
This study examined the origin of the Evangelism-Missiology program at The Criswell College, its development, and its effectiveness in the lives of its graduates. The study was limited to the 1986-1987 through the 1991-1992 academic years. The case study method was used to examine the program and its curriculum, and to evaluate the practical use of the curriculum as perceived by its graduates and faculty.

To trace the development of the program, the history of the college was examined. The background and heritage of the Southern Baptist denominational ties of its founding president were explored.

A 30-question survey instrument was mailed to the 23 students who graduated from the program during the years 1987 through 1992. Five of the graduates were interviewed. Eighty-three percent of the graduates completed instruments which were used to compile the data. Several members of the faculty of the college were interviewed for their perception of the effectiveness of the program.

This study examined the origin of the Evangelism-Missiology program at The Criswell College, its development, and its effectiveness in the lives of its graduates. The study was limited to the 1986-1987 through the 1991-1992 academic years. The case study method was used to examine the program and its curriculum, and to evaluate the practical use of the curriculum as perceived by its graduates and faculty.

To trace the development of the program, the history of the college was examined. The background and heritage of the Southern Baptist denominational ties of its founding president were explored.

A 30-question survey instrument was mailed to the 23 students who graduated from the program during the years 1987 through 1992. Five of the graduates were interviewed. Eighty-three percent of the graduates completed instruments which were used to compile the data. Several members of the faculty of the college were interviewed for their perception of the effectiveness of the program.
Some conclusions reached as a result of the research were: 1) 58 percent of the graduates believed they were "well prepared" for their present work setting and the remaining 42 percent believed they were "satisfactorily prepared;" 2) 79 percent would select the same major if they were starting over; 3) professors in the department have academic credentials and professional life experiences to make the study of their field relevant in the classroom and in practicum; and 4) professors also perceive the program as one that effectively equips its graduates for ministry in evangelism and/or missions.

Results of the study led to the conclusion that deficiencies exist. Among these problems are: 1) lack of adequate full-time faculty; 2) limited financial resources to fully develop necessary practicum courses; and 3) lack of focus on urban studies. Administration and faculty are aware of many of the problem areas and are in the process of correcting them. The study concluded with recommendations for strengthening the work of missiology programs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Criswell College began as an institute dedicated to furthering the biblical education of the laity of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Texas, during W. A. Criswell's protracted tenure as pastor. In his autobiography (1990), Criswell states that the institute was formed to "preserve and proclaim the centrality of God's infallible Word to Christian faith and practice" (p. 235). Criswell also desired to provide further education for full-time pastors who could attend school only on a part-time basis. His model was the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, which at that time served to educate both laity and clergy.

Jacobs (1991) has chronicled the history of The Criswell College. The present study built upon Jacobs' study and focused specifically on the development of the program of Evangelism-Missiology Studies at the college.

The school opened on January 12, 1971, with evening classes only. Criswell was the first president, succeeded in 1972 by H. Leo Eddleman, former president of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. Davis (1993) commented that Eddleman came with the instruction to begin a day program.
Under Eddleman, the school began holding day classes in January, 1973, and granting diplomas to its graduates. The shift had begun to the time when the school would be a comprehensive theological institution granting baccalaureate and master's degrees. Eddleman, whose health was in decline when he left New Orleans, asked to be relieved of his administrative duties in 1974 citing health problems (Jacobs, 1991, p. 31).

In February of 1975, Leighton Paige Patterson accepted the invitation of the school trustees to become the third president and was inaugurated on September 19-20, 1976. The school flourished under Patterson, shedding its image as a small lay institute. "A seminal thinker and writer" (Jacobs, 1991, p. 43), Patterson developed programs designed to emphasize applied studies.

In 1992, Patterson accepted the presidency of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina. Later that same year, Richard Melick of the Mid-America Seminary in Memphis, Tennessee, was installed as the new president of The Criswell College and Graduate School of the Bible.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was the development of the program in Evangelism-Missiology at The Criswell College.
Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were:

1. To trace the development of the Evangelism-Missiology Program at The Criswell College.
2. To examine the curriculum of the Evangelism-Missiology Program at The Criswell College.
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of the program as perceived by its graduates.
4. To evaluate the effectiveness of the program as perceived by selected faculty at the college.

Questions for Study

1. Why was a program of Evangelism-Missiology Studies begun at The Criswell College?
2. What are the goals and objectives of the program?
3. What members of the faculty have influenced the program?
4. What are the academic qualifications of the faculty?
5. What is the curriculum of the program?
6. How did the curriculum evolve?
7. Has the curriculum changed since the inception of the program?
8. How many students have graduated from the program?
9. Where are the graduates now?
10. Are the graduates pursuing evangelism-missions vocationally?

11. How is the effectiveness of the program perceived by its graduates?

12. How is the effectiveness of the program perceived by selected faculty at the college?

13. What are the strengths of the program?

14. What is the uniqueness of the program?

15. What are the weaknesses of the program?

Significance of the Study

The Criswell College has aspired to academic excellence since the Patterson administration. It has sought as well to produce graduates prepared for Christian ministry in evangelism and missions domestically and abroad.

This study had the potential to affirm that The Criswell College is fulfilling its purposes. It also provided opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the Evangelism-Missiology Program in the lives of its graduates and in the perceptions of its faculty, resulting in suggestions for improvements.

The study of the program of Evangelism-Missiology may serve as a guide to other graduate schools interested in establishing such a program. The study of the curriculum of the program also may be a model for similar programs.
Significant to a case study approach to the development of an organization or institution is the fact that the research provides more than just a story about, or a description of, events (Bell, 1987). It should provide the reader with information that illustrates "relationships, micropolitical issues and patterns of influences" (pp. 6-7). This study provides the reader with that kind of information, from the worldview of the administration and faculty who influenced the program to the hopes and aims of its graduates. Such information can provide planners with explanations and direction for change.

Limitations of the Study

This study was concerned primarily with the Program of Evangelism-Missiology Studies, its development, its curriculum, and its effectiveness as perceived by some of its graduates and faculty members. It was not intended as a comprehensive history of The Criswell College, nor as an in-depth study of the vocation of every graduate.

Basic Assumptions

A basic assumption of this study was that graduates or faculty interviewed or surveyed could be contacted and would answer all questions truthfully.
Definitions of Terms

The terms *evangelism* and *missiology* as used in this study were defined as follows: *Evangelism* is "the proclamation of peace with God" (Graham, in Douglas, 1984, p. 5). *Missiology* is the study of sending forth under the authority of Christ to the nations of the world for the purpose of evangelism (Tippett, 1987, p. xviv).

Differentiation between the use of *mission* and *missions* was made. Peters' (1972) definitions were used in this study, with *mission* referring to the "total biblical assignment of the church of Jesus Christ," and *missions* used to mean the sending forth of authorized persons beyond the borders of the New Testament church and her immediate gospel influence to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ in gospel-destitute areas . . . (p. 11).
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Basic Methodology Procedures

Borg and Gall (1983, p. 489) list two classifications of case studies: historical case studies of organizations and oral histories. This study combined elements of the two. Because of the historical element, four essential steps in doing historical research cited by Borg and Gall were followed in researching the development of the Evangelism-Missiology Program at The Criswell College. Those steps were:

- define the problems or questions to be investigated,
- search for sources of historical facts, summarize and evaluate the historical sources, and present the pertinent facts within an interpretive framework (p. 803).

The Case Study

Borg and Gall note that for some time the case study approach was rejected by educational researchers who believed that its lack of research controls rendered it unscientific. With the increasing acceptance of qualitative methods such as the use of participant observers and ethnography, the case study is being revived (p. 488).
Case studies generally are concerned with why and how things happen. They deal with contemporary events versus pure historical research which deals with the past (Anderson, 1990, p. 158). Bell (1987) states that case studies principally concern "the interaction of factors and events" and attempt to identify the varied processes at work in a system or organization (p. 6). This study dealt with contemporary events and the interaction of factors with those events, readily qualifying it to be considered a case study.

McMillan and Schumacher (1984) equate ethnographic studies and case study designs, "meaning that the focus of the inquiry is one unit" (p. 321). Their view is that an institution, a process, a program, or even an organizational position may be considered a unit. Although they lend validity to the case study as research, the authors theorize that the findings of such a study cannot be generalized to other settings (p. 322).

Anderson (1990) states that choosing a case "implies a knowledge of some interesting issue or feature" (p. 159). An "interesting feature" of the Evangelism-Missiology program at The Criswell College is that studies in the program can lead to a Master of Missiology (M.Miss.) degree. A survey of the catalogs of more than 30 Protestant theological institutions in the United States and Canada appeared to confirm the uniqueness of the degree. Several of the
institutions offer a Master of Arts, Master of Divinity, or Master of Theology degree with a missions emphasis, but none except The Criswell College offers the Master of Missiology degree.

The Population

The nature of the study limited the population to be interviewed or surveyed. Because it specifically dealt with the Evangelism-Missiology program at The Criswell College, only faculty and graduates of that program were included in the population.

Faculty population included current full-time and adjunct faculty members, the vice-president for academic affairs and the academic dean. Two former faculty members, including the professor who designed the original curriculum and first taught in the program, and the former president, were also interviewed. No women serve as faculty in the program.

For the student population, the registrar at The Criswell College furnished a list of the 23 persons who have completed requirements to be graduated from the program during the period 1987 through 1992 along with their last known addresses and telephone numbers. Inquiry of the alumni affairs representative, faculty and students, and former students produced more recent information on several graduates.
Survey Instrument

To research the perceptions of Evangelism-Missiology Program graduates, a survey instrument (questionnaire) was adapted for use (Appendix A). The instrument was adapted from one being used by the Higher Education Department at the University of North Texas in a follow-up study of graduates of that department.

The questionnaire as a research tool has several advantages, chief among them being the low cost. Bell (1987) comments that certain types of information can be collected quickly and cheaply by its use, if the subjects are literate (p. 58). Use of a standardized written questionnaire also eliminates possible bias on the part of an interviewer, and it does not place pressure for an immediate response upon the recipient.

