widened their range of experience of ministerial situations and developed the ability to reflect critically on them;

ii) Students should be able to relate different strands of theological study to one another and to issues of mission and ministry in the Church and in the world;

iii) Students should more fully understand the place of the Church in society and be able to analyse it in the light of history, theology and the human sciences;

iv) Students should have a mature appreciation of their own place within the Christian tradition and a critical openness towards other traditions;

v) Students should have developed pastoral skills and expertise, and the ability to recognise and analyse various models of pastoral care;

vi) Students should have developed the ability to apply theological thinking and critical analysis to the Church's mission and ministry. (ABM 3, 1992, pp 65-66)

The Report ABM 3 identified two areas of assessment that "can present particular difficulties in arriving at criteria" (ABM 3, 1992, p 66). The first involved the assessment of managerial skills such as the ability to collaborate and communicate effectively. Some responses used group-work and presentations as a form of assessment of these skills. The second area that presented difficulty was concerned with growth in spirituality. It was noted that while there will always be a place for independent spiritual directors or guides, "the staff also retain a responsibility for assessing growth in spiritual life" (ABM 3, 1992, p 67). This raises the issue of
boundaries, especially in a training institution where the number of staff is very small.

Specific mention was made in the report to profiling as a means of assessment. In response to concerns raised by the Association of Anglican Ordinands (AOCM) that "there was fragmentation in the assessment of candidates during the period beginning with the exploration of vocation, through selection and training to ordination and CME", the Working Party on ABM 3 was asked to comment on how to achieve greater integration by means of profiling (ABM 3, 1992, p 71). It was recognised that fragmentation could occur because of the complex role of the dioceses and the fact that an individual can pass through several different dioceses from pre-selection through to CME. Furthermore, the role of the Bishop's Selectors for ordination training is different to that of the College and Course staff, resulting in "inconsistencies in the patterns of challenge and support" (ABM 3, 1992, p 72). This reflects the comment made above regarding boundaries:

the role of the Bishops' Selectors is necessarily one of challenge ...the staffs of Colleges and Courses ... give such priority to nurture and pastoral care that they can be insufficiently challenging in assessment. (ABM 3, 1992, p 72)

Regardless of the difficulties:

the Working Party's advice is that more positive use can be made of continuity through profiling both during training, in the hand-on between the training institution and the diocese at the time of ordination, and through the time of post-ordination training. (ABM 3, 1992, p 72)

If profiling were to be adopted it should have a considerable impact on POT and CME subjects that will be discussed in Chapter 8.
Conclusion

The basis for discussion in this chapter has been the two ABM Ministry Papers 1 and 3, which were interim evaluations of the responses to the questions set in ACCM 22, which was discussed in the previous chapter. The aims of these Reports were twofold; to provide a theological evaluation of the responses, and to offer some discernible patterns that could be useful to the Colleges and Courses during the following five years' programme planning.

Several themes were recurring. These included the doctrine of the Trinity, the importance of context, the tensions surrounding diversity and conflict and the concepts of integration and collaboration.

The doctrine of the Trinity was specifically referred to in relation to diversity, including religious diversity, and also to collaborative styles of working. The doctrine, correctly applied, could also provide a model for issues of conflict and integration.

The Report stressed, however, that:

the doctrine of the Trinity needs patient and painstaking scholarly attention and presentation. This is even more so if the doctrine is to provide a basis for understanding the Church and its ministry. An insecure or ill-founded doctrine of the Trinity would weaken the theological foundations of how the Church and its ministry are conceived. (ABM 1, 1990, p 19)

The basis for suggesting that the doctrine of the Trinity may be used as a model for ministry, diversity, collaboration and even conflict is because of its relational dimension; that it allows for unity in diversity, for difference with equality, for mutual dependence and accountability. This is the social model of the Trinity.
spoken of by Moltmann, Boff and D'Costa and referred to in Part I (see pages 36-38).
Is this the model of the Trinity that is being taught in the Colleges and Courses?

The Report stated that many Colleges and Courses do not have a full-time, or even part-time teacher of systematic theology. This raises the question, "how, if at all, is the doctrine of the Trinity being taught"? These questions will be returned to in the following chapter, which will be an enquiry into more recent responses to ACCM 22.
Chapter 7 The Colleges and Courses - a recent response to ACC 22

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to discover how the Colleges and Courses are currently providing clergy training which complies with the requirements set out in ACCM 22, and also with the College and Course responses to ACCM 22, as discussed in the previous two chapters. This will involve an exploration of the stated aims and mission statements of the Colleges and Courses and an analysis of submitted curriculum material. I will also make reference to material drawn from interviews with a small number of deacons.

I concluded in the previous chapter that certain themes, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity, the importance of context, tensions surrounding diversity and concepts of integration and collaboration, had emerged from the documents previously submitted by the Colleges and Courses. Particular attention will be paid to these themes in this chapter to see what, if anything, has been done to address these issues.

Before discussing the curriculum material, or content, I will explain the present organisation of Courses and Colleges into clusters and federations. This has affected the way that institutions have developed their programmes and has also influenced my decision in choosing which institutions to contact for my research.

The Formation of Training establishments into Federations and Clusters

In 1992, the Steering Group for Theological Courses and the Advisory Group on Full-time Theological Training submitted their report, Theological Training: A Way Ahead, to the House of Bishops of the General Synod. This report recommended radical changes to the way that theological training institutions should be organised. The aim of these changes was to strengthen links and share resources between different types of training establishments in a given geographical area.
The main advantages for Colleges and Courses of such interaction and collaboration were said to be:

a) *Deriving maximum benefit from the theological teaching resources available in the university.*

strengthening the link between academic theology and ministerial training; encouraging and benefiting from the development of relevant modular degree courses, using university expertise to validate College and Course educational programmes; improving the quality of staff in both the University and theological training systems by cross-fertilisation in teaching.

b) *Deriving maximum benefit from collaboration with Church Colleges of Higher Education (CCHE'S)*

sharing teaching staff and facilities including libraries; sharing residential facilities and technical services; encouraging the exchange of experience between ordinands and those training for other professions; sharing insights on models of professional formation.

c) *Contributing to the vocational, educational and training initiatives of the Dioceses.*

offering specialist support in areas of CME, of lay training including Reader training and of adult education; making available modules of ordination training which could be relevant to the training of LNSM's. *(A Way Ahead, 1992, pp 76-77)*

The October 1992 Report *A Way Ahead* was followed by the Report *Theological Colleges - The Next Steps* which was published in June 1993. This report suggested that the provision of theological education within a particular geographical area could be organised in three ways: a) a *cluster* which "is a group of independent educational agencies of varying theological traditions which are prepared to work in partnership in order to share academic and educational resources", b) a *consortium* which is a "partnership of educational agencies which work together to integrate programmes" and c) a *federation* where a consortium becomes "institutionalised in a
formal structure binding on the constituent bodies for part or all of their work" 

The 1993 report finally recommended that all theological education for the training of Church of England ordinands should be based at eight centres: Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Leeds/Mirfield, London, Nottingham/Lincoln and Oxford. All clusters, consortia or federations should be located around one of these centres. A list of these centres with their associated training institutions is given in Appendix 7.1.

As a result of these recommendations, which took into consideration student numbers and financial resources, some theological colleges were closed and some merged with other institutions; for example, Lincoln joined with Nottingham University and St John's College Nottingham.

With the implementation of these proposals, the provision of clergy training has changed since 1992. Some institutions have disappeared, most are now working collaboratively with other educational agencies and some students take modules from different Colleges, Courses or Universities while working on a common curriculum. An example of how this kind of partnership across theological training institutions has been worked out in practise, is shown in the Joint Preface to an ACCM 22 submission by the Oxford Partnership in Theological Education and Training (OPTET). (Appendix 7.2)
The Selection of Colleges and Courses for Research Purposes

The focus of this research is on the training needs of clergy in the Diocese of Chelmsford. My original intention was to examine the curriculum material from those Colleges and Courses where the majority of Chelmsford clergy had trained. In order to identify these institutions I examined the data drawn from Questions 5 and 6 of the Clergy Questionnaire. (Appendix 9.1) This Questionnaire will be discussed fully in Part Three.

Question 5 asked "At which Theological College were you trained?" and Question 6 asked "On which Ministry Training Course were you trained?" The data revealed that 187 of the total number of 208 respondents had trained at a College, while only 25 had trained on a Course. (see Table 3, p 183) Some students had attended both. In view of the small number of respondents who had trained on a Course, I decided to draw my selection from the Colleges.

I chose eight out of the total number of 22 Colleges listed in the questionnaire. My reason for only choosing eight was because it was also my intention to carry out follow-up interviews and I felt that eight would be a manageable number. The complete list of 22 Colleges showing the numbers of students and theological tradition of students is given as Appendix 7.3. My original aim was to choose those Colleges which had trained 10 or more clergy who are now serving in the Diocese of Chelmsford, according to the data taken from Question 5 of the Clergy Questionnaire.

I also wanted to take Colleges from a variety of theological traditions. Question 12 of the Questionnaire asked "Which words would best describe your present theological/church tradition?" During the processing of the data, the variables of
theological/church tradition were collapsed from ten to four to give more manageable categories. This is further discussed in Part Three, page 171.

I then compared Question 5 (College) with Question 12 (Theological Tradition) in order to identify, according to student background, the likely theological position of each College. This was done by a frequency test and gave the following result:

*Table 1 Colleges showing Number and Theological Tradition of Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Theological Tradition of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Trinity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Evangelical 16 Charismatic 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's London</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Catholic 8 Liberal 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 1 Evangelical 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Evangelical 24 Charismatic 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 9 Catholic 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley Hall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evangelical 6 Liberal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 1 Catholic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury &amp; Wells</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Liberal 8 Catholic 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evangelical 2 Charismatic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Nottingham</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evangelical 10 Liberal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott House</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Catholic 8 Liberal 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Evangelical 9 Liberal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that respondents were not confined to a one word description of their theological position. For example, some described themselves as Evangelical/Charismatic or Liberal/Evangelical etc.
These statistics are in line with how the Colleges are generally perceived and also how they define themselves. For example, “Ridley is rooted in the Evangelical tradition but aims to develop an open evangelicalism…” while Westcott House “has firm roots in liberal catholic Anglicanism…” (Cambridge Theological Federation 1998, Section 1). “St John’s College belongs to the Evangelical tradition of the Church of England and has been influenced by the Charismatic movement… Our evangelical, Anglican and commitment…” (College Prospectus).

My intention was to contact each of the above institutions and ask for a copy of their curriculum. However, on consulting the 1998/99 *Crockford’s Clerical Directory* for addresses, I discovered that Salisbury & Wells was no longer a College but was functioning as the Southern Theological Education Training Scheme. Since, at this point in my research, only eleven out of the original 22 Theological Colleges listed in the questionnaire were recognised by the Church of England for the training of its ordinands, I decided to contact each one of the eleven. They were:

- College of the Resurrection, Mirfield
- Cranmer Hall, Durham
- Oak Hill Theological College
- Queens College, Birmingham
- Ridley Hall, Cambridge
- Ripon College, Cuddesdon
- St John’s College, Nottingham
- St Stephen’s House, Oxford
- Trinity College, Bristol
- Westcott House, Cambridge
- Wycliffe Hall, Oxford

The Diocese of Chelmsford also trains ordinands on the East Anglian Ministerial Training Course and the North Thames Ministerial Training Course. I therefore included these two establishments.
Responses from the Colleges and Courses

a) Aims/Mission Statements/Commitment

I wrote to each of the above institutions explaining the purpose of my research and requested a copy of their curriculum. I received information from all institutions. In some cases I received a direct reply from the College or Course and in other cases a reply from the Federation. For example, the Secretary of the Cambridge Federation sent me a joint publication which covered the courses of all institutions within the Federation; these being Ridley Hall, Wescott House, the East Anglian Ministerial Training Scheme, Wesley College, Westminster College, The Margaret Beaufort Institution and the Cambridge University Faculty of Divinity. (see Appendix 7.1) Other replies varied from a short letter enclosing a copy of a course prospectus, to a complete ACCM Submission comprising almost 300 pages.

In the case of the latter, the first 70 pages outlined the training institution’s response to the three questions set by ACCM 22, namely 1) “What ordained ministry does the Church of England Require?”, 2) “What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?” and 3) “What is the appropriate means of assessing the suitability of candidates to exercise this ministry?” (see Chapter 5, Page 80).

The question, “What Ordained Ministry does the Church of England Require?” was posed by ACCM as a fundamental starting point for any approach to the training of ordinands. I was interested to see therefore if this question was reflected in the stated aims or mission statements of the various institutions.
Out of all the material received, only four institutions appeared to have a clearly defined mission statement or commitment. These were:

- **To nurture faith, life, and discipleship, in the context of a residential and worshipping community, in order to prepare men and women for the ordained ministry, mindful especially of the contexts faced by Anglican Christians in this land.**

- **Our mission is to provide resources for the ministry and mission of the whole Christian church, particularly in the United Kingdom and in the East Anglian region.**

- **To be a multi-purpose resource for theological education in support of the church’s mission and ministry.**

- **Our commitment**

  We **recognise** that above all, today’s church needs men and women who are advancing in godliness and seeking to lead others to maturity in Christ.

  We **aim** to develop leaders who know God personally, who believe that he is calling them to Christian ministry, and who have a vision for sacrificial service.

  We **endeavour** to make the Bible the foundation of all that we do and are, equipping people for a wide range of ministries, both ordained and lay.

  We **provide** ministerial training that is a potent combination of the academic, the missionary and the pastoral.

  We **enjoy** our life together as a community, taking things seriously but having fun as well.

  We **encourage** a deepening love and respect for one another through listening, discussion and debate.

  We **welcome** men and women of all ages, backgrounds and different church traditions.
One institution expressed its various aims within the text of the prospectus as follows:

...We are here to equip men and women for Christian ministry and mission in the power of the Spirit

...We place great importance on personal and spiritual growth as the focus of training for Christian ministry

...We are committed to a lifestyle of worshipping together, learning together and sharing our midday meal together

...We aim to provide a flexible pastoral and mission-based training programme that enables a certain degree of specialisation, such as mission across cultures, care and counselling, evangelism and communication, teaching and preaching.

...Our task is to help you integrate theology and practical ministry so that in the future you will reflect on your experience and continue to grow in wisdom and effectiveness.

One institution made no mention at all of its aims, objectives or understanding of ministry. However, two institutions placed their understanding of priestly ministry within the context of their response to ACCM 22 Question 1. For example:

...ordained ministry is for the Church and arises out of the Church...it constitutes a representative and enabling service, historically focussed in the holding of certain roles and the carrying out of particular tasks and functions. Those who are ordained have pastoral and teaching responsibilities; they are required to exhibit a mature and well articulated understanding of the Christian faith and mission; and they must set an example of growth in discipleship and holiness.

The particular institution which sent me its complete ACCM submission, responded to ACCM Questions 1, 2 and 3, in 70 pages of theological reflection. As part of this process of reflection, this particular training institution, which placed itself within a distinctively catholic tradition, stated that the:

...context for answering this question is from the place of that community, the Church, which knows itself to have been called into existence through the mission of God in the person of Jesus Christ, ...in this way, our answer to this question is fashioned from a particular place and time, ... but directed always towards a fidelity to God's offer of salvation in the person of Jesus Christ as handed on through his Church. Thus, the ministry and mission of the Church
can only be understood within the context of God’s mission, and as an extension of Christ’s ministry.

The institution identified the following as aspects of the mission and ministry of the Church:

a) **God’s Mission: Christ and the Church**  In Jesus Christ, we recognise the mission of God to his people....Christ is our only priest, our one true prophet and king, and through him the community called to gather (the Ecclesia) comes to participate in his priestly, prophetic and royal ministry by way of analogy.

b) **The Church’s Sacramental Mission and Identity**  The Church’s ministry reflects Christ’s *prophetic* ministry, in that she presents a vision of the future, is conscious of her past and, being carried forward by the momentum of her tradition, offers a critique of the present...She reflects his *priestly* ministry in her acts of mediation, intercession, reconciliation and representation, in the offering of worship and in her manner of life. And she reflects his *royal* ministry in proclaiming God’s kingdom and seeking to cooperate with his kingly rule within the whole range of human affairs and endeavours.

c) **The Mark of Apostolicity and the Ordained Ministry**  If as we have argued the Church’s identifying marks are *christologically* determined, then the purpose of the ordained ministry in fulfilling its apostolic commission involves calling the Church to live in this identity...In particular the Church of England understands its ordained ministry to be one with the ministry of bishops, priests and deacons as known ‘from the Apostles’ time’ (*The Ordinal, Preface*).

d) **The Three-fold Order**  The ordained ministry represents Christ to the people of God, the people of God before God, and the whole people of God to the world...

The bishop as a focus of unity with the universal Church and within the particular Church is entrusted with the apostolic ministry of leadership and oversight...

Deacons recall the fundamental character of all Christian ministry, lay and ordained. They embody and express the servant ministry of the Christ...Priests (as the Church of England has traditionally been willing to call those in its presbyteral order, expressing once again its claim to continuity) are empowered and authorized, by the bishop and in union and collegiality, to exercise a sacramental and pastoral ministry.

e) **The Three-fold Character of the Three-fold Ordained Ministry**  The *communal*, which takes account of the wider communities in which our existence finds its expression...the *collegial*, which considers the more
closely-knit ties of smaller, more intimate communities... and personal, which considers the unique expression of human existence made in every human life.

It is worth noting that this particular submission modelled its understanding of ministry on the person of Christ. For example, “In Jesus Christ we recognise the mission of God to his people” (point a) above); “The Church’s ministry reflects Christ’s prophetic ministry” (point b) above); “The ordained ministry represents Christ to the people of God” (point d) above). (my emphases)

Another institution also modelled its ministry on Christ, though the emphasis was on the historical Jesus rather than the risen christ:

...we are keen to let Jesus’ model for ministry training influence us as much as we can. Jesus spent many hours teaching his disciples privately, answering their questions, challenging their presuppositions and showing them how to interpret scripture.

The original ACCM 22 document asked all institutions to reflect theologically upon the nature of the Church as a basis for an understanding of ministry and therefore ministerial training. From the material that I received only two institutions, that which submitted the complete ACCM 22 document and one which focussed upon the Trinity (see below), appeared to have referred to the nature of the Church as the context for ordained ministry. All others, with the exception of one, made reference to the Church, but there was no attempt to articulate an understanding of the nature of the Church. The one institution which made no reference to the Church at all is the one which did not even have a stated aim or mission statement. At the time of writing, however, I understand that this particular institution is in the process of completing a revised ACCM submission.
It is likely that the ACCM submissions of the other institutions did answer this question to the satisfaction of ABM. Indeed they must have done so in order to be awarded recognition as institutions for the training of Church of England ordinands. However, this was not evident from the material that I received and even allowing for the fact that I only received a prospectus from some Colleges and Courses I would have expected some form of statement in a prospectus referring to the training of priests for ministry within the context of the nature of the Church.

b) The Trinity

Only one submission that I received, which was a joint submission, explicitly referred to Trinitarian doctrine as a model for ecclesiology and ministry. For example,

The starting point for the college’s understanding of ministry is that the trinitarian being-and-activity of God is essentially missiological. Mission is not simply a task of the Church but the expression of God’s nature.

...The being-and activity of God is essentially missiological because it is also essentially trinitarian

...This ministry of the Church, lay and ordained, is the most recognisable embodiment in history of the ministry of Christ, which is itself rooted in God as Trinity.

...Lay and ordained ministry make equally significant but parallel contributions to the life of the Church as part of the mission of God. They share a character of inter-relatedness reflecting the life of the Trinity... (my emphases)

The fact that only one submission was so Trinitarian is a departure from earlier ABM documents and responses from Colleges and Courses, where “the consensus amongst many Colleges and Courses is that the doctrine of the Trinity should provide the
theological foundation for an understanding of God’s mission, and therefore of the Church’s ministry and mission” (ABM 1, 1990, p 17). The material sent to me by one institution expressed caution regarding a simplistic use of Trinitarian doctrine:

We recognise a danger in prefacing our answer with a gesture which would potentially elide the dogmatic demand to articulate critically, historically and theologically the relationship between the Triune God and the modes in which we tell of the world’s relationship to God. We would argue therefore that the Trinity should not be interpreted as acting as a template for the modelling of human relationships (ecclesial or otherwise) but rather as the Church’s meditation upon God’s dramatic and life-giving encounter with the world in the mission of the Son ‘to the far country’.

And again;

Recently, it has become common to stress the importance for ecclesiology of the trinitarian character of God; a critical recognition no doubt, but one that should not lead to idealistic attempts to model the Church and our lives on preconceived patterns of the trinitarian relationships.

Following my analysis, in the previous two chapters, of the ACCM and ABM documents, including initial responses from the Colleges and Courses, I concluded that many institutions had placed the doctrine of the Trinity as central to an understanding of the nature of the Church and of ministry. I therefore expected to find this reflected both in the mission statements or aims of the Colleges and Courses, and also within the curriculum itself.

However, on further examination of the material that I received, only one institution made reference to the Trinity as a model for the Church and ministry within its general description of the course. When analysing the list of modules available and where given, the module content, all except two made specific reference to the Trinity. It is possible that in one case the Trinity could have been taught within the
context of early Church doctrine, which did appear in the curriculum. However, in
the other case, both doctrine and patristics was missing; both areas which could have
included the Trinity.

When comparing the various curricula, the Trinity was given most attention within
the courses offered by the universities through their degree programmes. In some
cases the Colleges also offered specific teaching on the Trinity. In theory it should
be possible for any student who is training at any institution within a consortium or
federation, to benefit from courses offered by other member institutions. However,
from my conversations with ex-students it would appear that while it is common for
those students who have completed a university degree to take up courses offered by
other institutions, it is not so common for a student who is on a Ministerial Training
Course to benefit from a module offered by a university. This could, of course, be
due to particular academic requirements.

My conversations with two deacons illustrate the different attitudes towards the
Trinity. In the first case, the deacon was single and in his mid twenties. He had an
Oxford degree in Theology and Philosophy followed by the Certificate in Ministry
from the Cambridge Theological Federation. When discussing the Trinity, he had
this to say:

I find it extraordinary when clergy say to me, 'O dear, it's Trinity Sunday –
what am I going to say? I would like Trinity Sundays all through the year.
There is so much to say. If you choose to ask certain metaphysical questions,
it is difficult – but what the Trinity is saying about God and us created in the
image of God is so fundamental. That was an idea I enjoyed in Oxford a lot
– John Zizoulas, Moltmann...
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The second conversation was with a woman deacon, probably in her mid to late thirties, married with a family. Because of her domestic situation she had studied part-time on a Training Course and she did not have a degree in theology. I asked her if, during her training, she did anything on the Trinity. She replied:

_We had a lot – but I can’t recall. It was like a nightmare. It was on our timed assessment that we had at the end of the year. I was told that mine was very muddled. And I thought, ‘yes, it was’._

c) **Context and Diversity**

The ACCM and ABM documents also emphasised the importance of context and diversity for theological training. Both concepts overlap and can be viewed geographically, socially, religiously, theologically and according to churchmanship.

All institutions with the exception of two, made reference to the importance of context in their aims, mission statements and course descriptions. The following is an example from Trinity College, Bristol, which is within the Evangelical tradition:

_We are daily more aware that we live in a complicated, multi-religious, multi-cultural society and world. At Trinity we recognise the importance of facing outwards towards this world and towards the worldwide church – in understanding, prayer and service. In our changing society and shrinking world, mission and evangelism are of fundamental importance for all those training for ministry of any sort. (College prospectus)_

This College’s commitment to diversity was put into practice by offering the following modules:

- Trends in World Mission and Ecumenism
- Understanding the Muslim World
- Jewish Thought
- Mission in Cross-Cultural Perspective
- Christianity and Education in a Plural Society
- From Mission to Church: Church-Planting in Historical And Contemporary Contexts
- The Gospel in Context: Rural and Urban Mission
- Christian Presence and Proclamation in Multi-Faith Contexts
Another example is taken from an ACCM submission of a College within the Catholic tradition:

The more immediate, local societies, within England and other European countries... exhibit an increasing variety. This diversity is not only a matter of different value-systems, but also of increasing economic and social differences. The variations between different sorts of city neighbourhood are increasing, and the differences between different rural communities have been analysed. Multi-culturalism is a daily reality in some places whilst it scarcely touches others. This social diversity has many consequences for the Church’s ministry, and therefore for the preparation of candidates for ordination, as well as for initial and continuing ministrial education and training. (ACCM submission)

And referring specifically to the question of other Faiths:

...Coupled with the social diversity and pluralism referred to above, there is an increasing variety in the forms of faith to which people adhere, both within the Church and outside it. This raises issues about the relationship of the ordained minister to those of other faiths and of no faith (see The Mystery of Salvation, chap 7), and about the role of the clergy in contemporary English society. It is important that those involved in ministry both know something about the practice of the world faiths, other than Christianity, and that they have thought carefully about the theological questions raised for the Christian by world faiths and by other ideologies. (ACCM submission)

In order to address this religious diversity, this particular College offered a variety of modules on other Faiths through Oxford University. It also offered specific modules on Missiology, which covered multi-Faith issues, and was compulsory for all students (Appendix 7.4) and also on inter-Faith dialogue, which was optional (Appendix 7.5).

When examining the modules on offer, all Colleges and Courses addressed the issue of diversity. Religious diversity may appear, as above, within the context of mission in the modern world, or mission in a multi-Faith society. Another example was Queen’s College Birmingham (Appendix 7.6). A different approach, entitled
Reading the Culture, Other Faiths/Other Cultures is given as Appendix 7.7. I was able to attend a residential weekend which formed part of this module, and my observations are included in this Appendix.

Within the universities, religious pluralism was responded to by offering a number of modules through Religious Studies programmes. These were more academic in style and included the study of Islam, Judaism, Hinduism etc. Six institutions offered modules specifically in inter-Faith dialogue or the relationship between Christianity and other Faiths.