A frequently mentioned disadvantage of the questionnaire is that the response rate is usually lower than the personal or telephone interview. Kidder and Judd (1986), however, point to findings that response rates from a mail survey can reach respectable levels when surveying such groups as alumni of a particular college (p. 222). Cohen and Manion (1985) refute the "myths about postal questionnaires," claiming that response levels frequently equal, sometimes surpass, levels achieved by interviewing (p. 108).
The questionnaire used in this study (Appendix A) followed suggestions given in several research methods texts. Anderson (1990) recommends the five-point Likert scale as the most practical (p. 212). Leading questions (Bell, 1987, p. 62; Cohen and Manion, 1985, p. 105) were avoided. Questions were carefully grouped (Anderson, 1990, p. 214).

The letter of transmittal (Appendix B) mailed with the questionnaire was composed using guidelines from Borg and Gall (1983, pp. 427-431). Cohen and Manion (1985) recommend the use of a token incentive accompanying the initial mailing to invoke a sense of obligation in the recipient. A $2.00 bill was chosen as an incentive in the mailing for this study because it meets the Cohen and Manion criteria of being neutral as well as obviously being a token "rather than a payment for the respondent's effort" (pp. 112-113).

Interviews

Marcello's (1993) advice to "follow the paper trail first" was heeded. However, personal interviews with faculty members and former faculty of the college became the primary sources of information because of the paucity of written documentation on the development of the Evangelism-Missiology Program at The Criswell College.
Research literature extolling the advantages of the interview in historical and case study research abounds. Anderson (1990) defines the interview as "a specialized form of communication between people for a specific purpose associated with some agreed subject matter" (p. 222) and asserts that it probably is the method most often used by educational researchers to collect data.

Kidder and Judd (1986) note the ability of the interviewer to probe when responses are inadequate or vague as a distinct advantage (p. 225). Bell (1987) agrees, indicating that responses can be developed and clarified with the personal interview (p. 70).

McMillan and Schumacher (1984) express a note of caution on the use of probing. They believe this may sometimes lead to incomplete or inaccurate responses if the interviewer anticipates and cues the interviewee. They suggest allowing the respondent sufficient time to answer before probing. Even then, standardized probes for all interviews should be developed for use (p. 194).

The consensus of educational researchers is that open-ended questions (as opposed to the bipolar yes or no, the specific factual, or the multiple choice question [Anderson, 1990, p. 235]), can establish rapport between interviewer and interviewee, provide a greater wealth of information, and may produce unexpected or unanticipated information (Bell, 1987, p. 70; Cohen and Manion, 1985, p. 302).
The greatest disadvantage of the interview is the time involved. Marcello (1993) suggests brief pre-interview conferences of 10 to 15 minutes duration in addition to the interview itself which may consume from three quarters of an hour to one and one half hours.

Pitfalls of the personal interview are concerned mainly with the bias of the interviewer. Leading questions should be avoided. Furthermore, asking only those questions tending to support the interviewer's preconceived notions should be avoided. Other sources of error on the part of the interviewer can be his/her stereotyped expectations of what people will say and allowing one's own opinions to influence what is heard (Cohen and Manion, 1985, p. 302; Borg and Gall, 1983, p. 439; McMillan and Schumacher, 1984, p. 152).

Festinger and Katz (1953) note that bias may occur or develop on the side of the respondent as a result of stereotyped judgment. The authors indicate that the goals of the respondent also greatly influence the outcome of the interview process and should be taken into consideration when devising questions (pp. 336-339). McMillan and Schumacher (1984) advise asking if the respondent has any questions or concerns before beginning the specifics of the interview (p. 154).

For this study, outlines (Marcello, 1993) for the interviews lent some structure to the process (Appendix C).
Interview questions were consistent with the purposes of the study (Chapter I). They were developed carefully to avoid interviewer preconceived notions or bias and to avoid antagonism or distrust on the part of respondents. The questions alternated between closed and open to be complementary and to provide a smooth flow to the interview (Anderson, 1990, p. 235).

Outlines of the interviews were given to respondents at least a week before the actual interview, along with a release form to be signed. This release form gave permission by the interviewee for the interview to be taped and the information to be used for this study. Marcello (1993) provided a sample introduction to interviews which was adapted for use.

In addition to faculty interviews, five of the program graduates were interviewed. Selected for interview were three white males, an African-American male, and an Hispanic woman.
CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVANGELISM-MISSIOLOGY PROGRAM AT THE CRISWELL COLLEGE

Evangelism-Missiology Background

Not until the 19th century did the word "evangelism" become meaningful in the Christian vocabulary. The word itself is derived from the Greek term "evangelion," meaning "the gospel." Within "evangelion" is "evangel," meaning "good news." To the Christian, this good news is God's provision for reconciliation with himself through Jesus Christ (Taylor, 1964, p. 15).

J. I. Packer (1961) states that the New Testament definition of evangelism is quite simple: It is "just preaching the gospel, the evangel." He terms it "a work of communication in which Christians make themselves mouthpieces for God's message of mercy to sinners" (p. 41). Whether the message is delivered from a pulpit to many others or in a private conversation with one, that is evangelizing.

Biblical writers introduced the term in the New Testament but it was little used until 1850, Taylor (1964) notes, when a book with the term "evangelism" in the title was published. Taylor continues that, very gradually, Christian thinkers in almost every Protestant denomination
came to believe that not only the enlargement of the Christian church, but its very existence, depended upon evangelism (pp. 19-20).

One of the most well-known evangelists in the world is Billy Graham. In an address at the International Congress for Itinerant Evangelists in 1983, Graham stated that "Evangelism in its biblical sense is concerned with individuals and their relationship to God and also their relationship and responsibility to their fellowmen" (Douglas, 1984, p. 5). Graham's simplest definition is evangelism as "the proclamation of peace with God" (Douglas, p. 125).

The Old Testament records Jonah's call to take God's message to the people of Nineveh, probably in the 8th century, B.C.E. While foreign missions may have begun this early, the term "missiology" is of the 20th century. In his work Introduction to Missiology (1987), Tippett notes that some critics have objected to the term "missiology" because of its derivation being half Latin and half Greek. The English word "mission" came into use in a number of ways in the 16th and 17th centuries—-theological, ecclesiastical, and political. The common element was the act of sending forth with authority. Although the word itself is not biblical the concept is. Whether we see Christian mission as "in the world" (Jn.17:18) or "to the nations of the
world" (Mt. 28:19) both are sendings forth under the authority of Christ and thus the modern word "mission" would seem appropriate (p. xviv).

As late as the 1950s, some Christian denominations were still conducting missions programs in the "colonial" method. Attempts at evangelization in other cultures often consisted of planting a small westernized church with little cultural relevance. The formative years of present day missiology and its emphasis on cross-cultural training were the 1960s and early 1970s, with Fuller Theological Seminary's School of World Mission providing much of the impetus for the movement. The message remained the same but methods changed radically.

According to Guy (1993), Donald McGavran redirected missions through his teaching and writing. In the late 1940s, McGavran returned from India where he had worked as a missionary with the Disciples of Christ denomination. He had experienced there the limitation of influencing a culture by attempting to introduce Christianity through educational and medical means and so he began advocating other methods.

McGavran first began teaching at Northwest Christian College in Eugene, Oregon upon his return to the United States. In the 1950s he was asked to join the work at Fuller Theological Seminary developing their School of World
Mission. From this base, the new theories of missiology streamed.

The Fuller Theological Seminary Catalog (1991-1992) emphasizes the need for using and affirming positive aspects of the culture where missionaries work. Being torn from one's native matrix and expected to become "foreign" should not be a prerequisite to becoming a follower of Jesus Christ (p. 98). Interdisciplinary and cross-cultural studies have become a necessity for training missions workers.

In the struggle to validate missiology as a discipline in Western education, proponents continue self-examination, interacting with scholars from other disciplines and with one another. They are keenly aware that missiology can never be static, but must ever be adapting and changing to relate to a changing world. It is now seen as a discipline where theory must come from the mission field to the classroom and then back to the mission field to test its usefulness (Tippett, pp. xii-xxiv).

Baptists and Missions

Baptists have not always displayed missionary zeal. For more than a hundred years after John Smyth began the Baptist movement in England in 1609, it reflected the same lack of enthusiasm characterizing all the Protestant denominations that grew out of the Reformation. Some individuals and groups had begun to recognize a need to
evangelize beyond their own borders in the 1700s, but the experience of William Carey and his missions enterprise in India permanently placed its mark upon American Baptists (Crawley, 1985, pp. 28-29).

Carey and a handful of colleagues in the Particular Baptist denomination (one that held to the "predestinarian teachings of John Calvin . . . preaching a limited atonement" [Mead, 7th ed., 1980, p. 35]) formed the Society for Propagating the Gospel Among the Heathen. Carey's spiritual journey from hyper-Calvinist to zealous missionary is well-known in Baptist circles. What he began in England and India in the late 1700s and early 1800s became the pattern for American efforts of cooperation in missions work.

In 1814, the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions was organized, becoming known popularly as the Triennial Convention. Missions programs of the Triennial Convention were conducted following the society pattern, viz., persons interested in a particular purpose would form a society to sponsor that purpose, the method used by Carey and others.

When the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) was formed in 1845, it grew out of the Triennial Convention. The break came over the issue of slavery, but its central purpose of
propagating the gospel was the same. It chose, however, to use a different method.

In April, 1845, the Virginia Baptist Foreign Mission Society issued a call to Baptists of the South to hold a consultative meeting in May of that year. The meeting purposed to find the best ways of promoting the foreign mission cause and "other interests of the Baptist denomination in the South" (Baker, 1966, p. 110). Rather than follow the society program, the new convention chose to unite the autonomous, independent congregations into a single denomination with Boards of Managers to carry on the benevolent affairs (Baker, 1972, pp. 159-168).

The decision to form Boards did not immediately break patterns and habits of designating funds to particular causes, however. In 1925, more than 75 years after the denomination became a reality, the adoption of the present Cooperative Program systematized funding for the various causes of the denomination. Local congregations decide the dollar amount of their participation in the Cooperative Program. Those moneys are allocated to each cause or agency of the denomination by the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention on the basis of budgets submitted to it by the agencies (Baker, 1972, pp. 401-404).

As early as 1900, a department of missions began at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS) under Professor William Owen Carver. It was the "first such department in
any American theological seminary" (Crawley, 1985, p. 31). Carver's influence through his writing and teaching spread throughout the Convention. Other seminaries followed the lead of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in preparing graduates for more effective service in missions careers.

The curriculum of the Evangelism-Missiology Program at The Criswell College exemplifies the Southern Baptist Convention heritage of denominational interest in missions. It combines this with the modern scholarly, interdisciplinary approach to training its students for Christian missionary work throughout the world.

Evangelism/Missions Studies at Selected Institutions

The evangelism/missions programs at the following schools were cited for comparison with The Criswell College program because they are well-known among evangelical institutions. These schools share a similar philosophy of missions with that of The Criswell College, and are the most likely to have similar missions emphases.

The Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary in Mills Valley, California, 1990-1992 Catalog lists a Master of Divinity (M.Div.) degree with a major in missions (pp. 26-27). Twenty hours of the 96-hour degree program relate to missions.
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, offers a Master of Divinity with a concentration either in evangelism or missions and world religions. The 1991-1993 Catalog states requirements of 91 total hours for the degree with 16 to 20 hours in either concentration (pp. 25-31).

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth offers a specialized Master of Arts (M.A.) in Missiology. The 1991-1993 Catalog specifies that this "is an in service degree designed exclusively for missionary practitioners on furlough or leave of absence . . . " (p. 31). Prerequisites to entering this program are a baccalaureate with 12 or more hours in missiological studies and at least three years missionary service with a recognized mission agency (p. 36). The curriculum consists of 34 hours in missiology and evangelism courses.

The Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (SWBTS) Master of Divinity degree program includes a missions/evangelism concentration. This requires 16 hours specialization in the 92 hour program (p. 31).

Asbury Theological Seminary in Wilmore, Kentucky, offers a Master of Arts in World Missions and Evangelism. This degree has a requirement of 60 hours with 12 hours required in evangelism/missions courses (1990-1992 Catalog, p. 22).
Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan, lists a Master of Arts in Missions and Church Growth (1992-1994 Catalog, pp. 41-42). The degree program requires 88 total hours, 36 in evangelism/missions studies.

Capital Bible Seminary in Lanham, Maryland, offers a Master of Arts with a concentration in missions. This is a 90-hour program with 20 hours (including a six hour thesis) in the concentration (1991-1993 Catalog, pp. 42, 46, 49).

The School of World Mission of Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, lists a Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural Studies and a Master of Arts in Missiology. Of the 24 courses required for either of these majors, 12 courses must be in related subjects (1991-1992 Catalog, p. 100). Fuller also offers a Master of Theology (Th.M.) in Missiology. A Master of Divinity degree is a prerequisite, and the program requires 10 courses plus a thesis in missions (p. 101).

The Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, Mississippi, offers both the Master of Divinity and Master of Arts degrees with missions major. The Master of Divinity program is 105 hours with 20 hours in concentration (p. 20), and the Master of Arts is a 66-hour plan with 21 hours in missions study (p. 29).

The 1992-1993 Catalog of the Trinity Evangelical Divinity School lists a Master of Arts in Evangelism or in Missions (pp. 110-112). The 48 quarter hours required for a
degree include 26 quarter hours of evangelism/missions courses. The Master of Divinity Missions Emphasis degree calls for 25-26 hours of evangelism/missions courses toward the 110-111 hour requirement (pp. 97-98).

Westminster Theological Seminary offers a Master of Arts degree in Missiology. Eleven of the 36 required credit hours must be in missions courses (1992-1994 Catalog, pp. 52-56).

At the The Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, a Master of Divinity with a concentration in World Missions is available. The degree plan requires a total of 94 hours study with 12 hours in the concentration courses and another four hours in the concentration practicum (1991-1993 Catalog, pp. 48-49).


Purposes of The Criswell College

The Criswell College Catalogue (1992-1994) states its GENERAL OBJECTIVES as follows:

The student who completes one of the programs of study at The Criswell College should be equipped to serve the Lord Jesus Christ more effectively in the local church and in the wider work of His Kingdom as the Lord calls
him. In particular, he should be able:

1. To communicate the message of Jesus Christ, either on a personal level or to a group, inviting people to make a personal commitment to Him as their Lord and Saviour.

2. To give evidence of a deep concern for missionary work at home and abroad.

3. To give evidence of a degree of maturity in Christian life and expressing itself in commitment to Christ and His church.

4. To maintain habits of a disciplined study of the Bible.

5. To give sound reasons for holding the evangelical view of Scripture and of the gospel against the various other views (p. 7).

The development of The Program of Evangelism-Missiology Studies seems to be a natural outgrowth of the purpose and objectives of The Criswell College, especially as set out in Points 1 and 2 of the GENERAL OBJECTIVES. Although this formal program was not inaugurated until 1986, practical application of evangelism has long been required at the college.

In March 1975, two years after the school began offering day classes to train pastors, a program of Encounter Missions, a local practicum, was put in place (Jacobs, 1991, pp. 116-117). Missions trips abroad were
begun as early as 1981, led by Gerald Cowen, Professor of New Testament and Greek. Even though their teaching field was not evangelism or missiology, other professors joined in the trips on frequent occasions.

Encounter Missions is a supervised practicum with acceptable missions experiences ranging from street preaching to pastoring a church or mission, teaching weekly in a home or a nursing home, to jail ministry. This is a field education requirement of "all students who are enrolled in all the degree and diploma programs" (Catalogue, 1992-1994, p. 81). Attendance at weekly report meetings is also required.

When Criswell (1969) urged his congregation to approve the forming of a Bible institute, he spoke of it as an effective means of ministry for the church. He envisioned the involvement of all the people in an outreach ministry through this institute. His "dream picture" for the school has made remarkable progress in the years since. The school has become a world-wide means of evangelistic ministry through its graduates.

The Criswell College Catalogue (1992-1994) prefaces a description of the curriculum of the evangelism-missiology studies with these words:

The Criswell College exists to train people for the task of global evangelism. In keeping with this commitment, a B.A. degree in Evangelism and
Missiology is offered . . . Additionally, an Associate Degree in Missiology is offered (p. 27). A description of the Master of Missiology program states that the degree program is designed to meet the specific demands of a career in cross-cultural ministry . . . The graduate gains competency in the traditional theological subjects, but then applies them to the unique issues raised in cross-cultural missionary contexts (p. 61).

Patterson’s Influence

Leighton Paige Patterson’s interest in evangelism and missions stems from his early life. In personal interviews, he told Jacobs (1991) that his father, T. A. Patterson, and the church his father pastored during young Patterson’s formative years were the two greatest influences shaping him (p. 37).

Patterson (1993) also recounted the influence of an around the world preaching tour on which his parents took him when he was 16 years old. He stated that during that time he was directly involved in the saving of a number of female Korean babies who had been discarded in that country immediately following the Korean Conflict. That tour around the world focused my attention on missions and
gave me a global perspective from which I simply have never been able to extricate myself.

Patterson named Angel Martinez, an evangelist who had memorized the entire New Testament, as another great influence in his life. Both Martinez and Patterson's father demonstrated a dedication to evangelism and missions along with scholarship (Jacobs, 1991, p. 37). Another strong influence was Dr. Wayne Ward, professor of theology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, a distant cousin of Patterson's wife (Patterson, 1993).

When T. A. Patterson's health began to fail so that he was no longer able to continue in the missions education program, Paige Patterson looked elsewhere (Davis, 1993). During that time, Keith Eitel, a two-term missionary in Africa, came by to visit and to become acquainted with Patterson. "Tremendously impressed" (Patterson, 1993) by Eitel, Patterson named him to the faculty in 1985 as professor of missions

Patterson said it was Eitel's suggestion that the school look at a Master of Missiology degree. With his own interest in the area, it did not take Patterson long to agree. Because such degrees were "in short supply in any of the Convention schools," the men believed they could fill a need in the existing structure, and proceeded to develop the Evangelism-Missiology program (Patterson, 1993).
Eitel's Work

Keith Eitel had developed and established a Doctor of Theology program of studies at the Cameroon Baptist Theological Seminary in Africa. Under his administration the program received accreditation.

When Eitel came to The Criswell College, the school had only two two-hour required courses in missions, both taught by T. A. Patterson, and two two-hour required courses in evangelism. Eitel began his assignment by developing an expanded curriculum in the evangelism-missiology studies.

Although he had not trained specifically in the field of education, on his own Eitel had read and studied education theory. His goal was to assess the needs of the constituency and balance that with curriculum acceptable in the academic world. He had accomplished this in the seminary in Cameroon, and now sought to build an academically sound as well as practical program in Dallas.

A missiology studies program was not a new concept although it was offered in few institutions of higher education. Eitel himself holds a Doctor of Missiology (D.Miss.) degree from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, Illinois, one of the few institutions granting this degree.

For about 75 years, Roman Catholics granted a Doctor of Missiology degree at the Pontifical Institute in Rome (Eitel, 1992). The program blended strong academic research
with an applicative focus, a hybrid of the two emphases. Robert Schreiter (1993), professor at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, Illinois, said that the Gregorian University and the Urban College in Rome continue to offer a Doctor of Missiology degree. He is not aware of any Roman Catholic institution in the United States offering such a degree.

Eitel stated that The Candler School of Missions at Hartford Theological Seminary Foundation in Connecticut was the only institution in the United States offering missiology as an integrated discipline for a number of years. After that school closed in the sixties, Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California, began its School of World Mission and Institute of Church Growth offering master's degrees in the field. Since that time, a few other schools have added such a program (Eitel, 1992).

The Fuller Catalog (1991-1992) states that the Doctor of Missiology program was launched in 1970, and the Doctor of Philosophy program in missiology in 1976 (p. 122). Other institutions now offering Doctor of Missiology degrees include Asbury Theological Seminary, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and the United Theological Seminary.

The traditional program of missions studies usually is subsumed under some other department in the curriculum of most seminaries and graduate schools. Missions may fall under the rubric of church history with an emphasis on the
historical perspective of the development of missions. It also may appear in the philosophy of religion category with an apologetic study of missions (Eitel, 1992).