The question of diversity was also addressed through placements, which are a requisite for all those following a Certificate or Diploma in Ministry. An example taken from a College within the Catholic tradition, is the College of the Resurrection, Mirfield where “the setting of the College in the midst of post-industrial West Yorkshire provides rich possibilities for pastoral placements in multi-faith, multi-cultural communities” (College prospectus, p 2).

Parish placements are traditionally used as an opportunity for the ordinand to experience a church tradition that is different to his or her own. However, in discussion with one deacon who was a self-confessed Evangelical, I was told that he had spent a year on a parish placement with an Evangelical parish. In other words, he had been placed within his own tradition.

Ecumenical diversity was reflected through the ecumenical membership of the various federations. (Appendix 7.1) Students and staff within federations were
encouraged to join together for worship and social activities as well as for taking up modules.

Some training institutions emphasised the importance of the Church of England being seen as part of the world Church and therefore encouraged exchanges with churches overseas. For example,

Oak Hill shares an exchange programme with three colleges in the United States, which allows students to study there for a semester. In addition, American students and a tutor study at Oak Hill on a ‘semester abroad’ programme. The College has spiritual, financial and practical links with Namugongo Theological College in Uganda. Several Oak Hill students and staff members have spent time studying and working there. (College prospectus)

The College of the Resurrection:

Has long established links abroad. We have for some years had exchanges with the Roman Catholic Seminary in Trier, Germany and with both the Lutheran and Orthodox Institutes in Sibiu, Romania. In recent years students have undertaken pastoral placements in India, Canada, Romania, Denmark, Japan and Austria. All this is indicative of our awareness that the needs of the human community are not served by insularity, and that international and intercultural exchanges have a crucial role to play. (College prospectus, p 2)

ACCM submission:

There are many changes occurring within the international community within which England and thus the Church of England are placed. We might mention the developing relationships within the continent of Europe, the increasing number of refugees and the movement of peoples, and the revival of nationalism. This is the global and the immediate context within which the Church of England is presently called to exercise her ministry. It is important that the experience and understanding of ordained ministers and candidates for ministry is broadened by overseas links and exchange visits, and by encouraging the presence of students from other countries. (ACCM submission)

In conversation with two clergy who had trained at Westcott House, both had been given the opportunity for a three months overseas placement; one in India and one in South Africa. Both priests, one man and one woman, had started ministerial training
after following a university degree course, and it was considered that practical and pastoral experience in different contexts was to be a priority for further training. In both cases the overseas opportunity offered the clergy an experience of multi-Faith and multi-cultural co-operation and co-existence; an experience which they both claim has had an influence on their present thinking and ministry. In the words of one clergy:

*In terms of inter-faith, the things that have influenced most what I am doing now – partly because of the person I am – there is a kind of preconception that I should be an academic but on a lot of things there is a kind of pragmatism. What appealed to me in South Africa particularly was the sense that the levels of co-operation were forged through having to struggle together around common values. It seemed to me that the depth of relationship they had, hadn’t initially come from discussing beliefs – it had come from engaging – inevitably some kind of values come out of that but that is not where it starts.*

To sum up on the question of context and diversity, it would appear that all training institutions, in one way or another, have addressed this issue. The difference in approach may reflect differences in theological tradition or the extent to which university modules are made available and/or taken up. There may also be an issue around staff resources. For example, one deacon I spoke to could not remember anything being offered specifically in the area of mission in the context of religious pluralism. His comment was “I don’t think any of the staff knew anything about it anyway”.

I examined the relevant College prospectus, which gave a mini biography of all the teaching staff. There did not appear to be anyone with a specific multi-Faith/multi-cultural interest, and although several of the staff had worked overseas, this was not in the areas where multi-Faith experience would have been the norm. This was in
contrast to the Cambridge Federation where the influence of Kenneth Cracknell is still felt. Cracknell had served as a missionary in both Africa and India and acted as Secretary to the British Council of Churches’ Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths. Through this experience he had developed a growing awareness of the need for ordinands to be trained in multi-Faith issues and this is reflected in the number of modules available to Cambridge students.

d) **Collaboration and Integration**

Both collaboration and integration were frequently spoken of in the ACCM and ABM policy documents. Reference to collaboration was mentioned in the aims/mission statements/descriptions of courses in five of the submissions that I received from the various training institutions.

One submission, for example, stated that:

> Within her own household, and in particular within the body of the clergy, there is an increasing demand for the Church to be exhibiting collaborative forms of authority and ministry. To be able to work collaboratively with other members of the people of God, both clergy and lay, the deacon, priest, or bishop must have considered co-operative and collaborative models of ministry, mindful of the ministry of the Church as the ministry of the whole people of God, and also of the need to consider the rich variety of Christian experience. (ACCM submission, p 10)

Only one institution, however, offered a specific module in this area. This was Ushaw College, the Roman Catholic institution associated with Durham. (Appendix 7.1).

This module was entitled *Issues in Collaborative Ministry* and gave the following as its aims and rationale:
**Aim:** To encourage students to recognise that collaborative ministry is a way of relating and working together in the life of the Church which emanates from an understanding of the Church as communion.

To explore some of the issues involved in collaboration by engaging with the working on a project with young people.

The method of delivery of this course will endeavour to espouse some of the principles of collaborative ministry.

**Rationale:**

Drawing on students' experience of Church and hopes for ministry, the course will demonstrate that collaborative ministry is not optional nor simply a response to the shortage of ordained priests, but is the call of all the baptised – ordained, religious, laymen and women to work together in a way which is mutually enriching and accountable.

Students in training for ordained and lay ministry require an understanding of the ecclesiology which underpins collaborative ministry so that they may develop leadership skills and enable others to use their gifts for the benefit of all.

Ministry in the Church requires a recognition of the pastoral implications of the vision of the Church expressed in church documents and reports, and current research in collaborative ministry.

( Durham Degree Handbook, 1998-9, p 49)

This recognition of the importance of collaborative ministry did not, however, seem be reflected in modules offered by other training institutions. Only three submissions offered modules which included the importance of team work, which may have made reference to collaborative ministry, but this was not made explicit.

It is not surprising, therefore, that when I asked the deacons what they had done in that area, I received a variety of rather vague responses:

*I can't remember that word being bandied around, but there must have been something about teamwork.*

*It was just talked about – words*
If you are going to talk about collaborative ministry find a parish where leadership does happen and clergy collaborate. It's not just that the tutors have not had a wider experience, but any of us will have just one particular perspective – so get people in who have made this creative for them.

Turning now to integration, this was referred to in seven submissions. To give two examples:

Integration of theology and ministry is embodied at every level, with content and context being kept in continuous conversation. There are different dimensions to this process. Integration needs to take place between theory and practice, academic and spiritual development, previous life experience and current study, and between the provision of theological frameworks and the learning of skills for ministry. (Durham Degree Handbook, 1998-9, p 6)

Our late twentieth-century setting means we want this education to be: academically rigorous and world-aware ... integrative and collaborative ... contextual and critical ... and such as encourages denominations, sexes, races and classes to be, pray, think, and work together. (St. John's College prospectus)

It was to be the task of the Colleges and Courses to provide training which is integrative. (see pages 102-108) While actual modules on integration would not be expected, the students should be able to see the concept of integration working throughout the course, and be able to see the training institution functioning as a model for collaborative ministry. He or she should also be aware of his or her own process of personal integration.

Conclusion

From my analysis of the material received from the Courses and Colleges it would appear that there is no common stated aim or mission statement across the various institutions. This may be because of the inherent theological diversity within the Church of England or because the institutions are providing training for different groups of people. For example, some Colleges and Courses accept a large number of students who are not training for the ministry at all and may not be Anglicans.
On the other hand, it may be because there is still no clear definition of the nature of the Church and therefore of ministry.

It is my understanding that ACCM 22 Question 1, should have enabled this reflection to take place. While this may have happened as part of the original ACCM 22 submission process, an articulated understanding of Church did not appear in the material that I received, with the exception of two cases.

Whereas in the earlier documents the Trinity was spoken of as a model for Church and ministry, this approach no longer seemed to be the norm and may be one of the reasons for, or the result of, there being a lack of clear Trinitarian teaching appearing in the curricula.

All training institutions appeared to have taken the issue of context and diversity seriously and there was a wide range of modules on offer, including many which covered multi-Faith and multi-cultural issues.

While this research is interested primarily in the training needs for ministry in a multi-Faith and multi-cultural society, these needs are an integral part of the overall training. There has been a tendency for some modules relating to multi-Faith issues to be offered as optional extras and consequently of only secondary importance. This approach can result in such modules being viewed as periphery and not central to clergy training. However, it is clear that some Colleges and Courses now incorporate the multi-Faith and multi-cultural dimension into their mission studies.
programmes. This is an example of how an awareness of the cultural context has been integrated into mission theology.

Modules with a specifically multi-Faith dimension are mostly available where training institutions are working collaboratively with universities or courses where teaching resources are available. It would appear therefore that both collaborative styles of providing training and an integrative approach to programme planning should go some way to ensuring that multi-Faith and multi-cultural issues become more central to clergy training, and not left as optional extras.
Chapter 8   Continuing Ministerial Education

Introduction

The three previous chapters focussed upon pre, or initial ordination training for Church of England clergy. The aim of this chapter is to examine Post Ordination Training (POT) or, as it is more frequently referred to, Continuing Ministerial Education (CME). For the sake of simplicity and consistency I shall in future use the term CME on the understanding that this also includes POT.

The intention is to discover what is being offered in training or education for ministry in multi-Faith and multi-cultural societies and as in the previous chapters this will be examined within the context of the overall provision of CME.

Following the pattern of earlier chapters, I will first look at the national policy for CME as outlined in various ABM documents. Particular reference will be made to: a) the first four years of CME (Initial CME [ICME] or CME years 1-4), and b) training incumbents.

I will then focus upon the situation within the Diocese of Chelmsford making use of data collected from both the questionnaire (appendix 9.1) and the interviews conducted with individual clergy and deacons.

The National Policy

Initial training for ordained ministry with the Church of England normally takes two years full-time or three years part-time study. However, it is increasingly evident
that this is far too short a period adequately to cover all that is desirable, or even essential, for ministry today, particularly in view of the many social and economic changes referred to in Part One, Chapter 1. The authors of *Issues in Theological Education and Training*, ABM Ministry Paper No 15, made the following point:

anxiety has been expressed about whether two years at a College is adequate for ministerial training and formation for those over thirty. By the time the summer vacations are taken into account, the provision is nearer twenty months with the final months dominated by thoughts of ordination and moving to a new home and parish. The process of finding a title parish often begins during the summer between the two years and can distort attitudes to learning.

Fresh consideration could be given either to adding another year, or to a careful pre-College phase of training using distance-learning materials with some residential weekends, etc. (ABM 15, 1997, p 19)

In consideration of the findings of the previous three chapters, particularly in relation to increasing demands on course content, I would suggest that two years full-time or three years part-time is inadequate for anyone training for ordained ministry, whether they be over thirty or under. Rather, training and education should be an on-going process. While the addition of a further year, or more use of distance-learning and other mixed-mode methods of education prior to initial ordination training would help, greater emphasis needs to be placed upon the concept of life-long learning and development of skills in adult education.

Both life-long learning and adult education have been addressed by the Church to a degree:

this concept of an (almost) continuous and ongoing life-long training/education process would take pressure off the initial ministerial training Institutions by clarifying what is appropriate and expected in pre-theological and post-ordination training as well. (ABM 15, 1997, p 20)
new styles of ministry and the increasing need for parishes to be effective in
their communication and decision-making has led to the critical appraisal of
how the Church can utilize the insights gained through research into the
Church as a Learning Organization. The advances in adult education
methodology and management education are being examined as a joint
exercise by the Advisory Board of Ministry and the Board of Mission. (ABM
15, 1997, p 29) (see also ABM 10, 1995)\textsuperscript{14}

Although a recognition of the value of adult educational methods was stated in the
document \textit{The Continuing Education of the Church's Ministers}, paras. 25 to 29 (GS
Misc. 122) (Appendix 8.1), a lack of knowledge in adult educational methods was
identified in 1982 in relation to training incumbents. "Where there is sometimes a
lack, however, is in the knowledge of the educational methods..." (ACCM
Occasional Paper No 10, 1982, p 10). In 1997 this concern was raised again:

there are a range of issues related to the quality of teaching and
learning... Teaching staff (both core staff and visiting lecturers) may be
outstanding in their knowledge of their subject but have little skill in
education or \textbf{adult training skills}. Should there not be a requirement that
core staff in the first year undertake an appropriate course (perhaps by day
release once per week) and that visiting staff receive an appropriate leaflet
informing or reminding them of basic essential elements of adult education
methods? (ABM 15, 1997, p 18) (original emphases)

The document ABM 15 was referring to theological education and training in the
Colleges and Courses, but it is possible that if these skills are missing in pre-
ordination training, they will be absent in post-ordination or continuing ministerial
education and training, where such skills are even more necessary.

If a commitment to life-long learning should be made by the Church of England, as it
has been in many other fields, then clearly CME will have a vital role to play
throughout a person's ordained ministry.

\textsuperscript{14} I wrote to the Chief Secretary of ABM on the 6\textsuperscript{th} August 1999 to enquire if any progress had been
made on this point but received no reply.
Continuing Ministerial Education – The First Four Years

The first three years following ordination have traditionally been a time of on-going training when the newly ordained has been placed in a training parish with a training incumbent. This is an important transition stage from training institution to parish situation:

*a person’s experience in their first post after leaving their training institution is generally agreed to be of vital importance for their subsequent ministry. Although many candidates for accredited ministry are now older people, bringing with them a good deal of practical insight and knowledge, nonetheless their experience of the first three years after ordination or licensing will profoundly affect their future work. For the first time they will encounter in their own persons the pressures and expectations put on the church’s ministers by the laity and by society generally, and they will have a context in which to build on the lessons they learnt during their time in training. In the three main areas of pre-ordination training, spiritual, academic and pastoral, the skills that the minister began to learn can now be developed, and through that an integration of theory and practice …which will then set the pattern for the person’s future ministry. (ACCM 10, 1982, p 2)*

During this crucial period all newly ordained are expected to undergo a period of compulsory CME. In recent years this three year period of CME has been extended from three to four years, referred to as CME 1-4 or Initial Continuing Ministerial Education (ICME). This is partly in recognition of the increasing importance of CME, but is also a reflection of the growing trend for curates to move straight into a team vicar, priest-in-charge, or even incumbency post, after only one curacy of four years, instead of two curacies over a period of five years:

*the fourth year is crucial ... because that is the time when they are preparing to move on. We have to be sure that people have got the skills that are required for the greater responsibilities that they will be facing, including things like chairing meetings, PCCs [Parochial Church Councils], coping*
with the legalities and marriage laws, churchyards and all that boring stuff which is vital. (Chelmsford Director of Ordinands, discussion July 1996)

The idea of any education or training being of a compulsory nature for adults does not fit comfortably with modern theories of good adult educational practice. (Rogers 1969, Friere 1980, Knowles 1980, Brookfield 1986, Craig 1994, Jarvis 1983, Appendix 8.1, para. 27) When I sought clarification on this issue by asking the Chelmsford Director of Ordinands if this fourth year of ICME was compulsory, I was told:

yes, the initial continuing ministerial training is compulsory for all stipendiary candidates and it is hoped that all non-stipendiary candidates will take part as far as they are able given the type of constraints they are under. (Chelmsford Director of Ordinands, July 1996)

Both the compulsory nature of ICME, or indeed CME, and the provision of on-going training for non-stipendiary clergy create tensions which will be discussed later. (see pages 152-154)

The need for greater clarification in the aims and objectives of ICME led to the publication *Beginning Public Ministry: Guidelines for ministerial formation and personal development for the first four years after ordination* (ABM 17, 1998). This was the culmination of a two year consultative process and was prompted by a number of factors:

(i) The new deployment situation, in which the newly ordained rarely have to serve a second curacy, and in which many clergy seek employment in sector, part-time or dual-role appointments. The time available for explicit learning after ordination is therefore more limited.
(ii) The expectation of people in the parishes that their incumbent (who may be in post now as soon as four years after ordination) will possess certain technical skills.

(iii) The reasonable belief that the ordained clergy of the Church of England possess proper professionalism that they should acquire through ongoing training. This ranges from basic skills in leading worship, knowing about the law and being able to officiate at the Occasional Offices to being a theological resource.

(iv) The inadequacy of current communications in transmitting appropriate training information concerning the newly ordained from the college or course to the diocesan CME/POT officer.

(v) Concern raised in the House of Bishops in response to the report in the "1994 Quinquennial Review of CME" that some clergy felt inadequately prepared for aspects of the exercise of public ministry.

(vi) Recognition that the traditional role of training incumbent (or even training parish) was also changing and that the traditional role of master/apprentice was less able to be sustained. With an increasing move towards collaborative ministry, the role was becoming that of coach or learning facilitator.

(vii) A general sense that the developments in pre-ordination training that have followed from ACCM Occasional Paper 22 ("Education for the Church's Ministry") had not been matched by adjustments in post-ordination training. (ABM 17, 1998, pp 2-3)

Point (vi), which refers to the role of the training incumbent and training parish, was a recurring theme throughout the interviews and I shall return to this later (see pages 148-151). The issue of collaborative ministry as opposed to an autocratic style of ministry is also worth further exploration in relation to good adult education practice.

ABM 17 also stated that:

beginning public ministry in the Church of England is a critical period in the life of both the newly ordained and the community in which they serve their title post. In this time of major change, expectations are implicitly assumed and explicitly stated by the various interested parties. These may range from the lack of understanding of the purpose of the title post by parishioners to the impatience to 'get on with the job' on the part of the new curate and it is a frequent cry that post-ordination training (or CME 1-4 as it is increasingly known) is either irrelevant or inadequate for the needs of the newly ordained. (ABM 17, 1998, p 1) (my emphases)
A lack of understanding, or rather confusion, was also evident from my interviews with deacons in the Chelmsford Diocese. For example,

_We didn’t have a great deal of focus – people got a bit angry – what is up for negotiation? We realised that there wasn’t much of a programme – so we sorted it ourselves._

_Several of us felt it – it seemed to lack a kind of clear direction but whether this is just inevitable I don’t know._

_Our convenor didn’t seem to have much idea about what he was supposed to be doing. Only two people turned up. I said ‘where is everyone?’ He said ‘I don’t know’ I said ‘why don’t you know?’ He said ‘I’m really not sure what we are supposed to be doing’._

_I would like a clearer idea from the beginning about what CME is all about. What are their expectations of us? Is it just support? Are we there to learn? Will they provide input? It would be helpful if they would clarify the aims and objectives._

_I wasn’t sure what CME groups were for._

The implication from these comments is that there is a lack of understanding of the purpose or aim of CME. If this is the case then it will lead to _impatience_ and a sense of _irrelevance_ on the part of the deacon or curate who is keen to get on with his or her job. On the other hand the provision of CME or ICME could appear to be _inadequate_ for others, and particularly those who left their initial training feeling unprepared for public ministry. For example:

_We didn’t touch preaching at all. I learned to preach in my own home parish and on my own initiative. That bothers me slightly – but what do you do? I remember a classmate phoned me and I said “I’m preaching my first sermon tomorrow”. He said “I guess I have probably preached about 70 sermons”. So what would you do if you were running a course? How would you deal with that? He was a reader – a lot of them were lay readers in our class._

(Deacon interview)
If CME is to be effective, and ‘continuing’ ministerial education in the true sense, then what is covered in initial training has to be taken into account, both in the corporate sense and also from the individual’s point of view. ABM 17 made the point that:

the principal focus of ... initial training lies in the development of the ordinand’s spirituality, academic base, self-understanding and understanding of the pastoral context. While this will involve the learning of certain general skills, such as interpretation, communication, and bearing a public role, this is not the context for a wide-ranging acquisition of ministerial skills and techniques” (ABM 17, 1998, p 5)

ABM 17 suggested a set of expectations “that candidates should be expected to have gained ... during their initial training” (ABM 17, 1998, pp 5-7). These expectations arose from discussions and comments during the consultative process and are given in Appendix 8.2. The document also set out Expectations to be met during the first three to four years of CME. (ABM 17, 1998, pp 12-14) (Appendix 8.3)

It is worth noting several points when comparing the two documents:

1) Preaching skills appeared in Initial training (Appendix 8.2, point g). The deacon quoted above did not get this particular training opportunity.

2) Teaching skills appeared in Initial training (Appendix 8.2, point g) but not in Initial CME (Appendix 8.3) where there is a need to develop those skills.

3) Neither team work nor collaborative working styles was mentioned in Initial Training (Appendix 8.2), which is surprising when this was given such prominence in earlier ABM documents and College and Course material. (see Chapter 7 pages 133) This was, however, seen as important for Initial CME where the newly ordained should be expected to have gained: “A deepening self-awareness and development of interpersonal skills to enable co-operation and a truly collaborate
leadership style to be exercised in ministry” (ABM 17, 1998 p 12) (Appendix 8.3 point b)

4) It is interesting to note, in the context of this research, that both Initial Ordination Training and Initial CME refer to the need to be aware of multi-Faith issues. For example, a candidate should have gained:

a developed appreciation of the pluralist and multi-faith/cultural society in which we live, (including knowledge of the basic belief tenets of the major world faiths), and the implications for the proclamation and teaching of the Christian faith; (ABM 17, 1998, p 6) (Appendix 8.2 point I)

and be able:

to enter into dialogue with those of other faiths who live and worship within the training parish, or nearby, with a view to the mutual overcoming of misunderstanding and prejudice and the promotion of community; (ABM 17, 1998, p 12) (Appendix 8.3 point f)

However, while both Initial Ordination Training and Initial CME recommend the need to develop an awareness of multi-Faith issues and an ability to enter into dialogue, the aims of each are slightly different. For example, Initial Training stresses a need to understand the major world faiths in relation to proclamation and teaching, while Initial CME focuses upon the promotion of community, or Kingdom values. I would suggest that this is a useful approach because it provides the ordinand with some basic tools in the theology of religion during Initial Training which should then help in a parish situation whether it be for proclamation, dialogue or good community relations.

The document ABM 17 recommended that “each diocese should produce guidelines which stress the range of skills and experience that the newly ordained are expected to acquire in the first four years” (ABM 17, 1998, p 17). Some dioceses already do
this, for example Oxford, Exeter, Derby, Southwell and Lincoln. Such guidelines could be very helpful in planning and evaluating appropriate ICME and CME provision. However, the task would be made much easier if there were similar guidelines for Initial Training.

This brings us back to ACCM 22 and curriculum development.

The issue of curriculum development has been extensively debated. One question is whether the ACCM 22 procedures ... have adequately ensured sufficient attention to and standards in:

Certain core areas and/or some particular aspects of study.

Areas which have been repeatedly raised are:

Homiletics/preaching/communication

Mission/evangelism

Ecclesiology (and its integration with mission evangelism)

Issues of discrimination (racism, sexism, disability, etc.) (ABM 15, 1997, pp 19-20)

Linked to the above debate is the question of whether the Church could have a national agreement on what is expected of ministerial candidates

• When they commence initial ministerial education (i.e. what should have been covered in pre-theological education);

• When they commence post-ordination training (i.e. what should have been covered in College, Course or Scheme);

• When they complete three years of post-ordination training

• When they share in ministerial review and related continuing ministerial education (CME) throughout their ministries. (ABM 15, 1997, p 20)

If such a proposal were to be accepted by the Church of England it should help to clarify the boundaries between Initial Training and Initial CME and therefore go some way to address confusion or misunderstanding where it exists. For example, a Training Institution stressed how important it is for “all concerned being clear about
the parts of training considered appropriate for training institutions on one hand and for parishes on the other. (‘we don’t teach them how to hold babies.’) (ACCM 10, 1982, p 7). Such a proposal would also be a serious move towards the true concept of Continuing Ministerial Education or life-long learning.

Training Incumbents and Training Parishes

The need for an appropriate training for training incumbents was addressed in 1982 when it was recognised that “for most people by far the most important single influence [on the newly ordained] will be the ‘training incumbent’ (ACCM 10, 1982, p 3):

by precept and by example the incumbent will give a model of ministry against which the assistant can test his or her own ideas and experience, but also through the incumbent’s regular contact over a three year period he will probably be in a better position closely to assess the assistant’s development than anyone has ever been before. This will give the incumbent opportunity to develop the particular gifts the assistant has, to identify those areas in which special help and guidance are needed and then either to make provision for that guidance through the parish or to point the assistant to those places where such guidance can be found. (ACCM 10, 1982, p 3)

A person carrying out such a training role will need skills in personal relations and education and also the ability to reflect theologically. He will need to address the issue of power and authority and be able to create an atmosphere of trust and confidence within the training relationship.15 (ACCM 10, 1982 pp 3-4)

15 When this statement was made in 1982 there were no female training incumbents because there were no women priests. At the time of writing, there were two women training incumbents in the Diocese of Chelmsford out of a total number of 79.
The delicate relationship between deacon and curate and the training incumbent was also referred to in the interviews. The following is taken from an interview with a priest from a Liberal tradition who has been in ministry for over thirty years:

Q Did you feel that the training incumbent understood what the role meant? How do you think he saw you?

A I think I was very fortunate. I came from a clergy family and therefore knew my way around. I knew what was expected. We were six curates in Nottingham parish church. We all had specific areas of responsibility and we were told to go and do! He was always there to consult, but he didn’t say, “now, tell me what you think?” He said “that is the way to do it”.

A good example of his working was, that on the second day I was there, we had lunch together. The phone rang to say there was a funeral at half past two. He said, “you can do it!” I had never been to a funeral in my life!!

Q Never even been to one?

A Never

Q Would that happen today?

A I don’t think it happens today. I think, looking back, it was because I had a fair dollop of self-confidence that I got through but there were curates who I knew subsequently who crashed all over the place under this kind of authority. A little later on, of course, the curates began to take over underneath this autocrat, and nursed the younger curates, saying “no you do it this way” and “be careful not to say that”. So it became collaborative ministry unbeknown to him.

...as a young flabby duckling coming into this, it was extremely fierce, and there were casualties that I could point to you now in the church – all round the place – who didn’t make it, and have never refound their ministry.

Q They didn’t make it under his regime you mean?

A No, or subsequently, because he knocked it out of them.

Q But you had a good training?

A I had a good training; I came from a background which stood me in good stead, and I was able to survive.16

---

16 The full transcription of this interview is given in Appendix 10.1a. A second transcription of an interview with a younger priest from an evangelical tradition is given in Appendix 10.1b.
Evidence of such an autocratic relationship was not so present in interviews with younger clergy, but there were tensions relating to role, boundaries and training:

\[
\text{when you talk to the deacons there was a lot of stuff that came up within the group that felt that the training incumbents weren't doing their job. The question came up "had they been trained?"}
\]

\[
\text{the clergy/incumbent relationship is curiously undefined. I started off feeling that I had to do what I was told - now I know I can say no. But it is not clear where the boundaries are. I find that an extraordinary relationship in modern society. I think quite a feudal one. I think it is little wonder that many, if not most, curacies end up with great tension at some point. I didn't expect myself to be saying this a year ago, but particularly in a non-team context the whole curate/incumbent relationship needs to be redefined.}
\]

\[
\text{being frank, I don't know how the training relationship would have shaped up if it was just my incumbent and me. When I have felt the need to say "no, I can't do that - I don't agree with that" or "we need to discuss how are working together" he has given me the space. The experience on the whole has been great.}
\]

The responsibility for the training of training incumbents is shared between the Dioceses and the training establishments. This has resulted in a variety of provision and approach. In 1982 ACCM instituted an enquiry into the situation and discovered that the majority of training institutions:

\[
\text{are not at present doing anything directly in this area, but many have the matter 'on their agendas' and there is evidence of interest in the subject partly as a way of preventing or alleviating problems, but also partly with wider educational aims in view. (ACCM 10, 1982, p 11)}
\]

The provision for the training of training incumbents offered by the Dioceses varied from an annual conference to one conference once in every six years. Seven Dioceses said that while the need for more training was recognised, little was actually being done. Other Dioceses produced written material for incumbents.
Following this enquiry, ACCM stated that because the responsibility for providing training events is a shared one between Dioceses and training institutions, "it would be inappropriate for ACCM to seek to impose any definite framework" for the training of training incumbents (ACCM 10, 1982, p 11). However, the following recommendations were made:

1) that Diocesan Bishops should be encouraged to re-examine the criteria by which training incumbents are selected;
2) that the accessibility of information between training institution and training incumbent should be investigated;
3) that further training provision should be investigated;
4) that training conferences should be critically evaluated. (ACCM 10, 1982 p 12)

The Diocese of Chelmsford has gone some way towards addressing this area of training by providing an annual two day residential conference for all new training incumbents, followed by an further opportunity to attend two workshops a year. Records show that take-up of the residential conference by new training incumbents is 100 per cent. However, attendance at the daily workshops reduces over time.17 At present there are 79 training incumbents in the Diocese but with the increase in ICME from three to four years and allowing for an increase in vocations, the number of training incumbents in the future could approach 200 at any one time. The Diocese would find this training need difficult to resource without an increase in training staff.18

---

17 Conversation with Chelmsford Continuing Ministerial Education Officer, 9 August 1999
18 Meeting of Chelmsford Ministry Education Advisory Group, 29 June 1998
ICME and CME in the Diocese of Chelmsford

The ICME scheme covers all deacons and curates who are in their first four years following ordination. The CME scheme is for the benefit of all clergy in the diocese throughout their ministry. I shall first discuss the general structure of ICME and then look at CME in terms of structure and content drawing on the data from the questionnaire. (Appendix 9.1)

In August 1999 there were 79 deacons and curates on the ICME scheme in the Diocese of Chelmsford. All those on the ICME scheme are expected to take part in these first four years of training after ordination and this 'compulsory' nature of the training is stressed both to the deacons/curates and also to the training incumbents.

An example of the four-year training programme is given in Appendix 8.4. Training takes place in a variety of situations with an annual three-day conference for the first three years plus several daily conferences throughout the year. All newly ordained are placed into convened groups, which meet regularly for theological reflection on day-to-day ministry. Individuals are also encouraged to continue their personal learning through courses, placements etc.

The annual three-day conference, which is organised by the deacons/curates themselves, and based upon a chosen theme, is a good example of collaborative working. The day conferences seem to have been well received:

There's been some good things. The recent day on styles of communion was helpful and the one on authority wasn't too bad either. But also it's a good time to just catch up with your mates.
a lot of the day stuff has been good. The mass day and time management was good

we have had time management and a good one on celebrating the eucharist which was helpful. (Interviews with deacons/curates)

By way of observation, the above statements reflect the diversity in churchmanship to be found in the Diocese of Chelmsford. The statements were made by people who were ordained at the same time but were trained at different institutions and this may account for the references 'communion', 'mass' and 'eucharist' for the same sacrament.

There have been difficulties, however, in relation to the convened groups. Some of these difficulties were referred to above. (see page 144) Apart from some uncertainty on the part of the deacons/curates as to the purpose of the groups, it has been difficult to find the best formula for allocating individuals to a particular group. For example, in the year 1998/9 the ICME group was divided according to Stipendiary and Non-Stipendiary ministry. The logic behind this decision was that many Non-Stipendiary clergy have full-time jobs and therefore find it difficult to attend meetings during the day. It was thought that this arrangement would be more convenient for them because they could organise their meetings during the evenings or weekends. The following statements were made by deacons:

I have sympathy for the CME staff. Each year they try to put right the problem of the previous year. As it has panned out I think stipendiary/non-stipendiary is an irrelevant distinction. I think full-time/part-time would be better. There is one non-stipendiary woman who I understand works full-time in ministry and says she could come to the meetings. Also, all the stipendiary are male. They should have picked this up.

This has been an absolute disaster. On our first session we divided into smaller groups and we were divided into stipendiary and non-stipendiary – which caused – we were all horrified by the way they divided us. It caused so much bad feeling with the stipendiaries and non-stipendiaries. It means, among other things that there are all men in the stipendiary group and all
women in the non-stipendiary group. Areas weren’t taken into consideration either – the fact that five of us work in East London where we could have met easily, wasn’t taken into account. It started off on such a bad footing that after a couple of sessions no-one was turning up. (Interviews with Deacons)

The question of CME provision for Non-Stipendiary ministry has been, and is being debated within the wider context of Non-Stipendiary ministry. (ACCM 17, 1984; ABM 4, 1992; ABM 5, 1993) The Diocese of Chelmsford is also addressing the issue. In relation to the situation referred to above, “this year there will be three Convened Groups based on areas but mixed between stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministers in both membership and leadership” (Ministry Education Advisory Group [MEAG] meeting minutes, 21 June 1999).

In the broader context, the Diocese, through MEAG, is working on Reader CME and NSM CME.19 In relation to Reader and NSM training the challenge is to find an inclusive and integrative Diocesan training model which will be relevant to the particular needs of Readers and NSMs.

Regarding stipendiary clergy, MEAG has identified three areas of training, which could be developed in the following ways:

1. Personal/Parochial – i.e. those areas where the Curate assumes responsibility of own training, with guidance where necessary from the Incumbent. [p]

2. That training which could be implemented through facilities provided in the Deanery [d]

3. Training which could best be facilitated by CME/Diocese [cme]

Distinction was also drawn between training [that] the group considered essential and [that] which was considered to be desirable. (Paper presented to MEAG, 21 June 1999)

19 NSM, or Non-Stipendiary Ministry is sometimes referred to as Self Supporting Ministry
MEAG has also responded to the document ABM 17, *Beginning Public Ministry*, by taking the structure of that document and allocating areas of responsibility for training according to the above three areas of responsibility, i.e. personal/parochial [p], deanery [d], CME/Diocese [cme]. (Appendix 8.5) The identification of areas of responsibility for training could contribute towards a greater clarity in aims and objectives for CME. However:

it may be that such a radical change in the delivery of post-ordination training could not be immediately delivered...In the long-term it would mean a much wider base for training provision than is current. If training is spread across Diocese, Deanery and Parish there should be a greater ownership of the need for good and professional training in the field. In addition there could more easily be provision for individual needs to be met. If the universality of the Anglican church is taken seriously it may be that training needs cannot fully be satisfied within the parish. (Paper presented to MEAG 21 June 1999)

The current Diocesan policy for providing CME for all clergy is to respond, where possible, to the particular needs of the individual. In the past there have been Diocesan training events, but with a growing diversity in learning needs, which has not been matched by an increase in resources, the tendency has been to reduce Diocesan events.

*There isn’t very much going on – and there used to be a tremendous lot of options. And OK, there are lots of things published ...but they tend to be elsewhere – and they tend to be residential which means it’s not so easy to drop everything and go. But if it is a day at Guy Harlings or Pleshey [within the Diocese] it is a delight to be able to put in – and so I YEARN FOR MORE OPTIONS* (clergy interview)

*There used to be a lot of in-house things that were done and although there are a few, they tend to be a lot more ‘intellectually centred’. That’s not the right word – you know what I mean – rather than pastorally urgent. They are word games rather than actually facilitating what you might need Monday to Sunday and I tend to go for things which help my ministry as it is.* (clergy interview)
I am trying to keep up with the world changing as it is, and wanting to be among colleagues and people who specialise, to reflect. I want to be given some new ideas and lines to think about. (Clergy interview)

The rapidly changing, multi-cultural/multi-Faith society in which we live demands skills and knowledge that may not have been provided in Initial Ordination Training. The opportunity to develop these skills and knowledge within CME therefore becomes even more important.

In order to offer individuals an appropriate training for their particular needs, every member of the clergy and some licensed lay workers, are eligible for an annual training grant. In this way the individual is responsible for his or her own training by identifying first of all the training need, and then seeing what is available, both within and outside the Diocese. Should a grant be awarded by the Diocesan CME Officer, the individual is expected to submit a written report on the educational or training event.

While there is merit in responding to the individual’s needs in this way, there are two dangers. First, what the individual perceives as a need may not necessarily match the needs of the Diocese, and tends towards individualism, which is contrary to the national training and education policy. (see page 82) Second, it is very possible that the individual may be unaware of his or her needs and/or what is available.

In response to question 10 of the questionnaire (Appendix 9.1), 93% of the respondents claimed to have received some form of CME. A analysis of the topics covered, together with comments, follows in Chapter 10. (pages 186-7) However, in relation to this chapter it is worth noting that the majority (68%) covered pastoralia and 15% have taken CME in World Faiths. Since 1994, when I first joined the
Diocese as Inter-faith Adviser, I have only once been invited to speak to clergy in the context of CME about inter-Faith issues. The more usual practice is for an individual to seek out a relevant course on other Faiths issues outside the Diocese and apply for a grant. In such cases I have been consulted about what may be an appropriate course.

Conclusion

With increasing demands on Initial Training through the Colleges and Courses, without a corresponding increase in time and resources available, more is being expected of CME provision in the Dioceses. The document ABM 17, published in 1998 was an attempt at the national level to offer Dioceses guidelines for their provision of CME, particularly for the first four years following ordination.

The place of the training parish and the role of training incumbents are still considered to be of crucial importance for the transition from College or Course into ministry. However, the priests and deacons who were interviewed expressed both negative and positive experiences regarding their relationship with their Training Incumbent and a number expressed confusion. Considerable confusion was also apparent regarding the whole issue of CME, particularly in relation to its overall aim.

While the Diocese of Chelmsford, through MEAG, is taking serious steps to improve the provision of CME within the resources available, it is debatable as to how successful this will be without addressing some of the more fundamental questions regarding the overall policy of clergy training. The following concluding discussion is an attempt to draw together some of the questions and issues which have arisen out of the chapters of this section on training policies.
Concluding Discussion to Part Two

The document ACCM 22, which was published in 1987, led to the first serious attempt by the Church of England to reflect theologically on training for ministry. The document, which was adopted by the House of Bishops, challenged the training institutions to answer the following questions:

“What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?”

“What is the shape of the educational programme best suited for equipping people to exercise this ministry?”

“What are the appropriate means of assessing suitability for ordination to exercise this ministry?” (ACCM 22, 1987, p 24)

The authors of the document stressed “The task and nature of the Church as the basis of ministry”, that the Church must manifest its own nature in its ministry, and determine to train its ministry accordingly” (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). It went on to say that the task of the Church “is to serve the mission of God in the world” (ACCM 22, 1987, p 27). (original emphases)

If the Church is to be the basis of ministry and the nature of the Church is to be manifested in its ministry, then some clear understanding of the nature of the Church must be a pre-requisite to determining what type of ordained ministry is required. Prior to ACCM 22 and during the time of the GME, the training establishments functioned as autonomous bodies even though, in theory, they followed a common syllabus. However, ACCM 22 recommended that the corporate body of Colleges and Courses, together with ACCM, should agree a general policy for training, based upon the above questions. In other words, there should be general agreement
between the training establishments and ACCM as to what ordained ministry was required and what form of educational programme and assessment procedures should be adopted.

In order to arrive at a consensus between the various bodies there would need to be a general agreement about the nature of the Church. From my reading of the College and Course material, only two establishments referred to the nature of the Church as the context for ordained ministry. Other College and Course material mentioned the Church but there was no attempt to articulate an understanding of the nature of the Church. (see Chapter 7 page 124)

This inability to arrive at an agreed understanding on the nature of the Church by the corporate body may an underlying factor which has resulted in an inability to arrive at a common stated aim or mission statement for training across the various institutions. (see Chapter 7 page 121)

While there is no common understanding or statement regarding the nature of the Church, nor a common stated aim for training, the reality of diversity has been recognised. ABM 2 was sensitive to the difficulties faced by Colleges and Courses, which was "partly due to the diversity of views to be found in the Church of England, and current uncertainty about handling this diversity constructively" (ABM 1, 1990, p 4). However, the ABM documents stressed that the primary task was to train clergy for ministry of the Church according to the agreed general policy and that training for diverse situations should be of secondary importance and be the responsibility of the particular College and Course according to context. (see Chapter 5, p 80)
In their initial response to ACCM 22 a number of the Colleges and Courses approached the issue of diversity from a theological perspective through the doctrine of the Trinity. However, two dangers were identified; a) an over-simplification of the doctrine and b) an over-emphasis upon mystery and paradox. There was also a related question about whether or not students were receiving adequate teaching of Trinitarian doctrine. (see Chapter 6 pages 98-101) From my reading of the documents, and conversations with deacons it would appear that the doctrine is not universally taught, one reason being a lack of teaching staff. This lack of teaching the Trinity may be the reason why the later submissions by the Colleges and Courses made very little reference to the Trinity. Some were even critical of it arguing “that the Trinity should not be interpreted as acting as a template for the modelling of human relationships (ecclesial or otherwise). (see Chapter 7 page 126)

While I was unable to discover from the documents examined or from the interviews, a clear theological understanding of the nature of the Church in relation to diversity, the reality of diversity, whether it was religious, cultural, social or theological, was addressed. All training institutions offered a variety of different courses and modules plus placements which addressed the issue of diversity.

Some of these courses and modules specifically addressed multi-Faith issues, and the theology underpinning the course reflected the theological tradition of the training institute. For example, multi-Faith issues may be part of mission studies modules in the evangelical Colleges. Apart from theological constraints, each institution was limited as to what it could offer due to limited time and staff resources. There was also the reality that because of these limitations, any particular institution will only
be able to offer a limited and partial training, which cannot do justice to the total picture of diversity both within the Church and in society.

One way of dealing with this problem may be to agree a 'typology' of contexts. (see Chapter 5 page 85) If this 'typology' were to be incorporated into the general training policy, as an example of the wider diversity facing the Church of England, this could have the advantage of allowing all students to become aware of this wider reality. Furthermore, while it would not be possible or even appropriate for individual training institutions to cover all courses and modules, it would be helpful for both training institutions and students to know which institutions offered training in which particular field of specialism.

Such a 'typology' could also be of benefit to clergy CME. It is now universally accepted that two years full-time or three years part-time training cannot cover adequately all aspects of training. Therefore a greater burden is now placed on the provision of good CME which relates to a particular context, for example when a priest moves from a rural to an urban parish or from parish ministry to chaplaincy. While a particular Diocese may not be able to offer an appropriate training for a particular need, it may be possible to identity from the 'typology' what is available elsewhere. Furthermore, the growth in distance learning modules and increasing availability of computer technology should make it possible to access learning resources across the country.

The diverse nature of the Church of England has both strengths and weaknesses. On the positive side it allows for a variety of theological traditions and styles of churchmanship. On the negative side, in relation to this present discussion, this very
diversity has made it difficult to formulate a working definition of the nature of the
Church in the context of training for ministry.

In Part Three, which follows, I shall be taking the Diocese of Chelmsford as a case
study to explore in greater depth the nature of this diversity. Through the analysis of
data collected by questionnaire I shall be looking at theological diversity, the range
of training received, CME take-up and the range of training needs as perceived by
the clergy. The question may then need to be asked “is it possible to formulate a
common training policy for a Church that is so diverse?”
PART THREE - THE CLERGY IN CHELMSFORD DIOCESE
A statistical analysis of Initial and Continuing Education

Introduction to Part Three

Part One provided the context for this research. Beginning with an examination of the social context of British multi-Faith and multi-cultural society, I then gave a brief overview of the general theology of religions debate. In Chapters three and four I discussed the response of the Church of England and particularly the Diocese of Chelmsford, to religious and cultural diversity.

The aim of Part Two was to determine how the Church of England is training its clergy for ministry in a multi-Faith and multi-cultural contexts. In order to discover this, it was necessary to look at the general training provision. The document ACCM 22, published in 1987, is seen as a watershed in the provision of clergy training and I therefore took this as my starting point for discussion in Chapter 5. Chapters 6 and 7 examined the responses to ACCM 22 and Chapter 8 focussed upon the provision of Continuing Ministerial Training in the Diocese of Chelmsford.

Much of the discussion in the earlier chapters has been concerned with the Church of England and national training policies and provision. The aim of Part Three is to examine in greater depth clergy training provision and needs, by taking the Diocese of Chelmsford as a case study for investigation.

There are two reasons for choosing Chelmsford Diocese as a case study. First, having been the Inter-Faith Adviser to the Diocese for the past five years, I have both experience within the Diocese and access to useful data. Second, by virtue of its size
and diversity, it is reasonable to believe that Chelmsford Diocese is representative of many others in the country. Chapter 9 of Part Three describes the methodology that was used for this investigation and Chapter 10 provides an analysis of the data.
Chapter 9 The Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the methods and methodology that I used in order to discover, from the perspective of the clergy, both their own training experience, and also how they perceived their own training needs.

I decided to take the ordained clergy, both stipendiary and non-stipendiary, as my target population. The total number of ordained clergy in the Diocese in December 1997 was 503 and I decided to take 250 (almost 50% of the total number) as my sample. In view of the large number, I chose to use a questionnaire as my main research method.

After the questionnaires had been returned and processed I selected a small number of clergy for follow-up, face to face, interviews in order to examine some of the issues in greater depth.

The Questionnaire Design

This was commenced in August 1997 in consultation with research staff at RSGB (Research Service of Great Britain) which was also engaged to process the data. The final version of the questionnaire was agreed after working through four draft versions and running two pilot studies. The finalised version, together with a covering letter and my reasons for asking the questions, is given in Appendix 9.1.
The first draft was tested during a workshop on 15 September 1997. The workshop was attended by six senior clerics responsible for diocesan ministerial development and training in Chelmsford Diocese. All who attended worked through the questionnaire. Their suggestions for improvement were then incorporated into a second draft. (Appendix 9.2)

In October 1997, as a second pilot study, the revised draft was sent to a further twelve clergy who were less senior and working in the field. I chose the twelve as people who I knew to be interested in the research and who would be likely to respond quickly. All twelve responded and their recommendations were then incorporated into a third draft. (Appendix 9.3) The main result of this second pilot study was to include a separate section for Non-Stipendiary Ministers and Ministers in Secular Employment because this group might have identified special training needs peculiar to their distinctive form of ministry.

Following discussions with my academic tutors on the 14th November 1997, a third draft was written incorporating further amendments, the main one being to include an open-ended section for other relevant experience. (Appendix 9.4)

Between November and December 1997 the questionnaire went through further drafting to ensure consistency and clarity. (Appendix 9.5)
The Sample

In December 1997 the establishment figure for clergy across the Diocese of Chelmsford was 503. I decided to take 250 as my sample, which represented 49.70% of the total establishment figure.

In order to get an even spread geographically, I used as my source for data the Diocesan mailing list, sorted according to deanery. This ensured that I had a proportionate number from each deanery. Had I used an alphabetical Diocesan mailing list I would not have had the same geographical spread. Starting with the first person on the Diocesan list, I worked alphabetically across the 27 deaneries taking every other name from the mailing list, making a total of 250. (Appendix 9.6) Apart from my decision to take the first person on the total list of 503, this sampling was essentially random. I then created my own database in order that I could run off my own labels for subsequent mailings.

Having created and run off my own database I then coded each person on the list in such a way that I could identify the deanery of each respondent. For example, Barking and Dagenham Deanery was coded 01..., the first respondent being 0101, the last respondent being 0111; Epping Deanery was prefixed 02..., the first respondent being 0212 etc through to the final respondent, who was number 27250 (St. Osyth = 27; the respondent = number 250). While the prime reason for working across deaneries was to achieve a geographical spread, I also thought it would be useful, in the final analysis to be able to examine the data, according to deanery bearing in mind the diverse nature of the Diocese. (see Chapter 1, pp 9-14)
example, it would be useful to see if clergy from the urban areas perceive a greater need for resourcing in inter-Faith issues than do those from the more rural areas.

The first mailing
This was sent out on the 16th January 1998 with a covering letter and a stamped and addressed envelope. (Appendix 9.1) Respondents were asked to reply by the end of January 1998. The final page of the questionnaire had a section thanking the respondent and requesting the respondent to provide a name and address if he or she were prepared to be interviewed either by telephone or face to face.

As each questionnaire was received it was ticked off by its code from the master database and further coded in order to be able to identify when it was received. For example, those received between 26 and 31 January I marked in red and those received after 1 February I marked with a tick.

By 31 January I had received 67 anonymous responses and 83 named responses, making a total of 150 (60% of the sample population).

The second mailing
A second mailing was sent out on the 9th February with a covering letter, a further questionnaire and stamped and addressed envelope to all those who had not yet replied. (Appendix 9.7) By the end of February a further 26 anonymous and 26 named responses had been received, making a total return of 202 (80% of the total sample population). By the 12th March, a further two anonymous and four named were received bringing the final total to 208, being 83.2% of the total sample
population. Two questionnaires were returned with covering letters, one explaining that the respondent had retired, and the other that the respondent would be unable to complete it, saying "I am afraid that I cannot answer your questionnaire. The simple fact is that I do not know the answer to many of your questions, some I do not understand and the rest I have no desire to answer". 20

Creating codes for open-ended and 'other' answers

When all the questionnaires had been received I created a separate blank sheet for every question with either an 'other' option or an open-ended question. I then read through every questionnaire and wrote each response on the corresponding sheet.

I then read through all the sheets and where the same or similar answer was given more than once for an 'other' option, I created a code for this. For example under Question 5, At which theological college were you trained? 43 respondents (23% of the total number attending theological college) entered a training establishment under the 'other' option. To allow for these 43 I created the following codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Nottingham</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London College of Divinity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Bible College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Army</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes were added in a similar way to Questions 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 31. (Appendix 9.8)

---

20 This letter was sent to me by a parish priest in the Waltham Forest deanery, which is both multi-Faith and multi-cultural. See map on page 13
Questions 30 and 32 were completely open-ended. I read through every response to both questions and where answers were the same or similar I added a corresponding code to the existing columns. (Appendix 9.9)

Each recording sheet containing all ‘other’ comments and all open-ended comments were then typed up and kept for further reference.

I coded each questionnaire myself incorporating all the new codes for ‘other’ and open-ended questions. I then stored all the questionnaires securely according to code number.

Data input and processing
Once all the extra codes had been incorporated into the questionnaire, a data entry programme was written by RSGB and tested out on 20 of the completed questionnaires. The purpose of this test was to highlight any problems that may occur with the coding during the data entry process. No problems were detected and the first tables of raw data were made available in July 1998. These initial tables gave data for every question according to Age, Years Ordained, Gender, and whether College or Course trained. The decision to present the data in this way was taken by RSGB on the basis that such a breakdown could prove useful for future processing and later analysis. Question 1 of the raw data is shown as Appendix 9.10 as an example.
In order to make the data more manageable it was decided to categorise the clergy by ‘ideal types’, according to certain characteristics. This categorisation would also be helpful when deciding which clergy to choose for follow-up interviews.

As a first step I decided to collapse some of the variables and then run frequency tests on the data. The variable of Age was collapsed from five (25-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65, over 65) to two (up to 44 years and 45 and over). The variable Theological Tradition was also collapsed from ten (Anglo-Catholic, Catholic, Modern Catholic, Charismatic, Conservative Evangelical, Open Evangelical, Middle of the Road, Liberal, Traditional, Radical) to three (Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal). The variable Place of Ministry was collapsed from three (Urban, Suburban and Rural) to two (Urban and Rural).

Following this initial collapsing, a set of tables was run off to show the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>up to 44</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 These categories of Theological Tradition decided upon during the drafting process in consultation with clergy involved in the pilot studies.
A second set of tables was also run off to show the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>up to 44</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that no data appeared for table numbers 5, 17 and 18. A check against the raw data confirmed that there were no clergy who fitted that particular category.

Following a discussion with my academic tutors it was recognised that by excluding those who had said ‘yes’ to further training in favour of those who said ‘no’ I was showing an unacceptable bias. It was therefore agreed that any further attempt at categorising or looking for ‘ideal types’ should include those who had said that they did want further training.