The American Society of Missiology was formed in 1973 to promote the study of missiology as a discipline. Its membership is ecumenical, with conciliar Protestants, Roman Catholics, and evangelical Christians represented among its more than 700 members. George Hunsberger (1993), secretary/treasurer of the society, stated that members of the Board reflect the broad inclusiveness of the association as a whole. Some institutions hold membership but the society is comprised "overwhelmingly" (Schreiter, 1993) of individuals. Schreiter is a past president of the group.

In June 1985, the American Society of Missiology endorsed the Doctor of Missiology degree. Together with the Association of Theological Schools, they have published a description of a Doctor of Missiology degree along with guidelines (Appendix D) for evaluation. Their premise is that the Doctor of Missiology degree should be equated to the Doctor of Philosophy or the Doctor of Theology degree in the same way that a Doctor of Education degree is related to a Doctor of Philosophy degree in education. The Doctor of Missiology degree is a research degree combined with application, rendering it both theoretical and practical (Eitel, 1992).
According to Eitel, the description provided by the American Society of Missiology and the Association of Theological Schools pull(ed) Missiology up as a separate discipline, an integrated discipline, one that would require an integration with biblical studies, theological studies, historical studies, as well as anthropological and social studies, and blend it into a multi-disciplinary discipline, an integrated discipline. Well, that genre, or that model, is in microcosm what we were trying to create here. Not on the doctoral level, obviously (Eitel, 1992).

On May 8, 1986, Richard Land, then vice president for academic affairs, gave to the Criswell College Board of Trustees the 1986-1987 catalog (CCBS Trustee Minutes, p. 2). In it was listed the new program: A Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree in Biblical Studies with an Evangelism-Missiology major. An Associate of Arts (A.A.) degree in the program was begun in the 1988-1989 year.

In May, 1989, Patterson petitioned the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) for authorization to initiate two master's degree programs, the Master of Divinity and the Master of Missiology. On June 1, 1989, James T. Rogers of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools replied that the college was granted authorization to offer these degrees with the proviso that they be
reviewed as a part of your Self-Study for reaffirmation of accreditation and ... be considered by your reaffirmation visiting committee in March, 1990 (Appendix E).

The Master of Missiology (M.Miss.) degree program was given final approval in 1989 and introduced in the 1990-1992 Catalogue.

Eitel indicated that a Master of Arts degree in missions is available at other schools, but The Criswell College is the only school in the United States offering the Master of Missiology degree. Information from Paul Hiebert (1993), Chair of the Missions Department of the Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, was obtained by telephone. To his knowledge, there is not another school offering the Master of Missiology degree. Justice Anderson (1993), Chair of the Missions Department of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, concurred. Karen Klug (1993), Admissions Counselor at the Fuller Theological Seminary, said they do not have a Master of Missiology degree. She said they offer a Master of Arts in Intercultural Studies which would be the equivalent. Kathy Hepfer (1993), Assistant Director for Accreditation at the Association of Theological Schools, stated that the schools which they accredit offer a Master of Arts in Missions or a Master of Arts in Missiology, but not a Master of Missiology.
Most of the seminaries and graduate schools offering either the Master of Divinity or the Master of Arts degree with a missions or evangelism emphasis require 16 to 20 hours in evangelism-missions studies. By contrast, the Master of Missiology degree program requires 36 hours in evangelism-missions courses, 40 percent of the total required hours.

The program offered at The Criswell College has been well received by the Foreign Mission Board (FMB) of the Southern Baptist Convention. In past years, a requirement for candidacy with the Foreign Mission Board has been education at a Southern Baptist affiliated seminary which The Criswell College and Graduate School is not.

Atkinson (1993), of the Personnel Selection Department of the Foreign Mission Board, stated that several years ago the Board dropped the requirement of education at a Southern Baptist sponsored seminary for career missionaries. Degreed applicants from The Criswell College are given the same consideration as applicants from Southern Baptist Convention schools.

Eitel (1992) stated that when the plans for The Criswell College Master of Missiology program were completed, they were submitted to the Foreign Mission Board. The Board replied with a lengthy statement (Appendix F) not only saying they would consider this the equivalent of a
Master of Divinity for appointment purposes, but also extolling the creativity of the program.

The Home Mission Board (HMB) of the Southern Baptist Convention also welcomes graduates of The Criswell College for appointment, according to Holloway (1993), of the Missionary Personnel Section of the Board. He furnished an excerpt from the personnel manual given to all missionaries, detailing educational requirements (Appendix G).

When asked about foreign missions emphasis versus that of home missions in the graduate program, Eitel (1992) replied that home missions is not excluded. He said that home missions received greater emphasis in the evangelism track of the undergraduate program than in the master's program of missiology.
Faculty of the Program

In March, 1990, The Criswell College submitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) a self-evaluation for accreditation reaffirmation. The study asserts that the professors "comprise a very capable group" (Criswell College, 1990, p. IV-36). Twenty-four professors were on staff at that date, 21 with earned doctorates and three with master's degrees and/or pursuing doctoral degrees. The report also states that the professors were "relationship-oriented," as well as academically and intellectually capable, with an open-door policy for students.

When the Bachelor of Arts degree in Biblical Studies/Evangelism-Missiology Major was first offered, three faculty members taught evangelism and missions courses of the program. The 1986-1987 Catalogue listed them as:

Keith Eitel, Professor of Missiology
B.A., Dallas Baptist University
M.A., Baylor University
D.Miss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Postdoctoral study at North Texas State University
T. A. Patterson, Chaplain, Professor of Missiology
B.A., Hardin-Simmons University
B.D., Th.D., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
R. Alan Streeter, Professor of New Testament and Evangelism
B.A. University of Baltimore
M.Div., Wesley Theological Seminary
Ph.D., California Graduate School of Theology (pp. 14-18). The same were listed as faculty members in the 1987-1988 Catalogue (pp. 14-18).

The 1988-1990 Catalogue used a single page to list the faculty of "The Department of Missiology and Evangelism."
Keith Eitel was Department Chairman and Professor of Missiology, Paige Patterson was President and Professor of Theology and Evangelism, and T. A. Patterson was Professor Emeritus, Evangelism and Missions. Paige Patterson's academic credentials are as follows:

B.A. Hardin-Simmons University 1965
Th.M. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary 1968
Th.D. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary 1973

Additional biographical information was supplied on each man, including this on Eitel:

Dr. Eitel served several pastorates in Texas and then went as a missionary professor and church-planter in Cameroon, West Africa. Currently, he is enrolled in the Ph.D. program at the University of North Texas. He has written articles on missiological topics and is author of *Transforming Culture: Developing a Biblical Ethic in An African Context*. 
The description of Paige Patterson included the statement that he has written at least ten books and several articles for various journals and was the managing editor of the *Criswell Study Bible*. He served pastorates in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas prior to his appointment as president.

T. A. Patterson was said to be a "recognized resource person on international evangelism and missions concerns" (1988-1990 *Catalogue*, p. 69). Patterson died in January, 1990.

Changes in the 1990-1992 *Catalogue* listed Eitel as Dean of Undergraduate Studies (p. 24) in addition to his duties as Professor of Missiology. Also added to his list of academic credits was the Ph.D. (Cand.) Faculté' de Théologie' Protestante de Yaoundé' (p. 86). In the late 1980s, Eitel was enrolled at the University of North Texas doctoral program in the Department of History, but had discontinued those studies at the time the 1990-1992 *Catalogue* was published.

Added to the roster was John Moldovan, Professor of Evangelism. His educational credits follow:

- B.S. Polytechnic Institute Tarin Vuia (Romania), 1972
- M.Div. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987
- Ph.D. (Cand.) Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (p. 87).
Of Moldovan, Patterson (1993) stated that he "was a Romanian pastor who had experienced persecution, imprisonment, and torture." In an interview, Moldovan (1993) said that he had previously taught in the electro-engineering area in Romania, and was a teaching fellow in evangelism at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas.

Adjunct faculty members listed on Pages 89 and 90 of the 1990-1992 Catalogue were:

John Paul Avant, Jr., Adjunct Professor of Evangelism. He held a B. A. from Baylor University, an M. Div. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and was a Ph.D.(Cand.) at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Another faculty member was Chester S. Cadwallader, Jr., Adjunct Professor of Missions, with a B. A. from Baylor University, a Th.M. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, a Th.M. from New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, and the Th.D. from Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary. Cadwallader, a retired missionary, served in El Salvador and Guatemala for about 30 years. He founded and taught at a Bible institute in Guatemala, began an extension program for theological education in El Salvador, and was a professor of missions at Mid-America Seminary in Memphis, Tennessee, for seven years.

A third member of the adjunct faculty was R. Cal Guy, teaching missions. He held a B.A. from Union University, a
Th.M. and Th.D. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and a Doctor of Divinity degree awarded by Union University. Guy taught at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary for 36 years, 34 of those years teaching missions. Cadwallader (1993) said that Guy is recognized as the senior professor in Southern Baptist life as a teacher of missions and of having knowledge of missions both home and abroad.

Jay Strack, fourth member of the adjunct faculty, was Professor of Evangelism. He held a B.A. from Baptist College at Charleston, and M. Div. and Doctor of Ministry (D.Min.) degrees from Luther Rice Seminary.

C. Sumner Wemp was listed as Adjunct Professor of Evangelism. He held a B.A. from Samford University, a Th.M. from Dallas Theological Seminary, and a D.Min. from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

The 1992-1994 Catalogue listed John Moldovan as the only full-time faculty member in the program (pp. 74-76). Adjunct faculty members included Avant, Cadwallader, Guy, and Douglas W. Munton, Professor of Evangelism, holding a B.A. from Wheaton College, an M.Div. and a Ph.D. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Strack and Wemp were not listed (pp. 77-78).

After the catalog was printed, James Sibley, a career missionary with the Foreign Mission Board, was added to the adjunct faculty. On furlough from work in Israel, he taught two missions courses during the Spring, 1993 semester. He
held a B.A. from Baylor University, the M.Div. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, a Master of Sacred Theology (STM) from Dallas Theological Seminary, and had done additional study at the Institute of Holy Land Studies, Jerusalem, Israel. Another change from the printed catalog was that Avant was no longer a member of the adjunct faculty.