In September 1998 I carried out a further process of collapsing as follows:

Q12  Theological Tradition
- Catholic coded V1
- Charismatic " V2
- Evangelical " V3
- Liberal/ Middle of the Road " V4
Q17  Other Faiths present
None        coded no
All else    coded yes

Q21  Consultation
Never       coded no
All else    coded yes

Q28  Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>New Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Evangelism for conversion</td>
<td>Conversion (V1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>Dialogue for conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Witness through worship</td>
<td>Witness through worship (V2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Witness through action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Dialogue for community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>Dialogue for understanding</td>
<td>Community Relations (V3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>Irrelevant (V8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q31  Further training
Yes to any part of 31 coded yes
None    coded no

Frequency counts were then run on the following questions:

Q1  Age
Q2  Years Ordained
Q3  Gender
Q4  Pre-ordination College or Course Training
Q5  At which College
Q6  At which Course
Q8  Any Pre-ordination or Special Training
Q10 Any Post-ordination or CME
Q12  Theological tradition
Q15  Present Ministry
Q20  Frequency of contact with other Faiths

At this point Chi-Square was used for the following:

a) Q1, Age by Q20 A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H (Baha’i, Buddhist, etc.)
   Q2  Yrs Ord. by “ etc
   Gender by “ etc
b) Age by Q8 (pre-ordination training)
   Yrs Ord. by “
   Gender by “

c) Age by Q10 (post-ordination training)
   Yrs Ord. by “
   Gender by “

d) Age by Q5 (theological college)
   Yrs Ord. by “
   Gender by “

e) Age by Q6 (training course)
   Yrs Ord. by “
   Gender by “

f) Age by Q12 (theological tradition – collapsed as above)
   Yrs Ord. by “
   Gender by “

g) Theological tradition (Q12)

| NQ12 V1 by V1 | NQ12 V1 by V2 |
| V2 by V1     | V2 by V2     |
| V3 by V1     | V3 by V2     |
| V4 by V1     | V4 by V2     |

| NQ12 V1 by V3 | V1 by V4 |
| V2 by V3     | V2 by V4 |
| V3 by V3     | V3 by V4 |
| V4 by V3     | V4 by V4 |

All of these tables, with the exception of f) and g) carried the following warning:

"X number of cells have expected counts less than 5. Chi-Square may not be a valid test.

Because Chi-Square proved not to be helpful in the processing at this stage, I decided to run frequency tests in order to compare the following sets of variables:

1. Theological Tradition (Q12) by College (Q5)
2. Attitude (Q28) by College (Q5)
3. Theological Tradition (Q12) by Attitude (Q28)
Other Faiths Present (Q17) (a combination of Q17 – people of other Faiths living in the parish with Q18 – places of worship in the parish) by Other Faith contact (Q19)

Other Faiths Present (Q17) by Perceived need for Information (Q31)

Contact with Other Faiths (Q22) by Perceived need for Information (Q31)

Consultancy (Q21) by Perceived need for Information (Q31)

I also had the following tables run off:

Frequencies of Attitude (Q28)

Multiple answers to Attitude (Q28) (with the serial number of respondent)

The Selection of Clergy from the Questionnaire Respondents for follow-up interviews

My aim was to explore in greater depth some of the responses to the questionnaire.

I decided to select eight clergy for follow-up interviews, taking two from each of the following four categories:

Those whose response indicated that:

a) There **were** people of other Faiths in their parish/chaplaincy but they **did not** require resourcing

b) There **were** people of other Faiths in their parish/chaplaincy and they **did** require resourcing

c) There **were no** people of other Faiths in their parish/chaplaincy and they **did not** require resourcing

d) There **were** people of other Faiths in their parish/chaplaincy but they had **no contact**; one of which required resourcing and one which did not.

My reason for choosing these particular categories was to discover what connection, if any, the presence of people of other Faiths had on perceived training needs and also to examine why it is that some clergy do not see the need for further resourcing.

By resourcing I am referring to Question 31 of the questionnaire which asked:
Q.31 What further training or education do you need for ministry among people of other Faith traditions?

More information about the following Faiths:
- Baha’i
- Buddhism
- Hinduism
- Jainism
- Judaism
- Islam
- Sikhism
- Zoroastrianism
- Other

Further Study in:
- the theology of religions
- the theology of mission
- the theology of dialogue
- the relationship between mission and dialogue
- the relationship between religion and culture
- Other

Further training in:
- communication skills
- foreign language skills
- Other

Resource material
- Guidelines on the use of buildings by people of other Faiths
- Guidelines on multi-Faith worship
- Teaching tapes or videos
- Other

Opportunities to:
- meet people of other Faiths
- Visit other places of worship

I then extracted from the data tables, all those who fitted the above categories a), b), c) and d), by serial number. The result was as follows:

a) Other Faith presence but no resourcing required:
   25 respondents

b) No other Faith presence but resourcing required:
   6 respondents
c) Other Faith presence and resourcing required:

46 respondents

d) Other Faith presence but no contact:

28 respondents

I then extracted two completed questionnaires from each of the above lists according to serial number. In each case I started from the top of each list and took the first two respondents who had agreed to be interviewed as was indicated in the last page of the questionnaire.

Having extracted the eight questionnaires I then checked each one to make sure that the completed questionnaire matched the information given in the data tables. In every case the questionnaire matched the data.

I then telephoned each respondent to arrange an interview. If he or she had declined to be interviewed I had intended to move on to the next one on the list. However, every one I spoke to agreed to be interviewed. An example of the interview sheet is shown as Appendix 9.11.

The Selection of Clergy from Years 1-4 Post Ordination Training for interviews

I decided to interview four clergy who had recently been trained. I was particularly interested in their impression of initial training and also their experience of their situation in a training parish.
I chose four who were accessible to me geographically and who had trained at different types of training institution. The choices were:

- Westcott House, Cambridge a College in the Liberal tradition
- Oakhill College, London a College in the Evangelical tradition
- North Thames Ministerial Training Course
- East Anglia Ministerial Training Course

An example of the interview sheet is shown as Appendix 9.12.
Chapter 10  The Analysis

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to analyse and discuss the data resulting from the postal questionnaire and the face to face interviews. This will be done with a view to identifying key issues, particularly those referred to in the concluding discussion at the end of Part Two.

The research methods and methodologies that I used, as described in the previous chapter, produced 80 tables of raw data, 24 tables of initial processing into ‘character’ types, 130 tables of further processing and 82 tables of frequency tests, making 316 tables in total.

While all the data is of interest, it is too vast to deal with in detail, and it is not all directly relevant to this research. I do not therefore intend to analyse all tables, nor do I intend to work systematically through every question on the questionnaire or interview schedules. Rather I shall focus upon those areas that relate to the research question. It is anticipated that data that is not used for this particular thesis will still be of interest to the Diocese of Chelmsford.

I shall start by looking at the clergy profile for the Diocese in terms of age, gender, theological tradition, previous training and location of ministry. I shall then look at attitudes towards training and particularly training for multi-Faith and multi-cultural ministry. I shall also include reference to non-respondents.
The Clergy Profile – Age, Gender, Years Ordained

Questions 1 to 3 of the questionnaire asked for the age, gender and years ordained of the respondent. The results showed that the highest number of respondents, 67 out of 208 (31%) were between the ages of 46 and 55 years with the lowest number, 18 out of 208 (9%) being between 25 and 35 years. Ten respondents (5%) declined to answer the question. More generally, 129 (62%) were over the age of 45 years with 67 (33%) being under 45 years and 10 (5%) no answer. (Table 1 page 181)

In terms of gender, 173 (83%) were male with 35 (17%) female. Out of the female clergy, the largest number, 14 (40%) were in the age bracket 46-55 with the smallest number, 4 (11%) being in the age bracket 25-35. Out of the male clergy, there were 53 in the age bracket 46-55 and 54 in the age bracket 56-65, both being 31%. It would appear from these figures that the largest proportion of ordained clergy, both male and female, in the Diocese of Chelmsford taken from the sample, fall in the 46-55 age bracket. It is also interesting to note the proportionate balance between male and female in the 46-65 age groups. For example, 31% of the male in the 46-55 age group added to 31% in the 56-65 age group makes 62%, while for the females 40% in the 46-55 age group added to 23% in the 56-55 age group makes 63% resulting in an extremely close percentage for both male and female.
If we now look at the years ordained, Table 2, Years Ordained, (page 182) we will see that the largest number of clergy, 62 (30%) of the total number of respondents, were ordained within the past 6 to 15 years. 35 respondents, (17%), have been ordained for less than five years, making a total of 97 (47%) being ordained within the past 15 years. Those who have been ordained for more than 16 years, number 111 (53%). If we compare these figures with Table 1, Age Profile, it would appear that there is no necessary correlation between age and years ordained. For example, while 62% are over 46 years only 53% have been ordained for more than 15 years; 33% are under 46 years while 47% have been ordained for less than 15 years. This would suggest that there might be evidence to show that people are being ordained at a later age. This is certainly the case for the women where 49% of the women respondents, 40% of whom are aged between 46-55, have been ordained for less than five years. Of course this statistic may well reflect the general increase in women ordinands following the change in canon law which now allows women priests.
YEARS ORDAINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 35</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 35</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Years Ordained

Clergy Profile – College or Course Ordination Training

Question 4 of the Questionnaire asked whether the respondent received pre-ordination training from a Theological College or a Ministry Training Course. 187 (90%) of the respondents had attended a Theological College while 25 (12%) had attended a Ministry Training Course. (Table 3, page 183) Six respondents had received training at both a College and a Course. This can happen where an ordinand follows a Ministry Training Course in order to develop specific pastoral skills after having followed a more academic course at a Theological College. Two respondents, one female and one male; one who had been ordained for less than five years and the other between 26 and 35 years, declined to reply.
In terms of gender, it is interesting to note that 94% of the male ordinands and 69% of the female ordinands had attended a Theological College. This reflects the fact that by far the majority of respondents to this survey received their ordination training in Colleges.

An increasing number of men and women are coming into ministry later in life; many are training for non-stipendiary ministry and will continue in their secular employment, and many are women who have domestic commitments. Non-residential training on a Ministry Training Course would probably be the most suitable for such candidates. It might be expected, therefore that the statistics would show a trend away from College towards Course training. This would appear to be
the case for Chelmsford clergy, which shows a very gradual increase in Course training. (*Table 4*)

**Table 4  College or Course Ordination Training by Years Ordained**

The above table shows that of the 55 clergy who were ordained between 26 and 35 years ago, 54 were trained at a College while only one trained on a Course. However, if we look at those who have been trained for less than five years, we can see that the gap has narrowed considerably with 23 having trained at a College against 12 on a Course. This would seem to substantiate the theory that there is an increase in Course training over against College training.

However, the younger ordinands still seem to be training at Colleges. *Table 5* (page 185) shows that all of the 18 respondents between the ages of 25 and 35 trained at a College while no-one in that age group trained on a Course. The highest number of ordinands training on Courses appear in the 56-65 age group. This possibly reflects the fact that the younger students do not have the same domestic or employment
commitments and are probably more at ease in an academic environment than the older candidate.

**Table 5 College or Course Ordination Training by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clergy Profile – Pre-Ordination Training

Out of the total 208 respondents, 158 (76%) (130 male and 28 female) had received some form of training prior to ordination training. *(Table 6, page 186)* Of this number, 27 (17%) (24 male and 3 female) had taken degrees in theology while another 36 (23%) (33 male and 3 female) had taken other degree courses. The 158 respondents who had pre-ordination training were evenly spread across both age brackets and years ordained.
PRE-ORDINATION LEARNING/TRAINING
By Age Total 158 (76%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Years Ordained Total 158 (76%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Less than 5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Pre-Ordination Learning/Training

Clergy Profile – Post Ordination Training/Continuing Ministerial Education

Question 10 asked respondents if they had received any form of Post Ordination Training or Continuing Ministerial Education. 194 people out of a total number of 208 (93%) of had received some form of CME since ordination.

Table 7 Post Ordination Training and Continuing Ministerial Education by topic
Table 7 above shows the variety of topics studied by percentage, the most popular being pastoralia, followed by spirituality. In relation to this research, 15% of the total number of respondents had received some form of CME in the area of other Faiths.

Table 8 shows the same information by number of male and female respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST ORDINATION TRAINING AND CONTINUING MINISTERIAL EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Topics -</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Mngt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Mngt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14, (10 male and 4 female) respondents claimed to have never received any form of CME. It might have been expected that these 14 would have come from an older age group, or certainly those who have been ordained for some years. In terms of numbers, there would appear to be an even spread across age range and years ordained. However, according to percentages within age brackets and years ordained there is some evidence to show that those who have not had any CME fall within the upper age bracket and have been ordained for a longer period of time. (Tables 9 and 10)
Table 9 Post Ordination Training and Continuing Ministerial Education by Age

According to the above figures, the take-up of CME is higher among the younger clergy (100% for those between 25-35 years) and decreases with age. But this does
not seem to be the case with years ordained. For example, there is an actual drop in take-up, from 97% of those ordained between 6-15 years (60 in number on Table 10), to 91% of those ordained less than five years (32 in number on Table 10). At the same time, there is an increase in those who did not take-up any CME from 3% for those ordained between 6-15 years (2 in number on Table 10) to 9% for those ordained less than five years (3 in number on Table 10). This is particularly surprising in view of the fact that all newly ordained clergy are expected to follow the four year Initial Continuing Ministry Education scheme. (see Chapter 8, page 142) It is possible that these particular respondents, when completing the questionnaire, did not consider their ‘compulsory’ 1-4 Years ICME to be relevant to the question. On the other hand, there may be a general tendency for the older newly ordained person to decline CME. This may be because they consider themselves to be sufficiently trained during their previous secular employment or they may not see the relevance of what is offered.

**Clergy Profile - Theological Tradition**

Question 12 asked of the respondent, “Which words would best describe your present theological/church tradition?” The respondent was also given the opportunity to tick more than one option. For the purpose of analysis the eleven options, Anglo-Catholic, Catholic, Modern Catholic, Charismatic, Conservative Evangelical, Open Evangelical, Middle of the Road, Liberal, Traditional, Radical, Other were collapsed to four. (see Chapter 9 page 171) At this point I would like to make reference to Chapter 2, p 21 where I pointed out that ‘labelling’ or putting people into theological categories, was essentially unsatisfactory in that no individual
fits neatly into a ‘box’. However, in order to facilitate discussion ‘labelling’ was a useful tool. *Table 11* gives the proportion within the sample of each of the four categories. In order to present this in pie chart form it was necessary to adjust the figures proportionately in order to start from a base of 100%.

**Table 11  Main Theological Traditions of Clergy Sample**

Before discussing the above table in more detail, it is necessary to point out that 91 respondents, 44% of the total number, declined to answer this question. Two reasons are possible: a) the respondent genuinely did not know how to answer the question, or b) declined to answer because it was too sensitive an area. It would be interesting to explore this in greater depth but such research is beyond the scope of this thesis.

*Table 11* shows Evangelical as the majority group, followed by Catholic, then Liberal/Middle of the Road and finally Charismatic. My understanding and use of the term ‘open’ Evangelical as opposed to ‘conservative’ is that such a person is more
likely be open to other persuasions and possibilities. In other words, someone who has an enquiring mind, is ready to listen and perhaps even to learn from others. In the context of theological attitudes towards people of other Faiths, such a person may be described as an Exclusivist bordering upon being an Inclusivist, while a Conservative Evangelical is more likely to be described as an Exclusivist. (see Chapter 2, p 22)

The following tables show the breakdown within each group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208 18 51 67 62 35 62 42 55 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>18 9% 3 17% 4 8% 4 6% 5 8% 3 9% 3 5% 5 12% 4 7% 3 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>31 15% 3 17% 6 12% 13 19% 9 15% 5 14% 12 19% 7 17% 7 13% -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 Evangelical*

*Table 12* shows Open Evangelicals to be in the majority (15% as against 9%) and fairly evenly spread over age and years ordained, except that no-one who has been in ministry for over 35 years claimed to be in that category. The trend is different for the Conservative Evangelicals. For example, while there is a fairly even spread over the age brackets 36-45, 46-55 and 56-65, there is a sharp increase, from 8% to 17% in the younger age group of 25-35. However, this sharp increase in the younger age group does not seem to be reflected in the years ordained.
Within the Catholic tradition the Modern Catholics are in the majority at 11%, followed by the Catholic at 4% and Anglo-Catholic at 2%. (Fig 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-56</th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Catholic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. Catholic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13 Catholic**

Within the Modern Catholic tradition, however, while there is a fairly even spread across the ages, there is a noticeable decline from 21% who have been ordained for over 35 years to just 6% for those who have been ordained for less than five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-56</th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14 Liberal/Middle of Road**

An interesting point with the above table is that no-one in either the younger age bracket of 25-35 years, or among those who had been ordained for over 35 years, described themselves as either Middle of the Road or Liberal. The largest number
appear to be within the ages of 46-55 and among those who have been ordained for less than five years. Once more, this latter figure supports the theory that people are getting ordained at a later age.

Does this also reflect the fact that younger people are more theologically conservative, while older people tend to become more liberal with age and maturity? This question would be worth exploring in greater depth but again is beyond the bounds of this thesis.

Those who described themselves as Charismatic were the smallest in number, being two, only 1% of the total number of respondents. Both of these respondents were male, college trained as opposed to course trained, in the 36-45 age group and both had been ordained for less than 15 years.

Question 13 of the questionnaire, which asked if the respondent had always been of this tradition, may throw some light on the above question relating the people becoming more liberal with age. Table 15 shows the numbers of respondents who have changed their theological tradition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Number of Respondents who had changed their theological tradition
These figures show that 56%, of the total number of respondents, which is quite a large number, claimed to have changed their theological tradition. Within the 46-55 age group 52% had changed and of those who have been ordained for less than five years and between 6-15 years, the percentage is very close being 49% and 48% respectively. In terms of gender, 18 out of the 35 female respondents, (51%), had also changed their tradition.

Related to the above is question 14 of the questionnaire which asked “If this has not always been your tradition, what words would best describe your previous tradition?

Table 16 shows that the largest movement has been away from Conservative Evangelical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theological Tradition</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Cath.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. Cath.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con. Evang.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Evang.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid. Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Previous Theological Tradition
Looking at the Conservative Evangelicals, there is an even spread of 14% or 15% across the age groups 36-45, 46-55 and 56-65 with the lowest, 11%, among the 25-35 age group. In terms of years ordained, the highest percentage is among those who have been ordained between 6-15 years with the lowest, at 7% among those ordained for more than 35 years. The table also shows that there is a very strong correlation, between the younger age group and those ordained for less than five years who have moved from Conservative Evangelicalism, in both cases the percentage being 11%. What is interesting about this table is that while there has been a move away from other traditions, the move from Conservative Evangelical, at 13%, is considerably higher than for the others, the closest being a 5% move from Anglo-Catholic, Open Evangelical and Middle of the Road.

**Theological Tradition compared with College attended**

I was interested to know if there was any correlation between an individual's theological tradition and that of the college at which he or she had trained. The following table shows the number of ordinands according to theological tradition attending each college:
Theological Tradition of Ordinands by College

As mentioned earlier, respondents were given the opportunity to tick more than one option for theological tradition, which resulted in an apparent discrepancy between the total number attending a particular college and the sum of theological responses. Table 18 gives the same information except that the right-hand column summarises the general theological persuasion of the respondents attending each college, by taking the highest number in any one tradition to represent the first position, with the second to highest the second position. For example, Queens Birmingham is given as Catholic/Liberal because the highest number of respondents (5) were Catholic with the second to highest (2) being Liberal/Middle of the Road. Where the second and third positions were equal, for example Cranmer Hall, I simply gave the first position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cath</th>
<th>Charis</th>
<th>Evang</th>
<th>Lib/Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Queens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Trinity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Army</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranmer Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddlesdon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s London</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Bible College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Divinity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley Hall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury &amp; Wells</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Nottingham</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen’s House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott House</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18 Theological Tradition of Ordinands and College**

Having matched the theological tradition of the students against the colleges I then wanted to see how this compared with how the colleges defined themselves in terms of tradition. I discussed this earlier in Chapter 7, page 118.
Clergy Profile – Area of Ministry

Out of the total number of 208 respondents 76% said that they were in parochial ministry. This figure was made up of 20% (42) in rural parishes, 26% (55) in suburban parishes and the largest number, 30% (62) in urban parishes. *Table 19* shows how these figures are spread across age and years ordained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
<th>Total 25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-56</th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 19* Area of Parochial Ministry

The most interesting point about the above table is that there are no clergy under the age of 35 in rural ministry. There are only 7 (14%) in the age group 36-45 in rural ministry with a gradual increase to 10 (15%) in the 46-55 age group with the largest number, 23 (37%) being between 56 and 65 years. The same pattern, though with a more gradual increase, is mirrored in years ordained. Here the percentage increases progressively from 11% for those ordained for less than five years to 29% for those ordained for more than 35 years.

The situation for urban ministry is the reverse. Here the largest percentage (56%), of clergy in urban ministry are those between 25 and 35 years, with a sharp decline to
7% for those between 56 and 65 years. The same trend appears in years ordained where the largest percentage, 40% are those ordained for less than five years with a gradual decline to 25% for those ordained between 26 and 35 years. These figures would suggest that younger clergy move to ministry in urban areas. One reason might be related to the fact that the older, married clergy have to consider an appropriate schooling and social environment for their children, which they perceive to be found in the more suburban and rural areas, while single clergy may not have the same family concerns. Younger clergy may also be attracted to urban ministry which is more accessible to leisure and social facilities.

Before moving on to the next section and Other Faith presence, I should say something about the term urban ministry in this analysis. As mentioned in the previous chapter on methodology, the categories urban and suburban were collapsed into one category, urban, for the purpose of processing and analysis. In relation to what follows therefore, there may be some respondents who fall within the urban category who could be in ministry in the suburban parts of Chelmsford, Colchester, Southend, Harlow or any other large Essex town. These respondents may be genuinely unaware of the other Faith element within their parish. However, as pointed out in Chapter 1 pages 11-13, there is a continual movement of other Faith communities away from the inner and outer London area into the more suburban and rural parts of Essex.

Clergy Profile – Other Faith Presence

Question 17 asked the respondent “What other Faith communities live in your parish?” 24 (13%) respondents said that people of other Faith lived within their parish. 13 respondents (7%) said that Jews lived within their parish, followed by
Muslims, with 6 (3%) and Sikhs 2 (1%). Bearing in mind that 62 clergy (30% of the total number of respondents) said that they ministered in urban areas, this is a surprisingly low number. The following table, Table 20, shows how many respondents said that no people of other Faiths lived in their parish, or they didn’t know, or they didn’t answer the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-56</th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20  What Other Faith Communities live in your parish?

Question 18 asked “What other Faith communities have places of worship in your parish?” Table 21 gives the breakdown to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-56</th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21  What Other Faith Communities have places of worship in parish
The interesting point about the response to this question, is that whilst only six clergy responded to the previous question that they had Muslims living in their parish, 13 clergy said that they had Muslim places of worship within their parish. A similar situation appears with the Sikhs, where in response to Question 17 only two clergy said that they had Sikh people living in their parish while in response to Question 18, five clergy said that they had Sikh places of worship in their parish. This raises several questions:

- Did the respondents make no connection between those living within the parish and a place of worship?

- Did the respondents genuinely believe that Muslims and Sikhs would be coming from outside of their parish to attend a place of worship?

- In view of the large number of respondents ministering in urban areas and yet claiming to have no other faith communities living within the parish, does this reflect a problem in understanding the question? For example, perhaps the question should have been worded ‘people of other Faith’, rather than ‘Faith communities’.

However the above questions are answered, there is some evidence that certain clergy are unfamiliar with their own parish in terms of people of other Faith.

Another interesting point relates to the actual response. 149 (76%) of the respondents said that there were no places of other Faith worship in their parish, compared with 60 (31%) who said that there were no people of other Faiths living in their parish. It may not be surprising that more clergy, 149, were able to respond with confidence that there were no places of other Faith worship in their parish. A
place of worship may be more visible and therefore recognisable as such than knowing about the identity of individuals. However, in the London boroughs of Newham, Waltham Forest and Redbridge, which all form part of the Diocese of Chelmsford, numerous places of worship exist above shops, in schools and other community buildings. Equally, it is not always possible to judge the Faith tradition of a person by appearance. For example, not all Asian people are Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist or Sikh. Many Asian people are in fact Christians.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, reliable statistics are very difficult to obtain (see Chapter 1 pp 13-14). Having said that, once more the response to this question does illustrate a lack of knowledge on the part of the clergy, and particularly those 62 (30%) who are in urban or suburban ministry.

Question 19, which asked about contact with people of other Faith communities, very much relates to the previous two questions and shows an interesting response. For example, while only 13% said that people of other Faiths lived within their parish and 15% had places of other Faith worship in their parish, a much higher percentage, 49% claimed to have contact with people of other Faiths. The question could be asked, “where does this other Faith contact take place if 31% claimed to have no people of other Faiths living in their parish, and 76% claimed to have no other Faith place of Worship in their parish?”
Table 22 gives a breakdown of this contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoroastrian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 Frequency of contact with people of Other Faiths

The above table shows that the greatest contact on an occasional basis is with the Muslims (54%), followed by the Jews (48%). However, 41% have an occasional and 13% a frequent contact with the Hindus. This is a surprising statistic because no respondent claimed to have a Hindu place of worship in his or her parish. On the other hand, this may reflect either the fact that there are fewer Hindu temples in the Diocese of Chelmsford (see Chapter 1, pp 13-14) or that Hindus tend to worship more in the home. Or it may simply be that the respondents did not recognise a Hindu temple of worship in their parish.