Glenn Wittig was added to the faculty as librarian after the catalog was printed. He held a B.A. from Tennessee Temple College, an M.L.S. from Rutgers University, and a Ph.D. in Library Science from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. He has worked in theological libraries at Baylor University, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Princeton Seminary, and Columbia Theological Seminary at Decatur, Georgia. He taught library science at Western Michigan University and at the University of Southern Mississippi for a total of 12 years.

The 1992-1994 Catalogue listed a total of 14 full-time faculty members. With the exception of the Professor of Counseling and English (who held a Master of Education) and two professors who were Doctor of Philosophy candidates, all of the full-time faculty held Doctor of Education, Doctor of Philosophy, or Doctor of Theology degrees from accredited institutions.
Students in the Program

The office of the registrar at The Criswell College furnished information on numbers of students enrolled in the Evangelism-Missiology Program from the years 1986-1987 through 1992-1993 (Appendix H). For the years pertinent to this study (1986-1987 through 1991-1992), the largest enrollment occurred during the Spring 1991 semester when 73 students were enrolled. At that time, three were enrolled in the Associate degree program, 56 in the baccalaureate degree program, and 14 in the master of missiology degree program.

Graduates of the Program

The office of the registrar at The Criswell College listed graduates of the program from 1987 through spring 1992 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.A. in Missiology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Evangelism-Missiology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Evangelism</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Missiology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Miss.(Tech.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

CURRICULA AND DEGREE PROGRAMS OF EVANGELISM-MISSIOLOGY STUDIES

Curriculum for an Associate Degree

The student seeking an Associate of Arts (A.A.) degree at The Criswell College chooses either the Biblical Studies or the Missiology program. The 1992-1994 Catalogue states that the Biblical Studies course is often pursued by lay persons and student wives and may be seen as an advantageous background to lay a "biblical foundation for their total education" (p. 24). It is intended primarily for the person desiring that foundation but not necessarily preparing for the pastorate. The two-year program leading to the Associate of Arts in Missiology is "designed specifically to meet the minimal requirements for full appointment with certain mission agencies" (p. 27).

Davis (1993) said that the Associate of Arts program was begun primarily to equip wives of Criswell and other college or seminary students who planned to apply to missions agencies which required the two-year college-level studies. He said that many wives were enrolled in a similar two-year program at the Dallas Bible College, and, upon the
demise of that institution in 1985 (Ratledge, 1993), The Criswell College designed the Associate of Arts program to accommodate those students. In essence, said Davis, "We packaged the program with existing courses we were offering and put together a two-year program as an A.A." (degree plan).

Since its introduction in the 1988-1990 catalog, the program curriculum has remained the same. The 18 hours of General Education Studies combine six hours each of English, Psychology, and Greek. The 30 hours of Biblical Studies include nine hours each of Old and New Testament Exposition courses for a total of 18 hours, and 12 hours of Theological Studies comprised of three hours of history and nine hours of systematic theology.

A Professional Studies core of 15 hours completes the 63 hour program. These courses are

EMS 101 Personal Evangelism
EMS 201 Philosophy and History of Missions
EMS 301 Church Planting
EMS 405 Biblical Missiology
EMS 407 Missionary Anthropology

Encounter Missions, the non-credit field education practicum, is required of associate program students also.
Curriculum for a Baccalaureate Degree

As introduced in the 1986-1987 catalog, the Bachelor of Arts in Evangelism-Missiology program required 128 hours. The General Education Studies requirement of 56 hours included 16 hours in Greek and Hebrew, and other courses ranging from Advanced English Grammar to Natural Science to Introduction to Philosophy to Dynamics of Marriage and Family.

The balance of 62 hours came from 28 hours of Biblical Studies which included nine hours of systematic theology, 12 hours of Professional Studies including six hours of homiletics, and 32 hours in Evangelism-Missiology studies. The latter 32 hour core was comprised of 22 hours of evangelism-missions courses, plus another 10 hours specializing in either evangelism or missions (pp. 75-76). The Evangelism-Missiology core required courses were:

PT 101.2 Personal Evangelism
PT 102.2 Church Evangelism
THS 407.2 Introduction to Missiology
THS 406.2 History of Missions
PT 316.2 Theology of Evangelism
THS 442.4 Religious Belief Systems
THS 444.4 Church Planting
THS 423.4 Theology of the Cults

The 1987-1988 catalog carried identical requirements (pp. 75-76).
At the time of the Bachelor of Arts program inception, R. Alan Streett was Professor of New Testament and Evangelism. He held degrees from the University of Baltimore, Wesley Theological Seminary, and a Ph.D. from the California Graduate School of Theology. According to Davis (1993), Streett developed the Evangelism Track and taught most of those courses, with Eitel developing and teaching courses in the Missiology Track. Streett left the faculty in 1988.

Changes in the 1988-1990 Catalogue were abundant, many of them brought about by the college's move from the two and four hour course credit system to a system based upon three hour courses, compatible with most other baccalaureate programs. The change enabled students to transfer in or out of The Criswell College with a more universal transcript (Klein, 1993). Total hours increased by only one, from 128 to 129. The degree plan was presented on one page, with a break-out of evangelism or missiology track courses differentiating the two majors (p. 44).

The General Education Studies section was reduced to 48 hours with only 12 hours of language requirement, the result of the course hour change. Course content remained the same. Biblical Studies hours increased to 36: Two Preparatory Studies (4 Hours) courses were eliminated and Bible Exposition (8 Hours) increased under Biblical Exposition (21 Hours). Theological and Historical Studies
(16 Hours) changed to 15 hours with no essential changes in subject matter, only a change in hours per course. A three-hour elective course was added.

In the older catalog, a difference was made between Professional Studies (12 Hours) and the Evangelism-Missiology Courses (32 hours). In the 1988-1990 and subsequent catalogs, Professional Studies (42 Hours) included Pastoral Studies and all of the Evangelism-Missiology courses (33 hours).

Descriptive course numbers and some course names also changed. Introduction to Missiology and History of Missions, two courses in previous catalogs, were blended into one course entitled Philosophy and History of Missions. A course titled Current Issues in Evangelism was added.

The 1990-1992 (pp. 46-48) and 1992-1994 (pp. 38-40) Catalogue course descriptions were identical to those of 1988-1990. The degree plans for the evangelism and missiology tracks were formatted differently, however, with each major featured on a single page.

Learning objectives have remained the same since the inception of the baccalaureate program, with only minor refining of the wording. The 1992-1994 Catalogue lists these:

Evangelism Track Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the Evangelism Track, the students should be able to:
1. Understand the role of the vocational evangelist in relation to the local church and its pastor.

2. Have a clear understanding of the nature and theology of evangelism.

3. Have acquired the necessary skills and knowledge to present the Gospel to the lost clearly and persuasively.

4. Teach and equip others for effective evangelism.

5. Demonstrate his prowess in preaching powerful evangelistic sermons and issue God-honoring invitations.

6. Possess the tools and knowledge to organize and conduct local church and area-wide evangelistic crusades.

7. Develop strategies for church planting.

8. Demonstrate a working knowledge of the major cults for the purpose of developing evangelistic approaches to them.

Missiology Track Learning Objectives

Upon completion of the Missiology Track, the student should be able to:

1. Identify and define the major facets of missiology as a discipline.

2. Demonstrate a knowledge of the interdependence of biblical, theological, historical and missiological studies.
3. Demonstrate a working knowledge of major religious belief systems.

4. Utilize cultural anthropology to benefit cross-cultural evangelism and ministry.

5. Develop strategies for church planting.

6. Analyze current trends and issues in global missions for continuing effectiveness (p. 27).

Curriculum for the Master of Missiology

The 1990-1992 Catalogue introduced the 90 hour Master of Missiology Program (p. 71), with this description: A three year graduate degree program designed to meet the specific demands of a career in cross-cultural ministry. The catalog further stated that a graduate of the program should be able to function with a high level of professional competency in a home or foreign mission setting; serve in a cross-cultural ministry or as a church planter; teach missiology on a secondary or undergraduate level; assume an entry-level role within missions administration; or enter a doctoral level program in missiology. Program objectives and courses remained the same in the 1992-1994 Catalogue.

Three specializations are offered in the missiology degree: Advanced Standing, Technology (Tech.), or Linguistics. A student in the Technology specialty combines
studies in other fields such as aviation, engineering, or medicine as part of the learning experience. The Linguistics specialty accommodates persons interested in Bible translation, literacy development, or teaching English as a second language, and is offered in conjunction with the Summer Institute of Linguistics at Dallas, Texas.

According to Klein (1993), all Criswell College graduates holding baccalaureate degrees who enter the program are placed in one of the specializations of the program, otherwise they would be repeating some of their baccalaureate work. Students without such a strong biblical studies background enter the basic Master of Missiology program. A baccalaureate graduate of another institution, and without theological preparation, can enter the Master of Missiology (Tech.) program with some modifications.

Master of Missiology and Master of Missiology (Advanced) courses differ in the language, biblical studies, and theological studies requirements. The Master of Missiology curriculum requires nine hours of Hebrew and nine hours of Greek. The Advanced Standing program presupposes Hebrew I and II and Greek I and II and requires only three hours each of Intermediate Hebrew and Greek. The additional 12 hours of language studies in the Advanced Standing requires "12 semester hours of an essential field language, linguistics, language acquisition courses, or any combination of the above" (1992-1994 Catalogue, p. 64).
For the Master of Missiology curriculum, Old Testament I and II and Hebrew Exegesis, and New Testament Introduction I and II and Greek Exegesis are required. In the Master of Missiology (Advanced Standing) curriculum, Old Testament Theology, Criticism, and Hebrew Exegesis, and New Testament Criticism, Theology, and Greek Exegesis comprise the 18 hours required biblical studies.

Theological Studies in the Master of Missiology are Philosophy of Religion, Systematic Theology I, II, and III, Church History, and Baptist History and Distinctives (18 hours). For the Master of Missiology (Advanced Standing), Philosophy of Religion, Contemporary Theology, Contemporary Ethical Issues, Biblical and Historical Christology, and Reformation are the Theological Studies core courses (15 hours). Advanced Standing students then may take one three hour elective.