Question 21 asked if the respondent had ever been consulted regarding a number of issues concerning people of other Faiths. The following table gives the breakdown:
Table 23  Consultancy regarding Other Faith issues

17 respondents replied that they had been consulted concerning a service where people of other Faiths may be present. This may reflect the establishment role of the Church of England in regard to funerals, marriages and baptisms where people of other Faiths may be present. It also may reflect the civic services that involve the civic authorities and the uniformed organisations such as Brownies, Guides and Scouts, all bodies that have people of other Faith as members.

A large number, 108, of the respondents said they had never been consulted at all. This may have been because they did not understand the question, did not know the answer, did not want to spend the time thinking about it or quite simply had never been consulted.
On the other hand, in response to Question 22 of the Questionnaire, a large number, 160 (78%) said that they visited schools, residential homes, hospitals etc. where people of other Faith may be present. These respondents were evenly spread across age group and years ordained.

Attitude towards people of Other Faiths

Question 28 of the questionnaire asked the respondent “as a minister licensed to serve the people in your parish, how would you best describe your ministry in relation to those who profess another Faith?” Respondents were invited to tick more than one box if appropriate. The following table gives a breakdown of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witness through worship</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue for understanding</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness through action</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue for community</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism for conversion</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue for conversion</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24  Attitude towards people of Other Faiths

In order to obtain a more overall picture of attitudes, these twelve responses were collapsed into the following categories:

Evangelism for conversion }  Conversion
Dialogue for conversion }  }
Conversion  }
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Witness through worship  }  Witness
Witness through action  }  
Dialogue for community  }  
Dialogue for understanding  }  Community Relations
Reconciliation  }  
Friendship  }  

Avoid  }  
Irrelevant  }  Irrelevant

These four categories are given as percentages of the total number of respondents in relative terms in the following table:

**ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE OF OTHER FAITHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 25 Attitude towards people of Other Faiths*

The following table, *Table 26* gives shows attitudes towards people of other Faiths according to theological tradition:
These figures show that the majority of respondents recognised the importance of good relations with people of other Faiths for the sake of good community relations. Dialogue in order to promote a better understanding scored the highest across all theological traditions. Witness, either through worship or social action appears to be the second most important. Within those of the Catholic tradition, witness, particularly through worship, scored the highest while within the Evangelical tradition witness through social action scored the highest.
However, the most interesting feature of this table is related to the question of conversion. Among the Catholics only 8 out of a total of 79 gave conversion as a feature of their ministry among people of other Faiths. The Liberals were slightly higher, showing 13 out of 65. The figures for Evangelicals show that 73 out of 87 consider conversion to be the aim of both evangelism and dialogue. These figures support the assumption that people from an Evangelical tradition are primarily concerned with conversion, while those of a Catholic or Liberal tradition are less so.

Training/Education for Ministry among people of other Faiths

Question 31 asked respondents what further training they needed for ministry among people of other Faith traditions. The question was broken down into five sections and I will show the responses to these sections in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Ordained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 25-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhism</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not now</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 More Information about other Faiths
The interesting thing about this table is that the largest number of respondents, 27 (13%) were interested in learning more about Buddhism and yet no respondent claimed to have Buddhists living or worshipping in their parish. No respondent wanted to know more about Hinduism and yet 39 respondents claimed to have occasional contact, and 12 frequent contact with Hindus. (see Table 22 page 203) Likewise, only 11 respondents wanted to know more about Islam and yet 52 claimed to have occasional contact and 15 frequent contact with Muslims. (see Table 22 page 203).

These figures seem to indicate that contact with people of other Faiths does not necessarily result in a desire to know more about them.

Taking the figures overall, a very large majority, 130 (63%) did not want to any information about other Faiths. The following table shows what respondents required in terms of further study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theology of Religions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology of Mission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between Mission and Dialogue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between Religion and Culture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not now</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28  Further Study

These figures show a very small number of respondents wanting any further study in important areas of ministry. There may be several reasons for this low response.
• The respondents do not see the connection between the subjects and their ministry.

• The respondents feel themselves to be under pressure and not able to take up more study.

• The respondents are reluctant to take up any form of study.

• The question is towards the end of a 13 page questionnaire and they simply could not be bothered to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 Further Training

These figures show that 45 (22%) of the respondents would like training in communication skills. However, by far the majority, 151 (73%) required no further training at all in these areas. The reasons could be same as above in response to Further Study. The following table relates to resource material:
Table 30  Resource Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines on use of buildings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines on Multi-faith Worship</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching tapes or videos</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines on birth, death etc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these figures show that a very large number, 151, did not want any resource material, the positive responses are worth comment. The fact that 17 respondents asked for guidelines on the use of church buildings by people of other Faiths probably reflects the reality that they have been, or are likely to be, asked for use of a parish building by people of another Faith community. This is a situation that is becoming increasingly common.

An even larger number, 33 (16%) asked for guidelines on multi-faith worship. While this is an extremely rare occurrence in the Diocese of Chelmsford it probably reflects a genuine concern about how to deal with a very sensitive area. 22

The final section of this question asked people if they would like opportunities to meet people of other Faiths and places of worship. 46 respondents (26%) replied positively to both meeting people and also places of worship. On the other hand, 149 (72%) said no or did not answer.

22 To my knowledge as Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser, there has been no multi-faith worship service or event in the Diocese in which Anglicans have taken a formal part in the organisation.
Question 32 of the questionnaire asked, "From your own personal experience, both pre-ordination and post-ordination, what could you contribute to clergy training in the diocese. The response to this question, which should prove useful to the Diocese of Chelmsford, is given as Appendix 10A.2

Non Respondents

Those who failed to respond to the questionnaire were evenly spread across all the deaneries. Out of the 250 questionnaires which were sent out, 208 (83%) were returned. 42 (17%) did not respond, 33 being male and 9 female. The non-respondents among the male population were 16% and the non-respondents among the female population was higher, at 20%.

In terms of age, 55.5% of the female non-respondents were over the age of sixty compared with 21.2% of the male population. Out of the 42 non-respondents therefore, females over the age of sixty were proportionately in the majority. This may have been due to a reluctance to complete questionnaires or a failure to see the relevance either to their own ministry or to ministry in general. It could of course be due to pressure of work, but this is less likely to be the case with this particular group of non-respondents.

Conclusion

The questionnaire was sent to a sample of 250 clergy out of 503, representing 49.70% of the clergy in the Diocese of Chelmsford. The total number of respondents was 208 (83%). The clergy profile taken from this 83% shows that the majority
(32%) were between the ages of 46-55 years and in terms of years ordained the majority were those who had been ordained between 6 and 15 years. However, there was no necessary correlation between age and years ordained because many clergy, both male and female are joining the ministry at a later stage in life.

90% of the respondents were college trained but an increasing number are now being trained on a theological training course (see Table 3 page 183). A large number (76%) received some form of pre-ordination training and 93% (see Table 7 page 186) have received post-ordination training, 15% having received training in other Faith issues. The few who had not received any post-ordination training were in the older age bracket and had been in ministry for over 35 years.

According to the responses received, the majority (33%), were from the Evangelical tradition followed by Catholic (30%), then Liberal/Middle of the Road (24%) and lastly Charismatic 12%. The majority of those within the Conservative Evangelical tradition were among the younger age group. However, 55% of the respondents claimed to have changed their theological position. These were largely from the 46-55 age bracket and the greatest move, 13%, had been from Conservative Evangelicalism.

The greatest number of clergy, 62 (30%), were ministering in urban areas, the majority being among the younger age groups. In the rural areas there was no-one in the 25-36 age group. 13% of the respondents said that people of other Faiths lived in their parish. However, 49% said that they had contact, either occasionally or frequently, with people of other Faiths and 78% visited schools, hospitals and other organisations where people of other Faiths were present.
41% of the respondents saw their ministry in terms of building good relations with people of other Faiths either through dialogue or social action. 39% said that witness, through worship or social action is important. 16% emphasised conversion and 03% said that people of other Faiths were irrelevant to their ministry. 73 (84%) of the 87 Evangelicals said that conversion should be the ultimate aim through dialogue or evangelism.

Turning now to the question of training needs, it would appear that contact with people of other Faiths does not necessarily result in the desire to know more about them. On the contrary, Buddhism scored the highest even though no respondent claimed to have a Buddhist place of worship in his or her parish, and a minority (20%) had only occasional contact with Buddhists. A very small number, maximum of 5%, saw the need for any further study in the theology of religions or mission but a much larger number (22%) identified the need for further training in communication skills.

Some questions were not answered. For example, ten respondents declined to indicate their age although all gave their gender. A large number, 44% and 48%, respectively, declined to answer the questions related to theological tradition and people of other Faiths living in the parish.

In the context of the research question, ‘What are the training needs for Church of England Clergy ministering in a multi-Faith and multi-cultural society?, the respondents perceive themselves to have very few training needs. For example, only 2 clergy wanted information about Judaism and only 11 information about Islam whereas 59 have contact with Jews and 67 contact with Muslims. Only 2
respondents out of 208 required further study in the theology of mission and 7 on the relationship between mission and dialogue.

However, if we look at those who have received post-ordination training or CME, the percentage is 93%. The gap between previous training, 93%, and perceived future training needs is very large, the closest being 22% requiring training in communication skills. If we look at topics directly related to multi-Faith or multi-cultural issues, the gap is even wider, the closest being requests for guidelines on Multi-faith worship (16%) followed by Buddhism (13%).

We are left with a number of questions:

- Do the clergy genuinely believe that they have no training needs?
- Are they too pressurised to take up, and therefore even consider, further training?
- Do they see what is on offer as irrelevant?
- Is there an aversion to clergy training in general?

In the final conclusion I shall address some of these questions along with others that have arisen from the previous chapters.
Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to explore the training and educational needs for Church of England clergy ministering in a multi-Faith society. I approached this question by first of all looking at the social and theological context of the debate. I then discussed, in Part Two, the general training policy for Church of England clergy from 1987, when ACCM 22 was published, to the present time, with particular reference to training and education for ministry in a multi-Faith context. Finally, in Part Three, I analysed the clergy profile and perceived training needs of clergy in the Diocese of Chelmsford.

An overriding theme throughout this thesis has been that of diversity. This was apparent in Part One in terms of both the social and theological context. For example, although many parts of Britain, and the Diocese of Chelmsford in particular, are multi-cultural and multi-Faith, large parts of the country remain monocultural, at least in a visible form. (see page 4) The social diversity within the Diocese of Chelmsford was also apparent from the profile analysis of clergy in Part Three which showed that 20% of the respondents ministered in rural areas, 26% in suburban and 30% in urban areas. (see page 198)

The reality of theological diversity was present throughout the theology of religions debate in Chapter 2. Alan Race attempted to articulate this diversity in relation to religious pluralism in 1983 (see page 20) and the struggle within the World Council of Churches to come to a consensus on the Christological issue and other Faiths was highlighted by Wesley Ariarajah in 1991. (see pages 19-20)
England addressed religious pluralism in 1984 with the publication *Towards a Theology for Inter-Faith Dialogue* and apart from one chapter in the Doctrine Commission's publication *The Mystery of Salvation*, in 1995, no further statements have been forthcoming from the Church of England.

Theological diversity is particularly prevalent within the Church of England. For example, the theological colleges that were discussed in Chapter 7 were quite open about their theological traditions, which ranged from firmly Catholic to Evangelical. (see page 118) Furthermore, the analysis of Chelmsford clergy in terms of theological tradition mirrored this diversity, with 33% describing themselves as Evangelical, 30% Catholic, 24% Liberal and 17% Charismatic. (see page 190) Over 50% also admitted to having changed their theological tradition at some stage. (see page 194)

Given such diversity, it is reasonable to ask "can there be a consensus on a theology of religions?", or should we accept the reality of multiple theologies which reflect a) the social diversity within which the Church finds itself and b) the different theological traditions that are manifest within the Church?

Turning now to clergy training and education for ministry in a multi-Faith society, the need for such training was expressed as far back as 1910 and was a recurring theme within the WCC. During my research of College and Course material, all of the institutions I contacted touched upon the issue of other Faiths, either within mission studies modules or through associate universities. In the latter case the approach was more academic in style. Six institutions offered courses specifically

---

23 Where page numbers are given in this form in this conclusion they refer to the page number of this thesis.
in inter-Faith dialogue and/or the relationship between Christianity and other Faiths. (see pages 128-130) However, from discussions with students, there seemed to be some uncertainty about what had been available in the institutions and who was qualified to teach the subject.

Lack of certainty, or clarity was a constant theme running through the whole discussion on training, whether it be initial ordination training or CME. Despite the fact that ACCM 22 placed great importance on the foundational question “What ordained ministry does the Church of England require?” and ABM 1 stated that “The Church of England will only be able to think more clearly about the ordained ministry when it has laid hold of a clearer theological understanding of its identity as a church” (ABM 1, 1990, p 8), I was unable to find such clarity of thinking across all training institutions.

While some institutions did have clear mission statements, (see page 121) only two made reference to the nature of the Church as the context for ministry. It is worth reflecting, bearing in mind the theological diversity already referred to, that if each institution had attempted to define its own understanding of the nature of the Church, how many models of Church would have been defined?

The reality of a plurality of models for Church was recognised by the authors of ABM 3. The authors stated that “it is probably true that there is no longer a single confident style or role for the clergy” and that “it seems essential that the ordained minister is prepared so as to be able to handle a number of different models of the Church, rather than be familiar or content with only one or two models” (ABM 3 1992 PP 47-48).
If clergy were to be prepared so as to be able to handle a number of different models of Church, this raises the questions, of "how, when and where?" I referred in Chapter 5, page 92, to the suggestion that there should be a general policy which addressed the question of what ordained ministry the Church of England requires, together with the most suitable educational programme and appropriate means of assessment. ACCM asked that this general policy should be agreed corporately between itself and the Colleges and Courses. It was further suggested that training for diverse situations should be the responsibility of individual training institutions. I discussed the difficulties with this approach on pages 92-93 and again on pages 161-162. My primary point is that diversity is so foundational to the Church and society that it has to be addressed as part of the general training policy for all clergy training for the ministry. This would become even more necessary if the Church of England were to acknowledge that there can be no one model of Church and therefore train its clergy according to multiple models of Church as is suggested above.

Given the reality of social and theological diversity and the likelihood of different models of Church, it is difficult to see how it is possible to train anyone for the role of priest in just two or three years. In this situation, it becomes imperative that CME and POT is relevant and effective. It is questionable as to whether this is the case at present. The analysis of clergy in Chapter 10, (see page 186) showed that while 93% of Chelmsford clergy had taken up CME in the past, 50% of the respondents said that they currently did not want any further training in the Theology of Religions, the Theology of Mission, the Relationship between Mission and Culture or the Relationship between Mission and Dialogue. An even higher percentage, 63% did not want any information about other Faiths. (see pages 208-211)
The usefulness or relevance of CME was also questioned during the clergy interviews. (Appendix 10.1a, pages 5-6) Furthermore there was some confusion regarding the aim and objectives of CME. (see page 144)

The fact that CME is seen as irrelevant by some, or is viewed with confusion by others, is symptomatic of more fundamental issues, and should not be viewed as a problem solely for the providers of CME. For example, if there is a lack of clarity regarding the nature of the Church and the aims and objectives of initial ordination training, this will be carried over into CME. While ABM has attempted to define some learning outcomes for CME (see pages 145-146), this has not been done for initial ordination training. Therefore there is no common base from which to start CME.

Mention has been made of profiling as a means of ensuring some continuity of training that is relevant throughout a priest’s ministry. This would go some way to address some of the issues and would allow a creative approach to diversity, but it would need the willing co-operation between ABM, the training institutions and the Dioceses.

At present the Dioceses function autonomously in terms of their selection and training policies within the framework set by ABM and all Dioceses have their own CME programmes. Once more, this is an example of the diverse nature of the Church of England and it raises the question of authority. ACCM made this point by stating that “it would be inappropriate for ACCM to seek to impose any definite framework” for the training of training incumbents (ACCM 10, 1982, p 11).
We are therefore left with the question of who makes the decisions and how are they applied? This question of authority is extremely important but it cannot be addressed here. It would have to be the subject of further research.

While it might be difficult at the present time to institute a satisfactory system of profiling across the Church of England, it should be possible to work towards a commitment to life-long learning. If potential ordinands accepted a commitment to training throughout their ministry, in addition to the two or three year necessary preparation before ministry begins, this would take pressure off the training institutions to deliver the impossible, and allow an ongoing flexibility which could incorporate all types of diversity. Such a commitment to life-long learning would, of course, also be necessary on the part of the Dioceses.

While maintaining a commitment to the importance of pre-ordination training, a policy of life-long learning would allow the concepts of integration and collaboration and different models of Church and Priest to be addressed. It would also give priests the opportunity to train for new areas of ministry as they move between parishes and different types of ministry. It would certainly allow for more opportunities to study inter-Faith issues that are relevant to an individual's ministry. However, it is unlikely that any one Diocese could provide all these training opportunities. A national database of training opportunities, together with more use of distance learning programmes, would provide one solution.

My main conclusion to this research question is that the clergy need:

- greater clarity in the aims and objectives of both initial ordination training and CME.
• greater flexibility in the provision of a training and education which allows the diversity of Church and society to be adequately catered for.

In order for this second point to be addressed, the national policy-makers, the Diocese and all ordinands and clergy, need:

• To be committed to a concept of life-long learning.

Having arrived at the above conclusions, I am left with the remaining questions:

• Can the Church of England provide training that works positively and creatively with diversity within an accepted national framework?

• Can the Church of England move towards a formal policy of life-long learning?

• In an episcopal Church with a synodical system, such as the Church of England, who has the authority to make these decisions regarding the training of clergy?
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JOB DESCRIPTION FOR BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD’S ADVISER FOR INTER-FAITH RELATIONS

To identify current and future areas of concern within other Faith communities, and between the Christian and other Faith communities, so as to keep the Bishop informed of these, suggesting matters for decision or action where appropriate.

To enable the Bishop’s understanding of inter-faith issues to be deepened, and to provide occasional opportunities for the Bishop to exercise a representative role on behalf of Christians in inter-faith meeting with leaders or other Faith communities.

To continue the process of endorsement by the diocese of a Diocesan strategy for inter-faith relations.

To be available to deaneries (and sometimes parishes) diocese-wide as a resource on inter-faith issues.

To enable more laity and clergy in the Diocese to meet people of other Faiths and to visit their places of worship, so as to help them reflect on the theological, pastoral and social implications of life in a society of many Faiths.

To encourage and support clergy and stipendiary workers in multi-faith settings, including those in chaplaincy roles, diocese-wide.

Through the appropriate diocesan channels, to organise study days, courses and conferences for Christians on inter-faith issues.

To keep abreast of inter-faith matters by reading and attending conferences.

In liaison with the Diocesan Communications Officer, to be available to the media as a resource on multi-faith matters.
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JOB DESCRIPTION FOR DIOCESAN INTER-FAITH AND INTERNATIONAL ADVISER

Outline responsibilities

a) to advise Bishops and Synod, on matters relating to international and inter-faith issues which require attention and decision.

b) To encourage, advise and challenge laity and clergy on international and inter-faith issues, principally through the DRT, DRC and Diocesan Synod, as well as Deanery Synods and Chapters.¹

Detailed Duties and responsibilities

1) To identify and become well informed on a wide range of issues on the relationship between the Christian and other Faith/Religious communities, both nationally and internationally.

2) To enable the Bishops' understanding of International and Inter-Faith/Inter-Religious issues to be deepened through a process of regular briefing and to be available to the Diocesan Bishop in relation to Diocesan links with overseas dioceses.

3) To be available to deaneries, chapters, chaplaincies and sometimes parishes diocese-wide as a resource and to encourage theological reflection and action in relation to the Church's mission at all levels.

4) To stimulate people at all levels in the Diocese to inform themselves on International and Inter-Faith/Religious issues using the wide range of resources available from the Church of England nationally, mission agencies and other Christian traditions.

5) To work ecumenically wherever possible.

6) To liaise with civic, educational and other authorities to facilitate appropriate discussion and action on International and Inter-Faith/Religious issues.

7) Through appropriate diocesan channels, to facilitate study days, courses and conferences for Christians on International and Inter-Faith/Religious issues and to facilitate dialogue and visits between Chelmsford Diocese and overseas dioceses.

8) To keep abreast of International and Inter-Faith/Religious issues by reading, attending conferences and through liaison with the General Synod's Board of Mission, the Anglican Communion Office, PWM and mission agencies.²

¹ DRT is the Diocesan Resource Team; DRC the Diocesan Resource Council
² PWM is Partners in World Mission
Appendix 4.2

9) To co-ordinate the Bishop of Chelmsford’s Lent Appeal and One World Week.

9) In liaison with the Diocesan communications Officer and the Bishop’s Press Officer, to be available to the media as a resource on multi-Faith/Religious and International matters.

11) To undertake such other reasonable duties as may be required by the Diocesan Secretary.
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ACCM 22 - Summary of Recommendations and Procedure

The GME syllabus and assessment procedures in their present form should cease to exist (paras. 22-24).

Responsibility for devising programmes of training and schedules of assessment should be devolved to colleges and courses under the close supervision of ACCM (para. 25).

A certificate should be awarded to all those who satisfactorily complete a programme of training and schedule of assessment (para. 24)

These changes would be consequent upon

(i) In order to ensure a common approach to training among colleges and courses and to make clear the purposes of training in order to meet the needs of the Church, a generally agreed statement of policy is required describing the nature of the ordained ministry required by the Church of England (paras. 26-40).

(ii) Colleges and courses would be required to reconsider their educational programmes (para. 41-57) and submit detailed proposals for their educational programmes for approval by ACCM (para. 58).

(iii) All existing educational programmes offered by colleges and courses currently recognised as equivalent to GME should be reviewed and submitted for approval to meet the criteria outlined in this report.

(iv) Assessment procedures employed by colleges and courses should be reconsidered (paras. 59-68) and submitted for approval (paras. 69-70) to meet the criteria outlined.

(v) The structure of the relevant ACCM Committees, the GME Examiners and the Bishops' Inspectorate will need to be reviewed and modified, and the adequacy of staffing reviewed in order to undertake this work. Financial provision would also need to be made in order to permit this additional work to be undertaken.

If these recommendations were, in general terms, to prove acceptable to the Committee for Theological Education and the Council of ACCM, the Working Party would recommend that the proposals should be sent to interested parties (i.e. the colleges and courses, ACCM, the Bishops' Inspectors and the House of Bishops) for their consideration and assent, in the following order:

(i) The Committee for Theological Education should consult with the colleges and courses about the implementation of the proposals.

(ii) Consultations should take place within ACCM about its committee structure and staffing in the area of theological education.
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(iii) The Bishops' Inspectors should be asked to consider the implications of the recommendations for inspections.

(iv) The recommendations should be sent to the House of Bishops for agreement.

(v) Procedures should be agreed by the Committee for Theological Education with colleges and courses for implementing the recommendations in existing and proposed programmes of study and assessment.
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Extracts from Some Key Research Findings Regarding the Church's Ministry by the Rural Church Project summarised by the Revd Dr Douglas Davies Co-Director of the Project as printed in ACCM 22

1 The Rural Church Project was initially funded by the Leverhulme Trust with additional support from the Archbishop’s Commission of Rural Areas. It was based jointly at the Theology Department in Nottingham University, where the Revd Dr Douglas Davies was a Project Director, and at the Rural Studies Centre of the Rural Agricultural College, Cirencester, where Dr Michael Winter and Dr Charles Watkins were fellow Project Directors.

2 The research on the view of the laity was based upon 489 interviews (half to one hour) with a random sample of people in rural parishes only, in five dioceses of the Church of England. The interviews subdivided into:

i) 341 interviews with people drawn randomly from the Civil Register of Electors.

ii) 148 interviews with people drawn randomly from Church Electoral roles.

The full data regarding the interviews with the laity can be found in volume 4 of the Rural Church Project Report, and the reference for the table given below are to this publication.

3 Laity Viewing Ordained Ministry

a) The Role of the Clergy

Dr Davies comments as follows:

In expressing views about the job of a vicar there was practically no difference of opinion between Civic and Church role members. Very few people indeed felt unable to answer this question (5%): ... WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER THE JOB OF A VICAR TO BE?.
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Table from Volume 4.1.55 Total Sample: Views on the Job of a Vicar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job of a vicar</th>
<th>Parish Sample N</th>
<th>Parish Sample %</th>
<th>Church Sample N</th>
<th>Church Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community figure</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/rites</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian teaching</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican representative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/shepherd</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/DNA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Totals represent the total number of references to all categories. Therefore the percentage figures total more than 100. Parish N = 341; Church N = 148. The average number of categories per respondent for parish sample was 1.35, and for the church sample 1.45.

Gender differences were slight except that women (63%) stressed the pastoral role more than did men (44%), while men (24%) very slightly emphasised the teaching role compared with women (20%).

4 The Clergy

The research based its account of the self-understanding of the clergy on:

i) 572 responses to a postal questionnaire of all clergy, urban and rural, in the same five dioceses as used for the survey of laity.

ii) 101 in-depth interviews (three to four hours each) of a sample of the rural clergy of the above group.

The full data from the questionnaires and interviews with the clergy is published in the first three volumes of the Rural Church Project Report.

Dr Davies offers the following concluding reflection on clergy self-understanding:

In many respects the clergy have a solid idea of the Anglican Ministry as fundamentally itinerant. We have found that the idea of being a
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relative outsider is not without its benefits. The idea of a very long stay in one parish is not generally appreciated by the clergy and the rural clergy themselves did not support it as one might have expected. This intuitive, almost gut reaction, needs exploration. At its most ecclesiological, it has something to do with the vicar as symbolic of the bishop as symbolic of the Universal Church. The non-parochial Church is represented by the vicar who sometimes said of himself that he differed from his parishioners by being the one with the larger vision. It also goes hand-in-hand with the idea of the Church as a State church ideally serving all the people: the priest is not a person of one segment or group. The fact that he comes from outside and will move onto another particular parish is expressive of the Anglican Ordained Ministry as Catholically pastoral.
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(Extract from Theological Colleges – The Next Steps 1993 p 29-31)

EIGHT CENTRES FOR FULL-TIME THEOLOGICAL TRAINING

We recommend that full-time theological training in the Church of England shall in future be based at eight centres. These will be Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Leeds/Mirfield, London, Nottingham/Lincoln and Oxford.

The proposed centres for full-time theological training are listed below with the other Colleges and institutions that together would form appropriate clusters. In some cases the various institutions are already working well together, while in other areas there remains much unrealised potential for co-operation.

a) Birmingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Queen’s College</th>
<th>Selly Oak Federation of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Ministerial Course</td>
<td>University of Birmingham Departments of Theology and Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary, Oscott (RC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Bristol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinity College</th>
<th>Wesley College (Methodist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West of England Ministerial Training Course</td>
<td>Baptist College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol University Department of Theology and Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheltenham &amp; Gloucester College of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Cambridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridley Hall</th>
<th>Wesley College (Methodist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westcott House</td>
<td>Westminster College (URC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglian Ministrual Training Scheme</td>
<td>The Margaret Beaufort Institute (RC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge University Faculty of Divinity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) **Durham**

St. John’s College/Cranmer Hall  Wesley Study Centre (Methodist)

North East Ord. Course  Ushaw College (RC)

Leeds University Department of Theology

---

e) **Leeds/Mirfield**

College of the Resurrection, Mirfield  Leeds University Department of Theology

Northern Ordination Course  College of Ripon and York St John

---

f) **London**

Oak Hill College  King’s College London

Oak Hill Ministerial Training Scheme or London/Chelmsford  Heythrop College (RC)

Oak Hill Ministerial Training Scheme proposal  Middlesex University

All National Christian College

---

g) **Nottingham/Lincoln**

St. John’s College, Nottingham  Nottingham University Department of Theology

Lincoln Theological College

East Midlands Ministerial Training Course  Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln

---

h) **Oxford**

Ripon College, Cuddesdon  Mansfield College (URC)

Wycliffe Hall  The Roman Catholic Private Halls

St Stephen’s House  Westminster College (Methodist)

Oxford Ministry Course  Regents Park College (Baptist)

Oxford/St Albans Course  Oxford University Faculty of Theology

Oxford Centre for Mission Studies
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(Extract from St Stephen's House ACCM 22 Submission, 1998)

**JOINT PREFACE OF THE OXFORD PARTNERSHIP IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING (OPTET)**

DURING THE last five years an increasing degree of collaboration has developed between the institutions of theological education and training in the Oxford area. The Oxford Partnership in Theological Education and Training (OPTET) brings together Anglican (Ripon College Cuddesdon, St Stephen's House, St Albans and Oxford Ministry Course, and Wycliffe Hall), Baptist (Regent's Park College), United Reformed Church (Mansfield College) and Methodist (Westminster College) institutions, with varying levels of involvement from the four major Roman Catholic theological institutions in the city.

‘Anglican OPTET’ (consisting of the three Anglican colleges and the course) has emerged as a significant group within this partnership.

OPTET works at a number of levels, of which the following are illustrative:

1. Regular meetings of the teaching staffs of all OPTET institutions. There are currently six such meetings a year, rotating round the member institutions. The meetings take place over lunch, which allows both social interaction and academic discussion. Three of the six meetings are essentially social, aimed to encourage good working relationships between the teaching staffs; three are business meetings, which are used to address issues of policy, shared teaching, and future projects.

2. Regular meetings of subject tutors. These ensure a significant degree of cross-fertilisation in teaching approaches, and make detailed suggestions for syllabus revision.

3. OPTET promotes courses of lectures in Oxford on Wednesday mornings of particular relevance for those pursuing the Bachelor of Theology, Certificate in Theology, and Diploma in ministry programmes.

4. An annual service, organised on behalf of all OPTET institutions, is held in the University Church followed by a dinner at St Edmund Hall.

OPTET aims to work towards increased collaboration, understanding and good working relationships across denominational divides, while allowing each member institution to maintain its distinctive ethos and identity.

The three Anglican colleges work together in relation to a number of specific areas, including the following:

1. The three colleges prepare students for the same range of theological degrees and certificates of the University of Oxford, and the Oxford
Diploma in Ministry. The Diploma in Ministry was conceived, and is administered, by Anglican OPTET and offers modes of assessment particularly appropriate for encompassing a diversity of past experience and academic skills. While there is some variation in the manner in which these courses are taught at the colleges, reflecting differences in ethos and teaching resources, the three colleges have found that collaboration in the administration, examination and teaching of the courses has led to increased efficiency and the sharing both of theological wisdom and practical insights. The increasing degree of collaboration between the colleges has led, not merely to collaborative teaching in which, where possible, the teaching resources of the colleges are shared, but also to collaborative learning in which students from our different traditions are able to interact with each other, and learn more about their assumptions, approaches and distinctive identities. Shared Pastoral Studies Weeks on, for example, ministry in schools, rural ministry or criminal justice are particularly important in this regard, as are the Mission Studies Weeks.

The three colleges work together in our dealings with the University of Oxford. The cumulative weight of the three colleges within OPTET ensures that we are able to represent the special needs and concerns of those preparing for Anglican ministry to the university (for example, through the Supervisory Committee for the Bachelor of Theology and Certificate in Theology). In particular, we consider it to be important that the needs of ministerial formation are recognised in the context of the teaching and assessment procedures of the University, especially as they concern the Bachelor of Theology and Master of Theology. The three colleges maintain a distinctively Anglican approach to theology and ministry, which is of particular importance in the light of the fact that the University of Oxford can no longer be considered to be a distinctively Anglican institution, and the significant contribution to theological teaching from the Free Church and Roman Catholic institutions.

The three colleges represent much of the diversity which is found within the modern Church of England, and offer their students a unique environment for training and study. Regular joint eucharists at each college, attended by students from the other two colleges, allow students to experience the distinctive approaches to worship. The colleges aim to model the principle of 'unity in diversity', which we believe to be integral to ministerial preparation in the contemporary church.

The three colleges share a commitment to the value of residential training, particularly the important opportunities which it offers for personal spiritual formation and experiencing life in community. Whilst stressing the many benefits of residential training, we recognise that this may not be the most appropriate form of training for all wishing to proceed to ordained ministry. The colleges maintain and foster close working relationships with the non-residential St Albans and Oxford ministry course, particularly through the Diploma in Ministry (used by SOC for some of its students) and through a contribution to its teaching.
In the light of this increased degree of collaboration and administration between the three Anglican colleges, it seems appropriate for us to work together in drawing up our submissions for renewed validation as part of the process initiated by the ACCM Occasional Paper No.22. This does not mean that we are offering identical submissions. Each of the colleges possesses a distinctive ethos. Ripon College Cuddesdon representing an open catholic, St Stephen’s House a distinctively catholic, and Wycliffe Hall an evangelical tradition (although the limits of such descriptions must immediately be conceded). Each college faithfully reflects its ethos in its submission. Our collaboration (which reflects the closer general working relationship already described) allows us to achieve a greater understanding of each other, and to share insights and ideas concerning the task of preparing candidates of ministry in the church.
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The number and theological tradition, of Chelmsford clergy who trained at the following colleges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Theological Tradition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Queens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Catholic 5 Liberal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Evang 16 Charis 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Catholic 9 Liberal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranmer Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evang 3 Charis 1 Liberal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddesdon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Catholic 4 Liberal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Catholic 7 Liberal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catholic 3 Liberal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Evang 24 Liberal 6 Charis 9 Cath 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley Hall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evang 6 Liberal 2 Charis 1 Cath 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evang 2 Liberal 1 Charis 1 Cath 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury &amp; Wells</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Liberal 8 Catholic 7 Evang 2 Charis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evang 2 Charis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen’s House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Catholic 5 Charis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Catholic 8 Liberal 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Evang 9 Liberal 4 Charis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s London</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Catholic 8 Liberal 5 Charis 1 Evang 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Nottingham</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evang 10 Liberal 2 Charis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Divinity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evang 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Bible College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evang 2 Charis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Army</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evang 2 Charis 2 Cath 1 Liberal 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some respondents gave more than one position as representative of how they would describe their own theological outlook
Example of course offered by St Stephen's House

MISSIOLOGY

God's People in God's World II

All students

AIM
The equipping of students at St Stephen's House for mission and evangelism, as understood by the catholic tradition

OBJECTIVES
In order to achieve this aim the course will:
1. complement experience of practical projects and Mission Study Weeks
2. provide lectures and seminars in-house and ecumenically
3. combine with the delivery of ecclesiology as part of God's People in God's World II in the final year
4. include visits from national and international figures so that the intrinsic otherness of apostolic mission may be experienced
5. thus explore from a variety of theological perspectives key issues for Christian mission at the beginning of the twenty first century.

COURSE OUTLINE
1. Mission and Worship
2. Mission and Sacraments
3. Mission in Post-Modernist Culture
4. Religion in Britain since 1945
5. Theology and Implicit Religion
6. Mission and Ministry
7. Globalisation (I)
8. Globalisation (II)
9. Paradigms of Mission in the Christian Church I
10. Paradigms of Mission in the Christian Church II
11. Why is cross-cultural Mission of continuing importance in the Church?
12. Inter-faith dialogue
13. New Religious movements
15. Liberation Theology
16. Can we use the bible as a mission manual?
17. The Search for Faith and the Witness of the Church
18. Alpha, Emmaus and RICA: Catechetics and Mission

Visiting lecturers to St Stephen's House include Fr Stephen Cottrell, Springboard and Wakefield Diocesan Missioner, Bishop John Finney, Bishop of Pontefract and formerly Decade of Evangelism Officer, Bishop Pat Harris, Bishop of Southwell, formerly Bishop of Argentina and Secretary of the Church of England Partnership for World Mission, Dr Anne Richards, Theologian, BMU, Bishop Paul Richardson, formerly Bishop in Papua New Guinea and Australia.
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Example of course offered by St Stephen’s House

INTER-FAITH DIALOGUE

AIM

Regulation:
Candidates will be expected to embark on a critical examination of the nature of inter-faith dialogue and its relationship to Christian mission. In addition, candidates may consider the possibility of dialogue of Christianity with a non-Christian religious tradition, and may study a particular example of inter-faith dialogue known to the candidate.

OBJECTIVES
The lecture and seminar course will cover the following areas:

COURSE OUTLINE
1 Biblical and theological approaches to inter-faith dialogue
2 The story of inter-faith encounter in the twentieth century
3 Christian theologies of religion(s)
4 Hindu-Christian dialogue
5 Christian-Muslim dialogue
6 The relationship between ‘dialogue’ and ‘mission’
7 Inter-faith dialogue and worship
8 Dialogue and questions of justice, peace and ethics

METHOD OF TEACHING
Eight lectures/seminars
Example of a module offered by Queen’s College, Birmingham

The Christian Gospel and World Faiths

Objectives:
- To introduce students to the ecumenical discussions on the meaning and relevance of the gospel in multi-faith contexts.
- To explore perspectives and issues which arise in dialogue between different religious communities.
- To analyse different responses to Christian mission by thinkers of World Faiths.
- To inspire ministerial candidates for redefining and reconceiving the gospel in order to engage in fruitful encounters with people of other faiths.

Description of Module:

The course will include lectures, visiting speakers from Faith Communities, and trips to local areas of religious significance. The outline of the course is as follows:

1. The multi-faith context of Britain. Resources and challenges. A general view.
2. Biblical reflections on the meaning of the gospel, approach in mission and Christian attitudes to people of other faiths.
3. Socio-political, cultural, theological and mission perspectives on Christian encounter with other religious communities.
4. Ecumenical discussions and guidelines on Christian encounter with people of other faiths – International Missionary Conference, World Council of Churches, Vatican II.
5. Specific issues in dialogue between (I) Christians and Jews; (iii) Christians and Muslims; (iv) Christians and Buddhists; (v) Christians and adherents of secular ideologies.
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Extracts from an example of a Training Course module

Reading the culture, Other Faiths/Other Cultures

Other Faiths/Other Cultures Project Summer Vacation

Students will prepare a schedule of questions designed to elicit information about the value systems and community stories of the groups they are addressing. This schedule will take the form of an adaptation of the one provided, amended with the help of the consultant, to suit the particular community.

They will present their results in the form of a report on these conversations, set out under the headings in the schedule. In addition, they will also write a 1,000 word summary of their research. At this stage, no analysis or theological reflection is required...

In the case of the Other Faiths Project, students may find it helpful to make use of some (no more than four or five) of the questions listed in the schedule Other Faiths/Other Cultures.

Students must interview at least 5 respondents before completing their report.

"Reading the Culture" is not evangelism. It is, perhaps a kind of pre-evangelism. We are asking you to undertake these tasks not primarily in order to help you acquire useful information about other faith communities, institutions, urban or rural "villages", or whatever, but to help you to see how to set about this kind of task yourselves so that you may be able to draw on these skills later in your ministry.

I expect a great deal of useful and interesting information will emerge, but every pastoral and evangelistic task is unique. It is the failure to appreciate this that has led to an enormous amount of misdirected effort in this country and overseas in the last 200 years or so. We are not trying to give you information which will be useful for all times and places, but to help you to develop skills which you will be able to employ in a great variety of different situations.

The communication of the gospel is – among other things – an educational venture. But it is adult education, and often of a non-formal kind. Our approach is therefore based on educational experience – but as it relates to non-formal education for adult learners. Moreover, we are not concerned with the educational task itself, but with the pre-educational situation. All the normal parameters of the educational process still have to be established. We do not yet know who we are addressing: their world view, the pressure points in their lives, the idioms of their community speech, their needs and desires, hopes and fears, are all unknown to us.

Of course, we can guess a such things. We are trying to help you to discover how to make much better, more "educated" guesses.
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Value-Systems and Community Stories

Literature on organizational dynamics has increasingly focused on underlying values or beliefs which are present and operative in all human dealings. The beliefs or values in question are so fundamental that, while often not articulated they explain basic orientations and decisional choices about life, religion, order, purpose, relationships, and so on. The importance of the values/beliefs is frequently known by the amount of resistance to change or vehemence of the emotions when these tenets are challenged. Value-systems are strongly influenced by formative factors in the history of a community.

The set of questions below may be used with a group of four or five key figures in the target community to help them to tell their story.

The structure of the tool below assumes that values and beliefs rise from the environment as well as from prior experiences. Therefore, it focuses on significant experiential settings, and asks first what happened, and then what values or beliefs emerged from the event. The tool is not an attempt to strip individuals of their privacy, but strives to bring to the surface some of the assumptions about life, its meaning, and direction. The purpose is not so much to discuss responses to the first question of each set as much as to gain clarification of deeper values (second question). The discussion therefore should be oriented towards highlighting values.

To use the exercise more efficiently, it is recommended that the questions be reprinted on a page and that participants be invited to answer all the questions briefly as preparation for discussion.
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Community Stories

1. What have been the significant historical occurrences in this community? What was most significant in the event? Prepare a time-line and date and mark the events with a word or two which highlights the important event.

2. What values/beliefs have arisen because of these experiences or others in this community?

Values Arising from Groups or Significant Persons

1. What groups or persons have had significant effect on this community or on you in your life?

2. What particular values arose from the groups (persons) or from the response of the community?

Values from ‘Outside’ Experiences

1. What one or two particular memorable or important experiences have you had involving people outside your own community?

2. What key beliefs or values have arisen from these experiences?
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My Comments on Appendix No 7.7a

The Research Project

Several students on this particular Training Course have contacted me over the past three years. They asked specifically for advice as to how to proceed with the project work described in Appendix 7.7a. The students said that they had no contact at all with other Faith groups and knew nothing about the beliefs and practices of these groups. As Diocesan Inter-faith Adviser they thought that I may be able to help them.

In every case I encouraged them to work with people who would be the most easily accessible. Some of these students came from the Borough of Redbridge where there is a large Jewish community which is extremely well integrated into British society (see Chapter 1, p 11-13). Above all, this group would present no language problems.

There was another case where the student was head teacher of a Newham Primary School. A large number of her pupils came from ethnic minority groups and she did have some contact with some of the parents.

I was also asked for advice as to how to construct the questionnaire (Appendix 7.7a p 3).

From my experience of inter-faith work over the past 15 years I felt that the students were being set an extremely difficult task for the following reasons:

1  They were being asked to approach a Faith community with no background knowledge of that community

2  In many cases language would create a problem, particularly if emotions, feelings, values etc were being discussed.

3  There was an assumption that people from other cultural backgrounds had the same understanding of the use of these words.

4  Even if they had the same understanding, there is a reluctance among some ethnic groups, together with an underlying suspicion, to answer questions in such a formal way.

5  ‘Inter-faith’ dialogue is a slow process, which requires a relationship built upon great deal of trust on both sides before any sensitive issues can be raised.

6  The students were being told that “At this stage, no analysis or theological reflection is required...” (Appendix No 7.7a p 1). This seems to be contrary
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7 to the principle of theological education, where theological reflection should be an ongoing process, reflecting upon all experience.

Residential Weekend – Communicating with People of OtherFaiths

January 10/11 1998

I was invited by the tutor of this Module to join this weekend as an observer/resource person. The 22 students, 11 male and 11 female, were second year ordinands from the Dioceses of Chelmsford and London. I made the following observations about the weekend:

1 Although I was described in the literature as a co-leader of the weekend, I was only invited to speak for about five minutes at the end of an hour lecture. Some of the students complained about this.

2 The students were asked to split into groups without being given clear instructions about the task, reporting back etc. The students made the following comments:

   we didn’t know what was expected for today – we brought artefacts
   we didn’t know what the tutor meant
   we haven’t done appropriate preparation because we weren’t told of this particular exercise
   the question posed for the project work is not the same as for this workshop
   I wasn’t aware I had to do a presentation
   We have to answer without doing adequate research
   If we had had the questions before, it would have helped focus on the project

3 The following is an extract from the formal evaluation of the weekend:

Student       it has all been very cerebral
Tutor         but your project connected with people
Student       pity we couldn’t have used Anne more
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Tutor the programme had been planned before Anne came on the scene
(I was invited at least two months before the weekend)

Student found the presentations very good

Student shame we had too little time for the presentations

Extract from my letter dated 2 February 1998 to the Principal of the Course

I did make a few notes and we agreed that I should pass them on to you in case they are of any use:

1 I was impressed with the students’ enthusiasm for the topic and also for the amount of work they had appeared to have put in.

2 Several said that it would have helped to have had the questions given on form U3W4, Section B when they were set the project work. This would have helped them to be more focussed in preparation for the presentation.

3 However, I think it would be difficult to tackle questions 3 and 4 under B unless a reasonable relationship had already been established and that the interviewee was fairly articulate.

4 Despite the above comment, I thought that the presentations were very good. The very important points that they managed to bring out were:
   a) the diversity within the faith groups, and
   b) the general concern among the Asian community of a loss of culture

5 Many expressed the need for more time for discussions, both after the main lecture and during and after the presentations, but I don’t know how you get around this when time is so short.

6 I wondered about the book-list. One student quoted from a book on Hinduism as if it was the authoritative voice. Something for students to be warned of I think.

I hope these comments will help. I think the idea of the project work is very good and it did produce some good presentations. In relation to my own research it was a useful experience and I would value sight of the evaluation sheets if that is possible. (never received)
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(Paragraphs 25 to 29 of "The continuing Education of the Church's Ministers"
(GS Misc 122, published in ACCM 10, 1982)

METHODS

25 Methods of education depend upon objectives. The objective of continuing education as we have considered it so far is in line with the statement of the General Synod Board of Education's paper "Education and Training" (GS Misc 19) produced in 1972: 'Education has to do with the full development of persons in society, their intellectual, emotional and social growth.' For the Church's Ministers there will be the addition that this development will be seen in the context of their primary vocation to ministry. With that objective clearly in mind account has to be taken of the nature of learning and the particular characteristics of adult learners.

26 In any educational process there are four factors at work: the learner, the teacher, the materials and the context. Each needs to be seen in its own light yet each also changes during the educational process as a result of its interaction with other factors. The context will often be that of a group, which means that those involved will require the sensitivity, awareness and skills that are needed in discerning the nature of the interactions of the learners and the learning group...

27 An adult is motivated to engage in learning to the extent that he feels a need to do so and perceives a personal goal that learning will help to achieve. His experience of himself, the world and God is the raw material of his learning and he will learn as he understands, enlarges and orders his experience. What takes place inside him will be the focal point of education rather than the simple acquisition of knowledge. The adult will therefore invest most energy in activities which he has himself helped to plan, and the more actively he participates in the learning process the more he will gain from it. It follows that the learning process should therefore be entered upon voluntarily; few adults will learn anything significant under compulsion.

28 The role of the teacher in adult learning is more that of a guide and resource for the learning process than that of a transmitter of information. He will have to pay attention to the questions raised by the learner rather than to the ones he himself wishes to raise. Seeking to encourage the creative activity of understanding, enlarging and ordering the learner's experience will involve both teacher and learner exercising their
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imaginative faculties to the full, since learning involves every aspect of the personality – emotions, will and spirit as well as intellect.

29 For the maximum benefit of any learning experience both learner and teacher should be involved not just in planning but also in evaluation. Adult learners need to be able to measure their progress towards their goals, recognising that the process of learning is never completed.
3 Expectations to be met during Initial Training

9 Initial training is defined as that period of formally agreed training which takes place within the context of a theological college or non-residential course approved by ABM. The principal focus of such initial training lies in the development of the ordinand's spirituality, academic base, self-understanding and understanding of the pastoral context. While this will involve the learning of certain general skills, such as interpretation, communication, and bearing a public role, this is not the context for a wide-ranging acquisition of ministerial skills and techniques.

10 Crucial to effective initial training is the ethos of the training institution itself. The institution has to take care that it models the ecclesiology, values, and priorities which it intends the ordinands to learn, and which will work in the Church of England as it is as well as being open to the future. If patterns of mixed-mode training are to be further developed, then the ethos of the training institution becomes particularly acute.

11 From discussions and comments following the circulation of the Working Party report, it was felt that candidates should be expected to have gained the following during their initial training:

(a) A developing spirituality and discipline of prayer consonant with their changing role and growth in learning;

(b) Firm and thorough grounding in theological, biblical and historical studies;

(c) Deepened and specific understanding of Anglicanism in its breadth and diversity and in particular Anglican ecclesiology and the Church of England as a national church in an ecumenical context;

(d) An enlarged understanding of mission and evangelism; being able to distinguish the one from the other and the relation between them;

(e) The ability to relate the Gospel to the life of the wider community and an understanding of the role of the local church in mission and evangelism;

(f) The understanding of worship and liturgical principles, and the abilities required to lead Anglican worship, with experience in
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(g) conducting both Alternative Service Book and Book of Common Prayer services;

(h) Basic understanding of preaching and teaching skills, as well as some assessed preaching experience;

(i) Basic skills of interpretation, enabling them to relate faith and experience and to begin to think theologically about their context; a process which would be developed further following ordination and arrival in their title post;

(j) A developed appreciation of the pluralist and multifaith/cultural society in which we live, (including knowledge of the basic belief tenets of the major world faiths), and the implications for the proclamation and teaching of the Christian faith;

(k) Racism awareness training;

(l) Some understanding of role, drawing on their own past and present experience, in preparation for taking up the varied roles required of the ordained minister;

(m) Personal skills including those involved in maintaining close relationships, standard courtesies, public politeness, financial management, etc;

(n) A developed self-awareness, with areas of woundedness consciously addressed; an awareness of others, listening skills and basic pastoral understanding;

(o) An understanding of issues of sexuality and power in relation to working with colleagues of the opposite sex and in general parish encounters;

(p) A basic understanding of sociology and psychology to enable reflection on pastoral and missiological issues;

(q) The ability to discern which of their previously acquired skills and experience can be incorporated into ordained ministry, and which need to be modified;

(r) An understanding of *diakonia* and the nature of service built into all forms of ministry.
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Beginning Public Ministry: Guidelines for ministerial formation and personal development for the first four years after ordination, ABM Ministry Paper 17 pages 12-13

7 Expectations to be met during the first three to four years of CME

18 During the first three years of CME the newly ordained should be expected to have gained:

(a) Experience and confidence in the variety of specific roles of the ordained minister, including liturgical, pastoral, and teaching roles in relation to both adults and children;

(b) A deepening self-awareness and development of interpersonal skills to enable co-operation and a truly collaborative leadership style to be exercised in ministry;

(c) Competence in preaching through increasingly frequent and regular practice, with the assistance of others, including laity, in reflecting on the experience;

(d) Practical experience and reflection on mission and evangelism to the unchurched in the local area;

(e) Building on the theoretical study of mission and evangelism at college or course, to practise different approaches in the parish and/or deanery;

(f) To enter into dialogue with those of other faiths who live and worship within the training parish, or nearby, with a view to the mutual overcoming of misunderstanding and prejudice and the promotion of community;

(g) An understanding of the nature of community development strategies and action and the church’s role within that context;

(h) Well developed interpretation skills, to relate theology to experience in the contexts of ministry, building on the skills learned in college or course placements, and including for NSMs their place of work or other activity;

(i) An awareness of the ecumenical dimensions of ministry and knowledge of the traditions represented in the ministry context;

(j) A working understanding of issues of authority, both delegated and assigned under Canon Law, in the practice of ordained ministry and parish life including registers, faculties etc;
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(k) Growing competence in the role of leader as well as community member, including the clear ability to work with others to seek the common good.