Missiological Studies in the required core for the Master of Missiology and Master of Missiology (Advanced Standing) comprise 36 hours and are identical. They are

- EMS 502 Theology and Practice of Church Growth
- EMS 504 Magic, Demonism, and Witchcraft
- EMS 505 Cross-Cultural Communication
- EMS 601 Studies in Contextualization Theory
- EMS 701 History of the Modern Missions Era, 1792-2001
- EMS 703 Contemporary Third-World Theologies
- EMS 704 Ecumenism and Global Evangelism
EMS 705 Cross-Cultural Teaching and Learning
EMS 706 Strategies for Global Evangelization
EMS 707 World Religions - Islam
Religions of Asia
Traditional Folk Religions
EMS 708 Senior Regional Seminar -- Asia, Africa, Latin America

The Master of Missiology (Tech.) curriculum requires only 21 hours of Missiological Studies, dropping EMS 502, 601, 704, 707, 709. Language Studies are limited to nine hours (all in Greek). A combination of six hours each of Old and New Testament introductory courses make up the Biblical Studies core of 12 hours. Nine hours of Systematic Theology are required. The additional 45 hours to complete the 90 hour program are in Technological Studies offered in conjunction with other institutions (p. 66).

The influence of the Association of Theological Schools-American Society of Missiology guidelines (Appendix D) for the Doctor of Missiology degree is evidenced in the missiological studies requirements for the Master of Missiology degree at the college. Inclusion of 15-18 hours of theological studies, 9-18 hours language studies, and the 36 hours of social-science cross-cultural and contextual
studies concentration echoes concerns of the Program Content and Duration of the guidelines.

**Practicum**

In addition to the required Encounter Missions program of practical application, missions trips out of the Dallas, Texas, area were taken by students and faculty every year on a voluntary basis. Students provided at least a portion of their trip expenses and no course credit was given. The trips began as early as the Fall 1980 semester.

Cowen (1993) reported the following trips for the academic years with which this study was concerned, 1986-1987 through 1991-1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil-Amazon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Data From Graduates

One of the purposes of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Evangelism-Missiology program at The Criswell College as perceived by its graduates. A questionnaire (Appendix A) was mailed to the 23 graduates of the program.

Four of the graduates did not return the questionnaires. One was in Brazil, one in Italy, one in Florida, and one in Dallas, Texas. None of the packets mailed to these four was returned even though "Address Correction Requested" was on all envelopes. The telephone company in Hawthorne, Florida, last known address of one graduate, did not have a listing by his name. The graduate with a Dallas address did not return messages left on an answering machine at his last known telephone number.

Five of the graduates were interviewed. Three were white males, one was an African-American male, and one was an Hispanic woman.

Data in the following tables were extracted from the returned questionnaires. Information concerning Purpose No. 3 (p. 3) of the study, or to answer Questions for Study (pp. 3-4) is displayed.
Table 1 answers Question for Study No. 9: "Where are the graduates now?"

Table 1

Program Graduates Classified by Current Countries of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-seven percent of the graduates listed their present occupation as student (Table 2), probably accounting for the high percentage of those still in the United States.
Table 2 describes the current work setting, answering Question for Study No. 10: "Are the graduates pursuing evangelism-missions vocationally?"

Table 2

**Current Work Setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivocational Pastor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Education and Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Evangelist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Missionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Lay Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivocational Missionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Biblical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivocational Youth Minister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Missions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 23

Some respondents checked more than one category.
Figures in Table 2 show 73% of the graduates pursuing evangelism-missions vocationally or bivocationally.

Several items on the questionnaire provided information to answer Question for Study No. 11: "How is the effectiveness of the program perceived by its graduates?" Tables 3 through 6 provide data to answer the question.

Table 3
Would Select Another Major Given Opportunity To Repeat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-nine percent of the graduates would select the same major. The three respondents indicating they would choose another major specified what that would be:

"Probably some technical degree, then seminary"

"Bible Exposition"
"I would have gotten a business degree or another secular degree. A lot of what I am currently receiving at seminary is somewhat a repeat of what I received (at) Criswell."

Table 4

Feel That Degree Program Did Not Adequately Prepare For Present or Anticipated Professional Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents believe that the program prepared them adequately for their professional duties. The three who dissented named the following areas in which they believe they lack preparation:

"General counseling"

"The whole minister of education ministry"

"Ministering from the African-American cultural perspective."
Table 5

How Well Program Prepared Student
For Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactorily prepared</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequately prepared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the respondents believe they were inadequately prepared. Comments shown as part of Table 4 indicate some additional preparation would be helpful, but all of the respondents believe the program prepared them at least satisfactorily for their present occupation. Table 6 and Appendix I relate to specific areas of competency gain for professional preparation.
Table 6

**Professional Competency Gain in Selected Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Evangelism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Evangelism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology of Evangelism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Issues in Evangelism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelistic Preaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Evangelism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Missions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/Cult Belief Systems</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Missiology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology and Missions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Anthropology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Issues in Missiology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Planting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivocational Ministry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix I shows the number of respondents checking each value.
Question for Study No. 13 asked: "What are the strengths of the program?" Several items on the questionnaire were used to discover this and the data are displayed in Tables 7 through 13.

Table 7

Would Choose The Criswell College If Beginning Program Again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the students would choose to attend the college again and those who would not gave the following reasons:

"I would get a B.A. in another career then go to a traditional seminary because that is the way the system is and the system is not fair to those who do it the C.C. (sic) way."

"A secular college to get a secular degree."
"The college has recently changed. Missions is not as strong a program."

(Would choose) "Wheaton College. Have lost key professors."

The graduate checking "Not Sure" said:

"The faculty has almost totally changed since I attended."

The quality of education that graduates perceive they receive at The Criswell College may be a reason the majority would choose to return there for education. Three of the respondents hold two degrees from the institution, and another three are working on a second degree from the college.

Another strength of the school as perceived by graduates is the availability of the faculty for interaction outside the classroom. Tables 8 through 13 continue showing responses of graduates to questionnaire items that relate to areas of strength and to the degree of satisfaction of the respondents with overall aspects of the program.
### Table 8

**Opinion of Quality of Education Experienced in Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

**On Basis of Quality Education, Would Recommend Program at Criswell College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Believe There Was Sufficient Student-Faculty Interaction Outside the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the respondents who checked "Yes," also made the following suggestion:

"Have brown bags lunch dialogues."

The suggestion for facilitating student-faculty interaction by one of the "No" respondents was:

"More openness in attitude; some professors were a little 'snobbish,' but some are still my friends today."

A second "No" respondent said:

"My fault. I worked two jobs and raised a family. No time."
Table 11

Satisfaction with Elements of Program

1 = Excellent
2 = Satisfactory
3 = Adequate
4 = Unsatisfactory
5 = No Opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Instruction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications of Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Course Offerings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Social Contact</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Social Contact</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Financial Aid</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Offering of</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix J shows the number of respondents checking each value.
Table 12

**Evaluation of Various Aspects of Program**

1 = Of Great Value  
2 = Of Some Value  
3 = Of Little Value  
4 = Not Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Readings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with Professors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with Fellow Students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix K shows the number of respondents checking each value.
Item No. 29 on the questionnaire asked the following question: "What is your opinion concerning the following aspects of the Evangelism/Missiology Program at Criswell College? (Please circle the number of your choice.)" 

Table 13

Opinion on Various Requirements of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Satisfactory As Is</th>
<th>Should Increase</th>
<th>Should Relax Requirement</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Course work overall</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Admission requirements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Applied experiences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Requirements in major field</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Requirements in minor field</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Difficulty of written exams</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Necessity of oral exam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Hebrew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every course in the degree program was listed at least once as being one of the "Most Valuable Courses." A strength of the program is that the graduates did not believe any of the courses are extraneous, and their comments amplify the reasons they believe the courses are valuable.

Only courses named by at least three respondents are shown in Table 14, and Table 15 lists comments about all courses named.

Table 14
Most Valuable Courses in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Missiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Planting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelistic Preaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Evangelism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Theology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology of Missions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Unedited Comments on Why Courses In Program Were Valuable

"Relevant--thorough--great teachers--provided solid foundation for Christian world-view and practice."

"Helped give me a better understanding of the need to know the culture of a society in order to reach them."

"They taught me the fundamentals of the faith and emphasized God's heart to save a lost and dying world."

"They gave me a wide range of understanding from biblical languages to practical ministry involvement."

"They were helpful to us so we could learn to be more sensitive with others while sharing our faith in Jesus."

"This course (Church Planting) demonstrated and forced the student to think and use the subjects of the other courses of the program. (Pulled all the classes together and focused them)."

"They helped me to understand what I believe to be the truth and why I believe it in light of so many options and in the face of so much opposition from our relativistic milieu."

"Delt (sic) with theology. I think that is most important."

"It (Biblical Missiology) gave a biblical prospective (sic) of what the early church was and why it was successful and
Table 15 Continued

how we should pattern our missions emphasis. I(sic) gave the non-traditional (today) view and causes us to get back to basics and then factor in our new technologies."

"1) Establish proper foundation for mission
2) Provided analytical skills necessary for missions work"

"They were filled with practical knowledge."

"They laid a grounded, well-established foundation upon which I can build my missiological future."

"Great theological depth. Challenged (sic) me to think. Opened my horizons of God's eternal plan for my life in missions work. Very practical."

"Lay the foundation and understanding for missions."

"I'm using information gained there on the field today."

"They prompted me to think for myself."


Not all of the graduates perceived all of the courses valuable. The following table lists these:

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Valuable Courses and Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses and Unedited Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Advanced Grammar. Not that necessary in performing my duties as a missionary."

"Baptist History. Inability of the instructor to transmit the importance."

"Computer Science. Class was not practical. Class was intended to be intro. (sic) level; but it was to (sic) advanced for beginner student."

"We did not have good computers at the time I took it (Computer Science)."

"Church Administration, Local Church Ministries, Intro. (sic) to New Testament. I think the blame here can be laid at the feet of the professors--one was incompetent to teach the subject I felt."
Table 16 Continued

"Cultural Milieu. Professor was so antagonistic toward Calvinists & (sic) subjects basically covered in missions class."

"History of the Baptists, Church Administration. They were very dry courses and did not pertain to me."