(l) A spiritual discipline in which the ability to pray alone has further developed, alongside the usual initial training experience of communal prayer, and which sustains the ministers both in their duty to pray for others through, for example, the daily office and in their own spiritual life;

(m) Continued systematic reading of and reflection on the Scriptures;

(n) The ability to handle the frequently isolated role of the ordained minister and to seek out and develop appropriate support networks including cells and chapters;

(o) The growth in self-awareness, team work and group dynamics, and recognition of the values and emotions which will enable effective and mutually enhancing personal and ministerial relationships.
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Resume of Years 1 – 4 Chelmsford Diocesan CME Programme (February 1997)

Year 1

• “Deacons Day” June/July after June ordinations. An introduction to the ICME Programme and Diocesan services
• “Funerals Day” held in October. Good practice in the conduct of this occasional ministry.
• Three day conference held in January at Pleshey. Theme and programme design by a representative group.
• 8-10 Convened group meetings of 2-3 hours (or equivalent in time over fewer meetings). Theological reflection on day-to-day ministry.
  (Paid for from central ICME budget)
• Four days plus negotiated personal learning e.g. courses, conferences, placements, personal study or further degree.
  (Paid for from personal ICME grant)

Year 2

• “Self Assessment Day” held in October. A personal review of learning after one year and identifying learning needs for year 2.
• Three-day Conference (as above)
• Convened Group (as above)
• Four days plus negotiated personal learning (as above)

Year 3

• “A Future Ministries Day” held in March with the Church of England Clergy Appointments Adviser
• Three day Conference (as above)
• Convened Group (as above)
• Four days plus negotiated learning (as above)

Year 4

• “First Responsibility Conference” held in November
• Convened Groups by mutual agreement
• Four days plus negotiated learning
Dear colleague

CLERGY TRAINING IN THE DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD

I would greatly value your co-operation in some research that I am conducting on the provision of clergy training in the Diocese of Chelmsford. As Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser, I need this information in order to evaluate the present situation and make proposals for better training provision, both for serving and future clergy in the context of ministry in a multi-faith and multi-cultural society. The research is also part of my own doctoral studies.

Your responses will be treated with strict confidentiality and anonymity, but each questionnaire will be coded in order to allow me to follow-up the responses. I alone will know the codes and all coding will be destroyed by me once the data has been analysed. The research will be carried out in full compliance with the British Social Science Association’s code of Ethics.

The findings of this research will be made available to you.

My suggestion is that you have a quick read through the questionnaire before starting your responses. The completion of the questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes.

I would be most grateful if you could return the completed questionnaire by the 30th January 1998 in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope. Thank you for your co-operation in this research, which will be beneficial to all clergy in the Diocese.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Davison
Bishop of Chelmsford’s Adviser for Inter-Faith Relations
SECTION ONE

PLEASE TICK BOXES

Q 1
2.1 Age .......

(10)
25 - 35 □ 1
36 - 45 □ 2
46 - 55 □ 3
56 - 65 □ 4
Over 65 □ 5

Q 2
2.2 How many years have you been licensed or ordained?

(11)
Less than 5 □ 1
6 - 15 □ 2
16 - 25 □ 3
26 - 35 □ 4
Over 35 □ 5

Q 3
2.3 Gender .......

(12)
Male □ 1
Female □ 2

Q 4
2.4 Did you receive your pre-ordination training through a .......

(13)
Theological College □ 1 Continue with Q.5
Ministry Training Course □ 2 Go to Q.6
3.5 At which Theological College were you trained?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Queens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Trinity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranmer Hall</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddesdon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandaff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirfield</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley Hall</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon Hall</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury &amp; Wells</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's House</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephen's House</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott House</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 On which Ministry Training Course were you trained?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Anglia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Thames</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Deniol's</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 If you were not trained at any of the above, where did you receive your training?

**PLEASE STATE BELOW**

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2.8 Have you had any pre-ordination, university or special training?

(21)

Yes □  1  Continue with Q.9

No □  2  Go to Q.10

2.9 What pre-ordination training have you received?

(22)

Theological Degree course □  1
Other Degree course □  2
Vocational Training □  3
Reader Training □  4
Lay Ministry Training □  5
Other (Please specify) □  6

2.10 Have you received any post-ordination training or continuing ministry education either within this Diocese or elsewhere?

(23)

Yes □  1  Continue with Q.11

No □  2  Go to Q.12
Q 11

2.11 In which area did you receive your post-ordination training or continuing ministry education?

PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE BOX IF NECESSARY

- Scripture □ 1
- Doctrine □ 2
- Liturgy □ 3
- Spirituality □ 4
- Pastoral □ 5
- Ethics □ 6
- Mission □ 7
- Church history □ 8
- World Church □ 9
- Other Faiths □ 0
- Other (Please specify) □ X

Q 12

2.12 Which words would best describe your present theological/church tradition?

PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE BOX IF APPROPRIATE

- Anglo-Catholic □ 1
- Catholic □ 2
- Modern Catholic □ 3
- Charismatic □ 4
- Conservative Evangelical □ 5
- Open Evangelical □ 6
- Middle of the road □ 7
- Liberal □ 8
- Traditional □ 9
- Radical □ 0
- Other (Please specify) □ X

Q 13

2.13 Have you always been of this tradition?

(26)

Yes □ 1 Go to Q.15

No □ 2 Continue with Q.14
Q 14  If this has not always been your tradition, which words would best describe your previous tradition?

**PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE IF APPROPRIATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Catholic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Catholic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Evangelical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Evangelical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of the road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 15  Where is your present ministry?

**PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE IF APPROPRIATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish rural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish suburban</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish urban</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy hospital</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy prison</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy forces</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy air/sea port</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy civic authority</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: diocesan officer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: theological education</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: industrial mission</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: ministry among the deaf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: ministry in retirement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: ministry to those with a disability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: religious orders</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q 16** Where was your *previous* ordained ministry?

**PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE IF APPROPRIATE**

- Parish rural □ 1
- Parish suburban □ 2
- Parish urban □ 3
- Chaplaincy hospital □ 4
- Chaplaincy prison □ 5
- Chaplaincy education □ 6
- Chaplaincy forces □ 7
- Chaplaincy air/sea port □ 8
- Chaplaincy civic authority □ 9
- Sector: diocesan officer □ 0
- Sector: theological education □ X
- Sector Industrial mission □ A

- Sector ministry among the deaf □ 1
- Sector: ministry in retirement □ 2
- Sector: ministry to those with a disability □ 3
- Sector: religious orders □ 4
- Other (please specify) □ 5

**SECTION TWO Parochial Ministry**

**Q 17** Present Parochial Ministry: what other Faith communities *live* in your parish?

- Baha’i □ 1
- Buddhist □ 2
- Hindu □ 3
- Jain □ 4
- Jewish □ 5
- Muslim □ 6
- Sikh □ 7
- Zoroastrian □ 8
- Other (Please specify) □ 9

- None □ 0
- Don’t know □ X
Q.18 Present Parochial Ministry: what other Faith communities have places of worship in your parish?

- Baha'i □ 1
- Buddhist □ 2
- Hindu □ 3
- Jain □ 4
- Jewish □ 5
- Muslim □ 6
- Sikh □ 7
- Zoroastrian □ 8
- Other (Please specify) □ 9
- None □ 0
- Don't know □ X

Q.19 Do you have any contact with people of these Faith communities, either as individuals or groups?

- Yes □ 1 Continue with Q.20
- No □ 2 Go to Q.21

Q.20 How frequent is this contact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith Community</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baha'i</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoroastrian</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.21 Have you ever, either in your present or previous ministry, been consulted regarding any of the following?

- A mixed Faith marriage [ ]
- The baptism of a child of a mixed Faith marriage [ ]
- A funeral for a person of another Faith [ ]
- Prayers for a person of another Faith [ ]
- The use of your church building by another Faith group [ ]
- A service where people of other Faiths may be present e.g. A youth service for Scouts/guides, a civic service [ ]
- In an advocacy/intermediary role [ ]
- Other situations (Please specify) [ ]

Never [ ]

Q.22 In your present ministry, do you ever visit local schools, residential homes, hospitals etc. where people of other Faith traditions may be present?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

Q.23 From your present or past ministry, how would you describe these contacts?

*PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE BOX IF APPROPRIATE*

- They helped me gain an insight into another tradition [ ]
- They highlighted my need for more knowledge about other traditions [ ]
  
  - Mission [ ]
  - Salvation [ ]
  - Revelation [ ]
  - Prayer [ ]
  - The nature of God [ ]

They provoked questions about:

- Other comments [ ]
Q.24 Present Chaplaincy/Sector ministry: Do you have contact with people of other Faith traditions in your ministry?

(46)

Yes □ 1 Continue with Q.25

No □ 2 Go to Q.28

Q.25 Which Faith communities do you have contact with?

(47)

Baha'i □ 1
Buddhist □ 2
Hindu □ 3
Jain □ 4
Jewish □ 5
Muslim □ 6
Sikh □ 7
Zoroastrian □ 8
Other □ 9
None □ 0

Q.26 Is this contact in relation to any of the following?

(48)

A request for prayer □ 1
A request for a prayer room □ 2
Advice regarding a pastoral issue □ 3
Advice in an advocacy/intermediary role □ 4
Other (Please specify) □ 5

Q.27 From your present or past ministry, how would you describe these contacts?

**PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE BOX IF APPROPRIATE**

They helped me gain an insight into another tradition □ 1
They highlighted my need for more knowledge about other traditions □ 2

They provoked questions about:

- mission □ 3
- salvation □ 4
- revelation □ 5
- prayer □ 6
- the nature of God □ 7

Other comments □ 8
Q.28  Parochial ministry: as a minister licensed to serve the people in your parish, how would you best describe your ministry in relation to those who profess another Faith?

**PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE BOX IF APPROPRIATE**

- To encourage evangelism with the aim of conversion □ 1
- To be a Christian witness through worship and prayer □ 2
- To be a Christian witness through social care and action □ 3
- To encourage dialogue for the sake of the community □ 4
- To encourage dialogue in order to promote better understanding □ 5
- To encourage dialogue with the aim of conversion □ 6
  - To be a reconciler/advocate □ 7
- To avoid engagement because you believe those who profess another Faith should be allowed to do so quietly □ 8
- Other (Please specify) □ 9

---

Q.29  Chaplaincy/Sector ministry: how would you best describe your ministry in relation to those who profess another Faith?

**PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE BOX IF APPROPRIATE**

- To encourage evangelism with the aim of conversion □ 1
- To be a Christian witness through worship and prayer □ 2
- To be a Christian witness through social care and action □ 3
- To encourage dialogue for the sake of the community □ 4
- To encourage dialogue in order to promote better understanding □ 5
- To encourage dialogue with the aim of conversion □ 6
  - To be a reconciler/advocate □ 7
- To avoid engagement because you believe those who profess another Faith should be allowed to do so quietly □ 8
- Other (Please specify) □ 9
Q.30 Do you have any further comment to make from your experience as an NSM/MSE in relation to any of the following:

training/education outside the diocese

contact with people of other Faiths outside the diocese

your own training needs

Any other comments
Q31. What further training or education do you need for ministry among people of other Faith traditions?

More information about the following Faiths:
- Baha'i □ 1
- Buddhism □ 2
- Hinduism □ 3
- Jainism □ 4
- Judaism □ 5
- Islam □ 6
- Sikhism □ 7
- Zoroastrianism □ 8
- Other (Please specify) □ 9

Further study in:
- the theology of religions □ 1
- the theology of mission □ 2
- the theology of dialogue □ 3
- the relationship between mission and dialogue □ 4
- the relationship between religion and culture □ 5
- Other (Please specify) □ 6

Further training in:
- communication skills □ 1
- foreign language skills □ 2
- Other (Please specify) □ 3

Resource material
- Guidelines on the use of buildings by people of other Faiths □ 1
- Guidelines on multi-Faith worship □ 2
- Teaching tapes or videos □ 3
- Other (Please specify) □ 4

Opportunities to:
- meet people of other Faiths □ 1
- visit other places of worship □ 2
Q.32 From your own personal experience, both pre-ordination/licensing and post-ordination/licensing, what could you contribute to clergy training in the diocese?

For example:

- experience of another culture

- knowledge of another Faith

- language skills

- teaching experience

- Other
Thank you very much for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire.

If you would be prepared to be further interviewed on any of the above issues, either by telephone or face to face, please give your name below.

NAME: ________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

PHONE: ____________________________
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THE QUESTIONNAIRE - Rationale for Questions

Section 1

Q 1 to 3 The response to these questions gives an over-all profile of clergy in terms of age, years ordained and gender and can be measured against CME take-up (Q11) and perceived learning needs (Q32).

Q 4 This gives a breakdown between college and course trained clergy which could be measured against other variables.

Q 5 and 6 This information is useful for measuring against church tradition (Q12) and attitudes towards people of other Faiths (Q28 and Q29)

Q 7 Provides for those clergy who were trained overseas or at institutions not mentioned in Q5 or Q6.

Q 8 and 9 These responses add to the diocesan profile.

Q 10 and 11 Provide an indication of CME take-up and made a useful comparison with age and years ordained (Q1 and Q2)

Q 12 Adds to the clergy profile in terms of theological tradition and can also be measured against the variables of College/Course (Q5 and Q6) and attitude towards people of other Faiths (Q28 and Q29). The ten theological categories were arrived at through consultation with clergy during the pilot processes.

Q 13 This question was asked to see how many clergy change the way they would describe their theological tradition during their time in ministry.

Q 14 If the answer to question Q13 was yes, it would be interesting to see in which direction clergy generally move; e.g. from a conservative position to a more liberal tradition, or vice versa.

Q 15 and Q 16 Add to the clergy profile and also provide a useful comparison with attitude to people of other Faiths (Q28 and Q29) and also perceived training needs (Q31). For example, it would be interesting to see if clergy in ministry in
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urban areas have a different attitude and different training needs, to those ministering in rural areas.

Section 2

Q17 to Q22 Ask clergy in parochial ministry what contact they have with people or communities or other Faith traditions. These responses make an interesting comparison with perceived learning needs (Q31). For example, do those clergy who have contact with other Faith communities perceive a need for training in this field? Another interesting comparison would be between contact and attitude (Q28). For example, does frequent contact result in a more inclusive attitude, or is there no correlation?

Q23 Is seeking to discover if this contact has led to theological reflection.

Q24 to 27 Ask the same questions as Q17 to Q23 but this time in relation to Chaplaincy/Sector ministry where the context (Q26) is different.

Q28 Seeks to discover the attitude of those in parochial ministry towards people of other Faiths and makes a useful comparison with theological tradition (Q12) and college/course attended (Q5/6). A distinction is made between those in parochial ministry and those in sector ministry because of the particular relationship that a Church of England vicar in parochial ministry has with the people who live with the geographical boundary.

Q29 Asks the same question of those in chaplaincy/sector ministry.

Q30 Provides an opportunity for those in non-Stipendiary ministry or Ministry in Secular Employment to comment on their experience.

Q31 Asks the clergy what they perceive as their own training needs in relation to ministry in a multi-faith/multi-cultural society.

Q32 Asks what skills the clergy could offer the diocese in terms of training. This information can also add to the clergy profile.

P14 Thanks the respondent and also asks if he or she would be willing to be interviewed either by telephone or face-to-face at a later date. This information is needed for follow-up interviews.
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AMENDMENTS TO SECOND DRAFT OF QUESTIONNAIRE
Resulting from Pilot Study No 1, clergy workshop, 15 September 1997

Q5  list colleges/courses alphabetically

Q11 include CME in question

Q13 reword ‘How would you describe your present theological/church tradition’ to (Q12) ‘Which words would best describe your present theological/church tradition?’

Add (tick more than one box if appropriate)
- Add catholic and radical

Q16 change ‘the disabled’ to ‘those with a disability’

Q17 add ‘ordained’, to read ‘present ordained ministry’

Q18 add Hindu

Q21 add Hindu

Q24, 27 rephrase to give optional answers

Q28, 29 rephrase to avoid using word ‘responsibility’. Suggest (Q28) ‘as a minister licensed to serve the people in your parish, how would you best describe your ministry in relation to those who profess another Faith?’ (Q29) ‘Chaplaincy/Sector Ministry: how would you best describe your ministry in relation to those who profess another Faith?’
AMENDMENTS TO THIRD DRAFT OF QUESTIONNAIRE
Resulting from Pilot Study No 2

General comments:

- NSMs (Non-Stipendiary Ministers), MSEs (Ministers in Secular Employment) are special cases.
- They should have a section in the questionnaire where they can reflect their ministry outside of the parish.
- Many receive CME outside of the Diocese.
- Deacons and Deaconesses need mentioning.

Specific comments:

Q12 list alphabetically

Q17 & 24 add the word 'present' to parochial and sector

Q19 reword to include individuals or groups within other faith communities

Q23 reword to 'how would you describe any of your contacts?'

Q25 reword to 'which people of other Faiths do you have contact with?'
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AMENDMENTS TO FOURTH DRAFT OF QUESTIONNAIRE
Incorporating comments from Academic Tutors

• Take out 'dual-role' ministry because this is a duplication if respondents can tick more than one answer

• Change 'sex' to 'gender'

• NSMs: suggest they ignore questions that are inappropriate and go to open-ended questions at the end.

• Include an open-ended section for those with other relevant experience, e.g. priests from other cultures or have taught Religious Education.

• Q31: add 'from your experience, what can you contribute?'

• Add a thank you at the end of the questionnaire and ask for the name, address and telephone number of those who would be prepared to offer a follow-up interview.
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AMENDMENTS TO FIFTH DRAFT OF QUESTIONNAIRE
Incorporating minor changes to draft number 4 and moving and splitting section two to give a greater distinction between Parochial and Chaplaincy/Sector ministry

Page 2 Q4 capital C for college

3 Q5 capital T and C for Theological College

4 Q9 capital T for training under point 3

6 Move SECTION TWO to follow Q16
And rename SECTION TWO Parochial Ministry

6 Q15 underline present

7 add Q16 as follows:

Q16 Where was your previous ordained ministry?

PLEASE TICK MORE THAN ONE IF APPROPRIATE

Parish rural 1)
Parish suburban 2)
Parish urban 3)
Chaplaincy hospital 4)
Chaplaincy prison 5)
Chaplaincy education 6)
Chaplaincy forces 7)
Chaplaincy air/sea port 8)
Chaplaincy civic authority 9)
Sector: diocesan officer 1)
Sector: theological education 2)
Sector: industrial mission 3)
Sector: ministry among the deaf 4)
Sector: ministry in retirement 5)
Sector: ministry to those with a disability 6)
Sector: religious orders 7)
Other (please specify) 8)

Page 7 Q17 add Don’t know

8 Q18 add Don’t know

9 Add section three before Q24 to read

SECTION THREE Chaplaincy/Sector ministry

10 Q26 point 4, intermediacy to read intermediary
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Page 10 Q27 rephrase to read “From your present or past ministry, how would you…”

11 Section three to read section four

11 Q28 point 8, capital F for faith

11 Q29 “ “ “ “ “ “

12 Section four to read section five

12 Q30 capital A for Any other comments

13 Section five to read section six

14 Q32 join gaps between ordination/licensing

Last page add a line for telephone
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THE SAMPLE

My aim was to select 250 clergy across the Diocese out of the total number at the time of 503. I wanted the sample to be evenly spread geographically. I therefore worked across the 27 deaneries of the diocesan mailing list which is sorted according to deanery.

I started with the first name on the first deanery list and thereafter took every other name up to 250 in number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deanery</th>
<th>Total No</th>
<th>Sample No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARKING AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRADWELL AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford North</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford South</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon &amp; Dengie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLCHESTER AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedham &amp; Tey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport &amp; Stanstead</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Follow-up Letter

5 February 1998

Dear colleague

CLERGY TRAINING IN THE DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD

In case you did not receive my earlier letter dated 13\textsuperscript{th} January, or have misplaced the questionnaire which was attached to it, I am enclosing a further copy for your use. As I said in the previous letter, I would greatly value your co-operation in some research that I am conducting on the provision of clergy training in the Diocese of Chelmsford. As Diocesan Inter-Faith Adviser, I need this information in order to evaluate the present situation and make proposals for better training provision, both for serving and future clergy in the context of ministry in a multi-faith and multi-cultural society. The research is also part of my own doctoral studies.

Your responses will be treated with strict confidentiality and anonymity, but each questionnaire will be coded in order to allow me to follow-up the responses. I alone will know the codes and all coding will be destroyed by me once the data has been analysed. The research will be carried out in full compliance with the British Social Science Association's Code of Ethics.

The findings of this research will be made available to you.

My suggestion is that you have a quick read through the questionnaire before starting your responses. The completion of the questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes.

I would be most grateful if you could return the completed questionnaire by the 28\textsuperscript{th} February 1998 in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope. Thank you for your co-operation in this research, which will be beneficial to all clergy in the diocese.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Davison
Bishop of Chelmsford's Adviser for Inter-Faith Relations
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EXTRA CODES FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 2 Q5  Col (15)
Add codes:  King's College London  7
            St John's Nottingham  8
            London College of Divinity  9
            London Bible College  0
            Church Army  X

Page 2 Q6  Col (17)
Add codes:  Oak Hill  6
            Aston Training Scheme  7
            Overseas  8
            Can't remember  9

Page 3 Q7  Col (18)
Add code:  Overseas  1

Page 3 Q9  Col (22)
Add codes:  Diploma in Theology  7
            Teacher Training  8
            Missionary Training
            Church Army/All Nations  9

Page 4 Q11  Col (24)
Add code:  Church Management  A

Page 5 Q15  Col (29)
Add code:  Town  6
            Cathedral  7
            Housing Estate  8

Page 6 Q16  Col (31)
Add codes:  Overseas  6
            Missionary  7
            First Post  8
            Cathedral  9
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Page 6 Q17 Col (32)
Add Very few A

Page 8 Q21 Col (43)
Add Memorial service 0
Schools work X
Inter-faith event A

Page 8 Q 23 Col (45)
Add Irrelevant 9
The good in other Faiths challenged my faith 0
Helped me to understand Christianity better X
Convinced me of the Truth of Christianity A

Page 9 Q26 Col (48)
Add In a work situation 6
In schools 7

Page 9 Q27 Col (49)
Add Convinced me of the truth of Christianity 9

Page 10 Q28 Col (50)
Add Irrelevant 0
To be a friend X
To draw people to Christ A
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Page 10 Q29  Col (51)

Add  
To be a friend  0
To provide pastoral care  X

Page 12 Q31  Col (61)

More information about the following Faiths

Add  
None  0
Not now  X
Cults  A

Page 12 Q31  Col (62)

Further study in

Add  
All  7
Not now  8
Mission to other Faiths  9
None  0

Page 12 Q31  Col (73)

Further Training in

Add  
Ethnicity  4
None  5

Page 12 Q31  Col (64)

Resource material

Add  
Guidelines on birth, death etc  5
None  6

Page 12 Q31  Col (65)

Opportunities to:

Add  
Already active  3
None  4
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**Extra codes for open-ended questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>training/education outside the diocese</strong></th>
<th>Col (52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more within the diocese</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col (53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some useful courses outside diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other dioceses offer better provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contact with people of other Faiths outside the diocese</strong></th>
<th>Col (54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col (55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact in work situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact in parish situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Your own training needs</strong></th>
<th>Col (56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at present</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time/money</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses are offered at a difficult time</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col (57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would like more intellectual theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like Christian/Jewish Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would welcome more opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other comments</strong></th>
<th>Col (58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I operate like a stipendiary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col (59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have done my own research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My study/contact has caused me to change my mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience has convinced me of the Trust of Christianity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col (60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My experience is outside of ordained ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an NSM I find it difficult to take part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Experience of another culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in the Middle East</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in the Far East</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in South America</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in a multi-faith/cultural area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Knowledge of another Faith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Language skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian languages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African languages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taught in schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in multi-faith schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in higher/further education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My knowledge is inadequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am moving/retiring</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to offer my help</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm more concerned with post-modern Secularism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My aim is to win them to Christ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be open</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CLERGY TRAINING IN THE DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD**

Q2. How many years have you been licensed or ordained?

**SECTION ONE : GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Number of Years Ordained</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PRE-ORDINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>56-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE OF RAW DATA**
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THE CLERGY INTERVIEW

1 Thank you very much for responding. What prompted you to respond to this particular questionnaire?

2 Looking back, can you say how helpful your own training has been?
   a) what has been useful?
   b) what would you like to see included?
   c) how easy did you find the transition from training to first post?
   d) How would you describe your relationship with your training incumbent?
   e) Were you able to use your skills/learning in your first post?

3 Do you have any opinion about training methods?
   a) e.g. formal/informal/placements etc

4 Have you made use of POT/CME opportunities?
   a) If not, why not?
   b) in your opinion, how could this be improved?

5 Do you think that communication skills are important?

6 Has any of your training assisted you with collaborative ministry?

7 Can you identify any current training needs and how would you go about fulfilling those needs?

8 Not many respondents saw the need for further training in issues relating to multi-faith/multi-cultural issues. Why do you think this is?

9 Possible question relating to specific respondent

9 Is there anything else you would like to add?
THE STUDENT INTERVIEW

How would you describe your overall training? Was it a good experience or not?

If good/bad – why?

Now that you are in a parish, can you identify what has been particularly helpful?

Or what you would have liked included?

Did you do anything about the Trinity?

Did you do anything about diversity – social, economic, churchmanship, religious?

And how to deal with diversity?

Did you do anything on collaborative ministry?

Did you do anything on other faiths?

If so, what?

Has it been useful?

How are you finding POT/CME?

What is good about it?

What is unhelpful?

What would you like?

How are you finding your first curacy and relationship with your parish/incumbent?

Is there anything else you would like to add?
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TRANSCRIPT OF CLERGY INTERVIEW  12 May 1999
A clergyman in his late fifties, ordained for 35 years, from a Liberal Tradition
and ministering in a semi-rural area

Q  First I would like to thank you for completing the form. I know that
many people put forms straight in the bin. What made you reply to this one?

A  Because it came from you. (laughter)

Q  Otherwise you wouldn't have completed it?

A  Oh no, not necessarily so. It is an important subject for me.

Q  I notice that your training is some time ago, but can you remember much
about it?

A  I can remember a lot about the training, yes. Yes, I can.

Q  Would you say that it was useful?

A  In terms of....