"Maybe Missionary Anthropology and History of Mission. The professor was not well prepared."

"Missionary Anthropology. Lacked a biblical anthropology."

"Int. (sic) of Script. (sic), Local Ch. (sic) Min. (sic), Homoletics (sic), Ch. (sic) Planting, Ch. (sic) Evang. (sic). Out-dated--irrelevant material."

"Church Administration and Pastoral Care because the material was not relevant."

| Total number of respondents | 11 |
Questionnaire Item No. 25 allowed respondents to choose from 19 suggestions, or to list any other choice, of courses not included in The Criswell College curriculum. Nineteen different subjects were cited. Table 17 displays those marked by three or more of the respondents.

Table 17

Courses Not Available but Desirable for Career Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject</th>
<th>N Desiring Course</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Task Areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Methods/Techniques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Organization Theory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Writing/Publishing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Criswell College library appears to be deficient according to respondents. Item No. 24 on the questionnaire gave the following instructions: "Evaluate the adequacy of The Criswell College library as it pertained to your studies. (Check the number that corresponds to your choice.)"

Table 18
Evaluation of The Criswell College Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Book Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Periodicals, journals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Special materials, films, microfilms, special collections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Research materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Library services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staff assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (please specify below) Interlibrary Loan Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table represent the number of respondents checking each value.

One respondent did not evaluate the library, stating: "I opted to use the DTS (Dallas Theological Seminary) library since it was so convenient."
Table 19

Unedited Additional Comments

"As stated, the faculty has almost totally changed since I finished my work @ (sic) Criswell. I received an outstanding education under the men I had for profs (sic). I'm not sure that the quality of education is on the same level today."

"I think you should take into account, if you have not already, that the mainstay of the missiology tract (sic) program was Dr. Keith Eitel. He taught the Lion's share of the courses in that tract (sic). He is gone now (to Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary). I had many classes with him and he was always more than competent. He was always well prepared and innovative. His requirements were tough. These opinions have also been confirmed by many other students in the missiology tract (sic).

"I think any assessment of this program during the years you are investigating should--to be fair--include consideration of the work of this man."

"The program of study that I was in was an excellent program. Some weaknesses (OT,NT) were corrected.

"I have problems with recommending the current programs at Criswell. After the change in the president, deans, & (sic) problems, I feel that the missiology program has/and will suffer greatly. I do not believe that Criswell is offering
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a quality mission study at this point. . .I am not pursuing (sic) further studies at Criswell because of Administrative/Professor (sic) changes."

"Because of my age, I began studying at Criswell originally to learn about sermon preparation and to get a deeper study of some of the books of the Bible.

"As I became more and more involved in the missionary work, I felt God’s call to go into areas where there are no missionaries. I have been blessed to preach on 4 continents. Last year I made 10 trips into El Salvador. The greatest commitment of Criswell College is their commitment of the professors to go into the missionary fields--all professors do this unless they have summer classes. I cannot say enough about the thorough training I received and I still actively go with them even though I have graduated--at age 63."

"Having left Criswell this past summer and having now taken my first full-time pastorate, I feel that what I gained from the classroom, chapels, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Eitel and other professors is a healthy and dynamic love and devotion for the Savior. I feel that I have more than an education--I have a much better relationship with my Lord from all that I experienced at Criswell. I will forever be grateful to God for sending me to Criswell."
"My overall experience at Criswell was a very good one. I came to the college with little to no knowledge of the Bible or related issues. As a high school drop out with a GED school was a challenge. Many of my friends along the way dropped out. Though I was tempted to do the same the professors and administration encouraged me to stay. While I still have much to learn my education at Criswell gave me a solid foundation on which to build. I know I will continue to draw on the experience (sic) and the acquired (sic) knowledge of my education at the Criswell College."

"With the recent changes in Professors at Criswell I am wishing them the best and supporting them with some of my volunteer time, although the College and the Missions department is not staffed with as excellent servants of God in these fields. But I am sure that the programs and College will rebound in time, at least this is my prayer."

"If I work toward a masters, it would be different than my B.A. at Criswell. I had to work two jobs -> one full time and one part time plus school, plus teach somewhere for Encounter Missions. I could not easily study or get the experience I needed to give me more confidence in ministering. I felt left out for recommendations from professors because of my outside work load & (sic) lack of
experience. But, I appreciate the knowledge I gained from it all."

"As an American Bible College, the focus is on American students. As an overseas student, it is up to me to sieve through the contextualization aspect of the courses."

"For what Criswell College is and the professors who are there, my opinion is that a great job is done already."

Comments from interviews, not verbatim:
Liked the concept of the baccalaureate degree being laid out comparable to an M.Div. When I got to seminary, I already had covered much of the same material.

The school has done a good job with practical application. I hope they will continue this.

The library services and research materials need working on.

Need mentoring program for students with pastors.

Like the personal commitment of the teachers to bring fresh material--new to the students, not just Xeroxed from their files.

Overall, the degree program was adequate for what I'm doing--much of it was excellent in preparing me for ministry and
Table 19 Continued

Need a placement service for graduating students. Appreciated the personal commitment of teachers away from the classroom, their integrity, their willingness to stand up in the Southern Baptist Convention and represent the conservative viewpoint. They inspired me to do the same.

Feel I gained the best possible education I could have at Criswell College.

I've been in school at the college for several years. It took time for the former administration and faculty to establish relationships and get programs started. In time, the new administration and faculty will have the same kind of relationships with students. I believe the new faculty has the same heart for missions and that will not be changed.

Overall, the degree program was excellent in preparing me for ministry and seminary. I am overwhelmed when I see how much better prepared for seminary I am than others who come to the seminary where I am going.
Data From Professors

A purpose of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in the perception of its professors. Only one full-time professor remained on the faculty in the Evangelism-Missiology program at the time of the study. The following data were obtained from him and the four adjunct faculty members.

Table 20

Quality of Education in Program Compared With Similar Programs Other Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Good!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;One of the finest, developed with a solid basis . . . very adequate in preparing people . . . Training is thorough.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Before the (faculty) change the college was on target with great commitment to missions. The entire attitude of the school is still mission oriented.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Not in a position to evaluate . . . impressed with John Moldovan (Professor of Evangelism, full-time) and the syllabi he has produced and is using . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Very strong. I think the quality here is very high.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Would Recommend the Program on Basis Of Its Intellectual Rigor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professors added that they would recommend the program on such bases as the fact that it is "well-balanced;" that the school "is small enough to tailor instruction to . . . the students . . . room for almost unlimited academic guidance and fulfillment;" that "every student is required to take the evangelism course;" and that the program is "very well managed," and "thorough."
Table 22
How Well Program Prepares Students
For Evangelism-Missions Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The five professors viewed the preparation as &quot;very adequate.&quot; They commented that courses are &quot;well balanced in research requirements and resources . . . thorough;&quot; in comparison with other institutions of which they had knowledge, the preparation is &quot;more practical . . . makes for effective work . . . can cut the pattern here (with new program in planning stages);&quot; more &quot;emphasis on ministry experience;&quot; program is &quot;intense, practical and covers broad areas around the world . . . We instill confidence through good training and practical advice;&quot; and the program &quot;stimulates their interest in evangelism-missions . . . they get a practical view . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five other questions were put to the four adjunct faculty, to the full-time faculty member, to the vice-president for academic affairs and to the academic dean. Data in the following tables reflect the responses of the seven men, and apply to Questions for Study Nos. 13 and 15.

Table 23

**Strengths of the Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Responses of the Seven Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical theology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Academic Requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on/Commitment to Missions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Motivational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Body</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Weaknesses of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Responses of the Seven Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Offerings Too Narrow--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Focus on Urban Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Additional Supervised Practicum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One professor cited as weaknesses three things that affect the college in its entirety, including the Evangelism-Missiology program: perception by the denomination that the school is on "the fringes" (versus one sponsored by the denomination); the precarious financial status; and the newness of the institution.
Table 25

Desirable Additions to the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Responses of the Seven Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping for Immediate Ministries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Missions Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Urban Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent added: "More focus on present day situations, groups, and developments."
Table 26

**Suggestions for Follow-up on Program Graduates**

Comments in answer to the question "What kind of follow-up on Evangelism-Missiology graduates would you like to have?" were:

"Personal from both professors and institution. I tell my students, let me know how it works out when you get to your field. Tell me how you are doing it. Professors must express sincere interest in students. Their continuing contact encourages the people who are in the field. The genuine teaching role does not end when the grades are in."

1. Alumni follow-up--College Staff calls, visits, letters, etc. (Need to continue)

2. Evangelism-Missiology Graduates (A must)
   - updates
   - special meetings
   - recommendations
   - visits
   - help within the professional struggles"

"Have the graduates complete a questionnaire at the end of one year of service. This would be based on their studies and allow the students to evaluate the preparation they received to meet the challenge of the missions field.

"Then I would have them come back to the school at the end of three or four years to share with students about
The adjunct professors felt they had limited information as to the sufficiency of student-faculty interaction because of their part-time basis on the campus. From observations they had made, however, the perception was that the camaraderie between students and professors is "unusually good and I find the faculty want it this way."

The full-time professor believes there is sufficient interaction. He added, "We need to accommodate our schedule to that of students."
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Criswell College, founded in 1971, initiated an Evangelism-Missiology program in the 1986-1987 academic year to train and equip men and women for global evangelism. The curriculum of the program reflects this objective.

The case study method was used to examine the curriculum of the program and to explore the effect of studying the curriculum in the lives of its graduates as perceived by the graduates themselves. The study was concerned also with the evaluation of the program as perceived by selected faculty.

Information for the study was obtained through the use of a questionnaire mailed to all graduates of the program, and through personal interviews with five of the graduates. Several members of the faculty of the college were interviewed, as were two former faculty members and a former president.

One of the concerns of the study was to trace the development of the program. This was done through the process of interviewing faculty, through briefly tracing the history of the college itself, and through examining the
background and heritage of the denominational ties of the founder and subsequent presidents of the institution.

Conclusions

The development of the Evangelism-Missiology program at The Criswell College is a natural outgrowth of the philosophy and theological heritage of its founder, W. A. Criswell. He has selected men of like mind as presidents through the years the school has been in existence. They, in turn, have selected faculty, and have attracted students, who share a common worldview.