Q  Your ministry

A  I think living in community, which we did at Warminster. Very closely
- a year without exams – a year of pastoral studies, which King's had at that
stage, was a gift because we had to work together. There wasn't any alternative
- and therefore a lot of the ideas were fresh and not necessarily absorbed, but
very much mind matters that had come out of the degree course at Kings. Super
tuition there – were then put to work, as it were, in every day examples of
dealing with the local parishes where we were sent to care. And it taught me
collaborative ministry really because it was community that we were in to start
with.

And yes, it was hard. I can remember having many a run-in – as we were the
'enfant terribles' of the early sixties. We were kicking over the traces - the
'Honest to God' generation. And really the greatest problem was with the staff
who belonged to something twenty years before that. – sort of post war. But I
can see that what happened was a purifying of the academic so that it became
earthed.

Q  Was the Warminster experience part of the King’s course?

A  Yes, year four.
Q So you did three years degree and then did your fourth year?
A Yes. The same group of people...
Q ...stayed together, all the way through?
A Yes, very powerful – and I think it taught as much about human relationships as it was about anything else - and many of the old arguments about churchmanship had been shredded by then. By the fourth year we began to see people behind the dogma – and that excited me.

But then off into the first parish and I went to one of the most autocratic men in the Church of England. And there was no question about consultation – you just did it – which confirmed the need in me, for collaborative ministry later in life.

He was a wonderful man and powerful – with tremendous insight and leadership – but you saw people being crushed. You saw people being frightened at having their own points of view – and above all, the diversity of what God was doing, had to be subdued – to coincide with this guy.

So that when I went to my first parish, there was little me – and a congregation of 40 – and 26,000 people on the North side of Nottingham, all different aged council house properties, which didn’t naturally generate leaders and it was quite a sobering experience.

Q Was he officially your training incumbent?
A Yes

Q Did you feel that he understood what the role meant?
B I think I was very fortunate. I came from a clergy family and therefore knew my way around. I knew what was expected. We were six curates in Nottingham parish church. We all had specific areas of responsibility and we were told to go and do! He was always there to consult, but he didn’t say, ‘now, tell me what you think?’ He said ‘that is the way to do it’.

A good example of his working was, that on the second day I was there, we had lunch together. The phone rang to say there was a funeral at half past two – ‘you can do it!’ I HAD NEVER BEEN TO A FUNERAL IN MY LIFE!!

Q Never even been to one?
A No. I can still remember running up the stairs – I was still in the flat across the vicarage at that stage – and searching desperately for my pastoral notes about how to take funerals. And when I got back, having stuttered my way through, he said ‘all right?’ I can’t remember what I said in reply, or that he was concerned that I had survived.

Q Would that happen today? Was that unusual?
A It was unusual then. I don’t think it happens today. I think, looking back, it was because I had a fair dollop of self-confidence that I got through but there were curates who I knew who subsequently crashed all over the place under this kind of authority. A little later on, of course, the older curates began to take over underneath this autocrat, and nursed the younger curates, saying ‘no you do it this way’ and ‘be careful not to say that’. So it became collaborate ministry unbeknown to him.

Q What an experience!

A Fascinating. And you see, because I could carry it off, and appeared to him to be very confident, he could give me anything — and he did. But, it was a very hard experience. He used to sit in front of you when you were preaching. He would come out of his stall and sit right in front of you, and to all his curates, if he felt that we were losing the point, or we were in some way getting woolly, he would slap the pew in front and tell people ‘we will now sing the next hymn’. Now that happened regularly, so that you learned quickly what was acceptable and we used to turn up with a sermon on the Tuesday afternoon for the following Sunday — and with a red pencil he would just take out large parts of it often — as either theologically unsound or irrelvant. Now his judgement was excellent. He was one of the finest preachers himself, that you could possibly hear. But as a young, flabby duckling coming into this, it was EXTREMELY (highly emphasised) fierce, and there were casualties that I could point to you now in the church — all round the place — who didn’t make it, and have never re-found their ministry.

Q They didn’t make it under his regime you mean?

A No, or subsequently, because he knocked it out of them

Q But you had had a good training

A I had a good training, I came from a background which stood me in good stead, and I was able to survive — and we became warm, warm friends. He treated me like a son, until he died — and I am eternally grateful for but, but — it was dependent solely on my capability of self-confidence for the system to work.

Q How long were you with him for?

A Four and a half years. And during that time we picked up all kinds of things. He gave me a geographical area to look at which was the old St Anne’s area slum. Grim. But lovely people.

Q The other thing I wanted to ask was, from your training, and particularly during the last year, were there other skills that you had learned, that you were able to use? If you compare with how you coped, with others who had trained somewhere else, do you think that you benefited?
A Undoubtedly. He set the highest of standards of his curates and himself – and he taught me to preach. He taught me never to apologise for the gospel and to be Christ centred and if you didn’t know something, find out about it and preach about it. Don’t dodge it. So there was a sense in which you put your head down, you went for your target and you did it well. Now that has been of enormous benefit to me. Because I think it has made me resilient. I still get frightened of preaching. I still worry about it – but then I think that is healthy and it is part of my trade-in from those years I think – to pick off difficult subjects.

Q So you definitely feel then that year was a continuation of your training and you learned a lot from it.

A O yes. I could tell you stories until the cows come home .........
St Mary’s at Nottingham has a very long aisle and we assembled at the back and the choir sang an introit at the back. And as the introit finished and we began walking up the aisle, he would issue out what we had to do. John, first lesson Michael second lesson, Ralph intercessions. The preacher was fixed before.

Q But you didn’t know before the service started?

A We didn’t know before which meant that you had to prepare every bit. Cunning you see – so you had to prepare every part of the service.

Q To go back to King’s – what sort of training methods were they using then? Was it traditional lecture style most of the time?

A Yes – entirely. Three years of lectures, tutorials and seminars.

Q And then the year was different.

A The year in Warminster was different because a lot of it was inviting speakers in for different disciplines and allowing a debating experience to come into play. And that was very helpful.

Q You said earlier that the year enabled you to reflect upon lots of your three years.

A That’s right.

Q If you hadn’t had that year, you would have been ..... 

A Working out the theology some ten years later sort of thing

Q But you were able to do it in that year..

A Yes, very, very helpfully. Partly because you were doing it with the same people who you had always been with and partly because Warminster, being in sleepy old Wiltshire, all us had to go to little country churches where
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hardly anything moved and try to generate enthusiasm for NEW theology (laughter) It actually made you think very hard. How do you put this over – all this in the face of people who had hardly known anything else other than the authorised version of the Book of Common Prayer?

Q Did everyone go into rural parishes as placements?

A Yes. There wasn’t anything else in that part of the world. We did have college missions – which were tough. We had one to Lincoln – downtown Lincoln and one to Brierly Hill – hell on earth. But they simply said ‘go and door knock’ and talk about your faith. We did that for a week and then came back together with our experiences.

Q Have you taken advantage of POT/CME? Have you found it useful?

A Yes. Initially in Southwell Diocese it was – you knew you had a great advantage over people who hadn’t gone to Kings. That wasn’t a boast. It was just that we covered ground very thoroughly and much more widely than people who had just had a three year experience. And therefore the potty training [POT] was useless. We were far ahead of where our colleagues were – which was painful really.

But ever since then, once we had got out of those initial three years of training, I have always made a point to try and widen my ministry with as many courses that are going on. I actually feel that the diocese now has lost its way. There isn’t very much going on – and there used to be a tremendous lot of options. And OK, there are lots of things published, as we know, but they tend to be elsewhere – quite a lot of them elsewhere and they tend to be residential which means it’s not so easy to drop everything and go. But if it is a day at Guy Harlings or Pleshey or whatever, it is a delight to be able to put it in – and so I YEARN FOR MORE OPTIONS (great stress)

Q How long have you been in the diocese?

A Ten years.

Q So you believe there is less now than there was?

A Oh yes. Emphatically so. There used to be a lot of in-house things that were done and although there are a few, they tend to be a lot more ‘intellectually centred’. That’s not the right word – you know what I mean – rather than pastorally urgent. They are word games rather than actually facilitating what you might need Monday to Sunday and I tend to go for things which help my ministry as it is.

Q Can you think of anything particular, if it was on offer, you would like.

A I think, in your line, it is very important to be able to explain your own faith to other faiths and listen to where they are coming from, and to pool so much that we have in common. I very much want to explore the Bible
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in the widest sense without being inhibited by the sense in which it is a holy of holy experience. And being more free and open to do that. I delight in both exploring and experimenting with different forms of prayer.

I want to know what people are thinking, for instance about the psychology of bereavement. Everyone knows about bereavement, but where are we in the sense of discovering, after all these marvellous courses and so forth, what actually works and what doesn’t, in the long term. Interestingly, we heard on the radio about counselling young people and saying, ‘is that helpful or not?’ I think that is not helpful. That they actually need a good cuddle. But you can’t give them a cuddle – because you will be in trouble. So I think it is at that level, I want to know, or to understand, where people are coming from as teenagers. I want to know why people get into alternative remedies to live with life, and why it is that the church seems to them, to be so irrelevant. Why? The great why’s of life. I want to find other peoples experience to help me do my job better.

Q So it sounds as if you are wanting something much more in-depth that what has been provided.

A Yes. Yes. I think that somehow we spend a great deal of time working in the shallows. And then we think we have done it. And we are frightened of actually taking on board difficulties. What I am really saying is that I am trying to keep up with the world changing as it is, and wanting to be among colleagues and people who specialise, to reflect. I want to be given some new ideas and lines to think about.

Q How do you think that could be moved ahead?

A I think I actively look to find courses about what I am interested in. Last week I went up to Bury to the Praxis conference on funerals and marriages. Last time I was at Pleshey I went to Wanda Nash and her thing about stress. All very interesting.

Q So that was at Pleshey. So it was in-house. Was it well attended

A 12 or 13. Pretty poor. I did a thing on Hildegarde of Bingen which was something I got trapped into doing, but I enormously enjoyed experiencing something I didn’t know much about. We had 25 there. It was very exhilarating. And that taught me, as much as I could have given them, about this great old girl.

Q Was that a local thing?

A Yes, Diocesan. I like taking on something like that, which is quite different to the work that I normally do. I think we ought to do it at our stage in ministry. Partly because it freshens us up in different areas and partly because the experience ought to count for a bit.

Q You have said that there weren’t many who came to that conference. From my experience things aren’t taken up with any great enthusiasm. In your
form you have identified several things in my area that you would like information on, for example Judaism, Islam and so on and some more input on the theology of religion and mission. You were one of the fewer. The majority, I have to say, didn’t want anything. I wondered if you had any idea as to why it is that there is this reluctance — that people genuinely don’t want — or they say they don’t want, any resourcing — any training. I shall be asking this question of people who have said that they don’t and it may be easier for them to answer, but you might have some idea.

A I do sense there is a general malaise around among fellow clergy, which I think is part to do with the secularisation of society, and being marginalised. But I also think it is about confidence in the faith. And people are becoming unsure about whether the certainties they inherited are quite as certain as they thought they were. It brings me back really to that hard training at the beginning, to have a focus firmly on Christ, but not to fear from then on. You see, I am actually going back to that, and saying that it was wonderful in its influence upon me.

Q I think that point about a lack of confidence is quite relevant. The research is showing that the evangelical wing of the church is over 50%, many of whom are quite narrow in their views — and I may have a difficulty with challenge.

A I am sure that is true — and I am sure they know that the pendulum is away from them because they have had their chance — and it hasn’t worked and there is going to have be probably a blood bath out of it to rethink evangelicalism.

Q We have finished. But just before ending, would you say that you, and the church wardens, need to have a clear understanding of leadership and teamwork, communications skills which is wonderful if you have it. Would you say that it is the same for other clergy?

A It is difficult to say because we work in isolation. You would know because you move between parishes. But wearing my assistant rural deans hat and going round my impression is that most of them work as autocrats.

Q Thank you very much for your time.
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TRANSCRIPT OF CLERGY INTERVIEW 12 May 1999
A clergyman in his mid thirties, ordained for 7 years, from an Evangelical
Tradition and ministering in an urban area.

Q Thank you for completing the form. What actually prompted you to
complete this form?
A From what I remember, one – it was important, two it was from someone
I knew, and three, as I skimmed through it, I thought, yes – I can answer this
within a reasonable space of time. I think that makes a big difference. A lot of
questionnaires you get are from people you don’t know, you are not sure why
they are doing it and when you look at it you realise that it is going to take a very
long time to complete. In this case I thought, through just looking at it, yes –
this is easy I can work through this and I knew where it was going.

Q I see that you were trained at Trinity – how long ago was that?
A I left there seven years ago.

Q Do you remember very much about the training? How useful it was?
A The experiences at college are difficult because you can’t always separate
your experience of the academic side of it from how life was generally. It was a
very up and down time personally, so that colours things a little bit. But in many
ways I actually found it a very positive experience. I have to say though, not
until almost in the final year when I really felt, in terms of the academic side, that
we were getting somewhere and it was really beginning to challenge and
stimulate me. The first two years, it was more, ‘this is the syllabus and we have
to work through it’. I wouldn’t say that I didn’t learn things from it – that would
be a lie – of course I did, but that was how it felt. It felt more of a chore. But in
the final year there was a much smaller group of students because many finished
after their second year and that enabled us to get together. The quality of the
relationships with the fellow students was so much better. And even with the
academic staff – with the lecturers. I think it was then that you really begin to
motor. Probably then that you really begin to extend yourself. And so it got
better as it went on. Of course there always some bits that you enjoy more than
others.

Q Did you do a placement in that time?
A I did two placements. One which was a complete waste of time, frankly.
It was extremely poorly managed – a total flop – total waste of time. I was
placed with the Industrial chaplaincy unit at Bristol Diocese. I don’t know why
they agreed to have students. They wouldn’t let us go on visits because that
would undermine their position. I think they felt that they had worked really
hard to get over things and then they suddenly if they dragged in some students
that might upset things. Well that’s fine but then why ask for students in the first
place because there wasn’t really anything for us to do. They set me a piece of work that they thought I might want to look at, which was related to unemployment – I can’t really remember what it was – but that’s not really the point. The whole point of a placement is to be in something a bit more practical in order to reflect theologically. Whereas all they really wanted was a bit of statistical research. It was just a waste of time and no-one was really that interested. It smacked of an exercise that they were giving me to do to fill in the time. So in the end I said to college – well this has been a waste of time.

Q So you told the college

A Oh yes. My second was a church placement – a Christian family centre in an area just south of the famous St Paul’s. An interesting area – a very urban area – mixed area – a high percentage of single parent families. It was a brand new building, which was a school building and church building all on a shared site. And that was really interesting – working in that kind of environment. It was also my first direct experience of working in a church where there were not only ordained staff but there were actually lay staff – full time paid staff in various areas of responsibility. That was a new experience for me and it was very, very helpful.

Q How long were you there?

A I did a block placement the first summer I was there and then carried on during the following year. So I would attend every Sunday plus a half day during the week. But because it was quite positive, I actually did more than that.

Q So that placement came fairly early on in the three years?

A It came during my first year. Everyone had a placement during their first and second years. If I remember rightly we weren’t obliged to do anything in our third year. They had a slightly strange situation where all single students had a block placement in Bradford which was part of a sort of urban theology type thing. But it was deemed that married students should stay with their families. It was a strange sort of set-up really where one lot would do one thing and the other lot would do another. Actually I think it was abandoned the year after I left. It had not been a particularly meaningful project really.

So I did my block placement in this church and then they allowed me to carry that on as my Sunday placement – largely because I had made very good connections.

Q You said that the first two years felt like ploughing through a syllabus and when you got to the third year, you were still with the same students, but a smaller number, how many of you were there at that point?

A Probably about 20-25 of us

Q Compared with the previous year of?
A More like 50-60

Q In one group?

A Yes – in lectures. In tutorials, seminars we were in smaller groups. As well as ordinands we had a lot of independent students. We also had a lot of students who may have only been on a one-year course. So certainly the first year the number was very big. Probably 60 students. There were lots of students around. That had it benefits.

I think the other thing about it – the problem was with us – the students not the college. One of the problems is, without sounding too rude, is that a lot of people came in with their own agenda. ‘I came to theological college to tell you what I know’ rather than actually coming to theological college to learn. And this was a real problem. We actually had a lecture from one of the staff one day about this issue. They suspended the topic for the day, whatever it was, and one of our pastoral theology lecturers spent an hour talking this through because I think a lot of the lecturers were really struggling. Whilst they wanted to encourage questions and get input, it was getting into a ridiculous situation in that sometimes in an hour’s lecture you had almost heard as much from fellow students as you had from the lecturer. Questions were couched in such a way ‘now you said such and such, but of course bla bla bla’ There was a lot of posturing going one. And I have to say it was from the men – and a lot of it was to do with men in their 30s and 40s who had come from very responsible positions, some of them very high powered people. And I think a lot of them found it very hard to come out of that and be an ordinary student.

Q So it was difficult for those mature students who came in from previous careers and positions of power?

A Yes. In some ways it was a positive dynamic. One of the students was a 19 year old who chose to come to theological college instead of going to university. Another was a chap who had been a very successful barrister. Working together side by side – the dynamics of that are quite exciting but they are also quite difficult and can cause problems.

Q Did the session you had with the pastoral studies lecturer help at all?

A It took the edge of things for a bit. People sat on their hands for a bit. It changed some of the symptoms but I don’t know if it got down to the real problem. I think as time went on people just became a little bit more relaxed in their approach to study. But I have to say that my own experience – with my own group of friends – it was wonderful. I would say that one of the reasons I managed to get through the course is because we learned to support each other. And I think to be honest, college really did try hard to create that from the beginning. I have to be honest about that. The college was really good at that. But a lot of people felt the need to compete.

Q Why do you think that was?
A I think it was taking people out of a situation where they were very sure of themselves, very accomplished, and putting them into a situation where they are just another student. Some people struggled with that.

I guess as well that the vast majority of students coming to that college were obviously from a fairly straight-forward evangelical background and I think the college tried to shake that a little bit and again that caused a certain amount of insecurity which some coped with better than others.

There was also an attitude amongst students as well which was 'well this is a hurdle I've got to get over'. It always felt a little bit like – 'God wants me to be ordained and the Church is putting all these obstacles in the way. Getting through my ACCM was really, really hard. Getting accepted at college was really, really hard. Now I've got to get through this college and then I can get on with the real thing of God's work' instead of actually seeing that the whole of this thing is part of God's work.

I can understand that on one level. I am a practical person and want to get on with things. But other people were so like that it shocked me a bit. It was one of the things about college that used to drive me mad. I found it very difficult to cope with. I think having lost some of the students during the second year, I think those who were there in the third year were quite happy about that. They were those who really wanted to study.

Q Those who finished after two years, was it because they were on a different course or route, or did they actually drop out?

A They were on two year courses. I don't know what the current situation is.

Q Did those who finished after two years go on into ministry, into parishes? Without having done the third year, which for you was so beneficial?

A Yes There was still a bit of the GME idea around. You could either do the diploma course or the degree course but you could only do the degree course if you were staying for three years. That meant that during the first two years we had quite a mixture of more 'training for ministry' – including the placements – running alongside the academic. They tried very hard to integrate it – but how successful it was I don't know. They had what was called pastoral studies units which was looking at particular issues. We spent a whole week looking at death, funerals etc.

Then in the final year it was much more academic.

Q And with fewer numbers you could get into more reflection and debate?

A Yes. I think it happened before. But the way in which we handled it was better. We were more experienced.
Thinking about collaborate ministry and communication skills, do you think that year helped you?

A A good question. I suppose for me, personally, yes.

It’s just that that is how it has come across to me. That during that third year you began to communicate better and so on.

A I think I have always been fairly sociable and able to get on with people, but I think at the same time, that on the academic side there was a sense that it was a bit more of a shared task.

So after your training, where did you go?

A Walthamstow.

How did you find the transition?

A I had a good training incumbent in that he set out some very clear boundaries for me in terms of my relationship with the congregation. For me at the time it was essential and I think if I hadn’t had an incumbent with that clarity of thought I would have struggled a great deal more.

Was he equally helpful in other ways?

A In many ways he was a brilliant guy and he had a great pastoral awareness at one level. In some ways I learned some good things from him. I think if I was honest, where it perhaps wasn’t good – and this seems to be quite common from what I hear from colleagues – is that no-body really explains the basic nitty-gritty of parish ministry – faculty forms, expenses, keys etc. I know it sounds so simplistic but actually no-one actually explains why you are doing this or that. So I wonder how many clergy know why we do so many things. And yet they are part of the fabric, our existence – but everyone goes round in this sort of ‘cloud of unknowing’. Curates are never given any advice about personal expenses, dealing with tax, keeping good financial records etc etc. Those basic things are part of ministry.

That comes into basic administration skills?

A Yes, and self-management. You are like a self-employed person and if you don’t get any help with that you can get into a mess.

Self employed and also like a general manager of a small company?

A Yes. That is one area where my training as a Church of England clergyman has been very, very poor. I have had to find out myself and my training incumbent was not great on that score at all. Luckily I had good church wardens.
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When we are looking for training posts it is not just the incumbent but the whole environment should be right. I have quite strong feelings about this. If we are putting people in, we should look to see if it is a place where lay people have authority – is it a place where the curate can learn? Is it a place where you will be engaged with the wider church?

But my training incumbent was good. He had had a colourful relationship with my predecessor and they had to bring in an outside consultant to help the relationship. That was a steep learning curve for him and I think I benefited from it.

Q And what about POT/CME – have you made use of it?

A Yes, I participated very fully in ICME. I always gave it very high priority. I should say that although my training incumbent had great strengths he also had great weaknesses, which ultimately led to his resignation. At that point my ICME group was very supportive. In fact there were several of us who went through quite traumatic times in our first curacy and our ICME group was helpful and supportive of each other.

Q All different sorts experiences?

A yes, problematic for some, traumatic for others. We also had a good convenor. In our group we had some very strong personalities. Our convenor was very confident in himself and didn't feel he had to assert himself. He was sufficiently wise enough and strong enough to guide and direct us through towards any initiative coming from us.

Q Have you done any other CME?

A I've done various bit and pieces. I did something on sexual abuse.

Q Did you go outside of the Diocese for that?

A Yes. I went because we had a pastoral situation in our own parish. And I was the only man who did the course out of about 25 people.

What else – I went on a course/seminar for people serving as area deans/rural deans. That was very helpful.

Q Where was it? Was it Chelmsford?

A At Limehouse – with London Diocese, St Albans, Chelmsford and maybe others. Some of those present had been deans for two or three years and this was the first time they had any training in what was expected of them. None of us had a job description; none of us had any instruction from our bishops or archdeacons. There was an assumption that somehow we all knew. But clearly nobody did know. And we were all working in different situations with each Diocese having different practices.
Q Did you do anything on communications skills in your training?

A There were various options – but it was usually connected with pastoral studies issues. I think there is a wider issue with communication professionally with the congregation, fellow clergy, the PCC etc. There is a huge amount to do there which is never touched upon. How to chair a meeting for example. At the moment we probably learn how not to do it. I think that is an area we need to do a lot more work on.

Q There is another area that I am interested in, and that is conflict. Did you ever do anything on that?

A In my experience there have been different areas of conflict and different ways to trying to deal with it. I have a situation now in the parish, which is very difficult and very painful.

Q We have covered most things. You identified a couple of things in the multi-faith area which you said yes to further training in. But many of those who responded said didn’t want anything. These are people living in urban areas. Do you have any thoughts as to why they say they don’t have any needs.

A On one level I can understand that. The reality is that it is not that people don’t care, but they don’t have the time. Whilst I can see the importance, the reality is that however important it is, it is still way down the priority list.

It may be that some clergy do feel strongly about this. But from my point of view, I am surrounded by people from different cultural backgrounds and I have learned a bit about them but I think it is good to reminded that I need some input on it.

Q What you put on your form, which I think is relevant to everyone, is the relationship between mission and dialogue.

A And I think it is possible to learn from colleagues as well – those who have a different perspective. It would be good if clergy could do some work on this together. The reality is that they come with very different opinions and that may make it difficult to then go on as colleagues.

Q Yes it can become confrontational.

A Yes, it’s a major issue. I don’t have to tell you that (laughter)

Q Well we have come to the end but is there anything else you would like to add.

A Yes, going back to the beginning – that theological colleges struggle to train people when they are not sure what they are training them for. I still that is one of the big problems with the Church of England. We still don’t know what kind of parish we are training people for. And because of the culture at the moment we find it difficult to say to people ‘this is what we expect of you’. So
people are given a *carte blanche* to do what they want to do. The danger is that we are not sure what our role is and therefore how can we be effectively trained for it?

Q Well thank you very much for all your time
Appendix 10.2

**KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF CLERGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of another culture</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Middle East</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Far East</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in South America</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in multi-Faith/multi-cultural area</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of another Faith</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Skills</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian languages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African languages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Skills</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taught in schools</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in multi-Faith schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in Higher Education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Places of Worship for other Faith communities in the Diocese of Chelmsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colleges showing number and Theological Tradition of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years Ordained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College or Course Ordination Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>College or Course Ordination Training by Years Ordained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College or Course Ordination Training by Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pre-Ordination Learning/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Post-Ordination Training &amp; Continuing Ministerial Education by Topic (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Post-Ordination Training &amp; Continuing Ministerial Education by Topic (nos.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Post-Ordination Training &amp; Continuing Ministerial Education by Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Post-Ordination Training &amp; Continuing Ministerial Education by Years Ordained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Main Theological Tradition of Clergy Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Liberal/Middle of the Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Number of Respondents who had Changed their Theological Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Theological Tradition of Ordinands by College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Theological Tradition of Ordinands and College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Area of Parochial Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>What other Faith Communities live in your Parish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>What other Faith Communities have places of Worship in your Parish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Frequency of Contact with People of other Faiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Consultancy regarding other Faith issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Attitude towards people of other Faiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Attitude towards people of other Faiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Attitude towards people of other Faiths according to Theological Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>More Information about other Faiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Further Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Further Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Resource Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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