In this view, evangelism and missions are the highest priority tasks of the Christian church. Its proponents are believed to deserve the best possible educational tools to fulfill the tasks. The desire of Patterson, president of the school from 1975 to 1992, to be in the vanguard of educational developments stimulated him to include the Evangelism-Missiology program in the curriculum (1993).

The high percentage (40) of concentration courses in the Evangelism-Missiology program curriculum compares very favorably with other institutions that have similar programs. Comparable programs offer a Master of Arts with an evangelism or missions major, and the Master of Missiology degree is unique terminology. Patterned after the Doctor of Missiology degree curriculum guidelines, course requirements are stringent and allow for only one
elective. This lack of choice did not seem to concern graduates of the program, however. Eleven of them responded to the survey item giving opportunity to list "least valuable courses," but only one or two courses were listed by any one graduate. Most of the reasons given for thinking the course less valuable seemed to be linked to the professor teaching the course.

Since all of the graduates believed they were satisfactorily or well prepared for their present work setting, the conclusion is that the curriculum is practical. Not only can one conclude that the curriculum is well-designed for practicality, the high percentage (68, or 13 of the 19) of respondents ranking the quality of education as "very good," and the equally high percentage (68) who would choose The Criswell College to attend if beginning again, lead to the belief that the entire program is highly respected by its former students.

The small classes lend themselves to discussion and exchanges of views. They also allow close student-professor interaction. A visitor to the campus quickly discerns the easy familiarity of friendship between undergraduate and graduate students with their professors. The strong admiration and affection that students have for faculty and that faculty members have for students was evident in the personal interviews.
Interviews with the faculty members provided information leading to the conclusion that they, too, view the program positively. They were very aware of deficiencies and needs in the school, but believe they are offering an effective program. Along with the students, faculty members attribute much of the success of the program to the practical, applicative opportunities afforded, and they desire to enlarge the practicum.

A project being developed jointly by the college, the Dallas Baptist Association, and the Baptist General Convention of Texas should greatly enhance the practicum. The location of the college in the inner-city of Dallas, and in proximity to the offices of the other entities, lends itself to establishing a vital urban ministry. This ministry will provide students with opportunity for the practice of their studies major. In the words of one of the professors, the project is so extraordinary and fresh that the school will be "cutting the pattern" in this type of shared ministry.

The new project will correct what is viewed as a major deficiency by several faculty members. This will allow more emphasis on urban ministry which can be projected globally by the students as they graduate from the school.

The library was given a low evaluation by the graduates. The new librarian, Glenn Wittig, is making a noticeable difference in this area. The budget has been
increased. Wittig has designed a software package using dBase. It is now functioning as a forum for acquisition, for keeping tabs on library holdings, and for records. He has asked professors to supply bibliographies for acquisition purposes.

Faculty members believe the school is maintaining its effectiveness during the transition period of a new administration. Morale seemed high among them and they are optimistic about the future. Bridge building with denominational agencies and entities is being pursued successfully.

One of the faculty members stated that the school is what he called the "best kept secret in the denomination." He went on to quote James P. Boyce, co-founder of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1859, who said that the important things in education are the three Bs: Brains, books, and bricks, in that order. If The Criswell College will keep the three Bs in the same order, it can continue fulfilling its mission.

Recommendations

It is recommended that a Master's program in evangelism-missiology require a core concentration in those studies of 40 to 60 percent of the total course hours of the degree program. Constant refocusing and adjusting of
curriculum will be needed to stay abreast of methods and techniques missionaries are discovering in the field.

It is recommended that a strong practicum be included in the evangelism-missiology core, including an emphasis on urban ministry. If possible, design a course enabling students to organize and fund an expedition in which they are active participants.

It is recommended that institutions work with the long-range strategy planning arms of their denominational mission agencies. This could result in designing a curriculum to meet projected goals of the agencies and preparing graduates for those purposes.

It is recommended that faculty members be encouraged (and provided funds) to take part in professional societies in their discipline.

It is recommended that institutions survey their graduates at stated intervals to provide information useful in updating the curriculum. A systematic method for tracking graduates could be developed. Professors as well as alumni affairs staff should be encouraged to stay in touch with graduates.

It is recommended that frequent chapel or classroom appearances by the program graduates be used as a means of stimulating interest in evangelism and missions, and as a means of motivating students in those programs.
APPENDIX A
# Survey of 1987 - 1992 Graduates

1. Name
   - Last
   - First
   - Middle

Permanent Address
   - Street
   - Apt. No.

City
   - State
   - Zip Code

Telephone ___________/__________

2. Gender: 
   - Female
   - Male

3. Age: ______

4. How do you describe yourself? Check one:
   - I. American Indian or Native American
   - II. Black or African-American
   - III. Mexican American, Spanish Surname, Puerto Rican, Cuban or Latin American
   - IV. Oriental or Asian American
   - V. White or Caucasian, other than #3
   - VI. Other

5. Criswell College Degrees Earned
   (check all that apply)
   - Associate
   - Bachelors
   - Masters

6. Date of completion of most recent degree earned:
   - Year
   - Major
   - Minor
   - Degree Earned

7. How did you learn about the Evangelism/Missiology Program at the Criswell College?
   - I. Previously attended Criswell College and knew of program
   - II. Heard of program from friends and/or colleagues
   - III. Program was recommended by faculty at another institution
   - IV. Other (please specify)

8. What most influenced your choice of Criswell College?
   (check all that apply)
   - I. Location
   - II. Low cost
   - III. Reputation of individual professor(s)
   - IV. Prestige of Criswell College
   - V. Availability of financial aid
   - VI. Other (please specify)

9. Which of the following best describes your current work setting? Check one:
   - I. Pastor
   - II. Bivocational Pastor
   - III. Minister of Education
   - IV. Vocational Evangelist
   - V. Bivocational Evangelist
   - VI. Career Missionary/HMB
   - VII. Career Missionary/FMB
   - VIII. Independent Missionary
   - IX. Other (please specify)

10. In what principal geographic area(s) did you look for employment?
    - I. Dallas/Ft. Worth Metroplex
    - II. Elsewhere in Texas
    - III. Southwest U.S.
    - IV. Southeast U.S.
    - V. Northwest U.S.
    - VI. Northeast U.S.
    - VII. Midwest U.S.
    - VIII. Other (please specify)

11. How has your degree affected your current career status? (check all that apply)
    - I. Necessary for desired employment
    - II. Necessary for desired promotion
    - III. Necessary for salary increase
    - IV. Improvement of self-concept
    - V. No affect on career status

12. If you had it to do over again, would you choose a major other than the one you did select?
    - YES
    - NO
    If yes, what major would you choose and why?
13. Do you presently have, or anticipate, professional duties for which you feel your degree program did not adequately prepare you? ___YES ___NO
   If yes, what are those duties?

14. If you were beginning your program over again, would you choose the Criswell College? ___YES ___NO
   If not, what school would you choose and why?

15. As a student in the Evangelism/Missiology Program at Criswell College, were you allowed a degree of intellectual freedom consistent with the aims of a Christian college? ___YES ___NO

16. How well do you think your program of study prepared you for your present position?
   1. Well prepared
   2. Satisfactorily prepared
   3. Inadequately prepared
   4. No opinion

17. Which of the following best describes your opinion of the quality of education you experienced in the Evangelism/Missiology Program at the Criswell College? Check one:
   ___1. Very good
   ___2. Good
   ___3. Undecided
   ___4. Poor
   ___5. Very poor

18. Do you consider the courses to have been academically rigorous? ___YES ___NO

19. Did your courses allow for diversity of views during classroom discussions? ___YES ___SOMETIMES ___NO

20. On the basis of quality education, would you recommend your program at the Criswell College to a person who respects your opinion?
   ___Yes ___No

21. Do you believe there was sufficient student-faculty interaction outside the classroom? ___YES ___NO
   If not, what suggestions do you have for facilitating student-faculty interaction?

22. What were the most valuable courses in your program? (Please list by number, title, or brief description. Use back of page to continue answer, if necessary.)

23. What were least valuable courses in your program? (Use back of page to continue answer, if necessary.)

   Why were these courses valuable to you?
   Why were these courses valuable to you?
24. Evaluate the adequacy of the Criswell College library as it pertained to your studies. (Check the number that corresponds to your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Book Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Periodicals, journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Special materials, films, microfilms,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Research materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Library services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staff assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (please specify below)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. In view of your career plans, what kind of courses in your program at Criswell College would have been most desirable that were not available?

___ Education methods and techniques
___ Instructional systems technology
___ Psychology of college students
___ History and philosophy of education
___ Sociology of education
___ Educational psychology
___ Administrative task areas
___ Curriculum development
___ Computers in education
___ Scholarly writing & publishing
___ Finance
___ Organization & organization theory
___ Business management
___ Legal aspects
___ Community relations & fund-raising
___ Administrative theory
___ Personnel Management
___ Adult education
___ Administrative management
___ Other (please specify below)
26. What is your opinion of the professional competency you gained in the following areas during your program at Criswell College? (Circle the number of your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Church Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Theology of Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Current Issues in Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evangelistic Preaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. History of Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. History of Missions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Religious/Cult Belief Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Biblical Missiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Theology and Missions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Missionary Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Current Issues in Missiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Church Planting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Bivocational Ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Please indicate your satisfaction with the following items as they pertain to your program at Criswell College. (Circle the number of your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Quality of instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Qualifications of faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Availability of faculty for counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Variety of course offerings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for social contact with faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Opportunity for social contact with students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Availability of financial aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Frequency of offering of required courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Evaluate the following aspects of your program at Criswell College. (Circle the number of your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Of Great Value</th>
<th>Of Some Value</th>
<th>Of Little Value</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Course work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Independent readings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Relations with professors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Relations with fellow students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. What is your opinion concerning the following aspects of the Evangelism/Missiology Program at Criswell College? (Please circle the number of your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Satisfactory As Is</th>
<th>Should Increase</th>
<th>Should Relax Requirement</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Course work overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Admission requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Applied experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Requirements in major field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Requirements in minor field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Difficulty of written exams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Necessity of oral exam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Additional Comments.
APPENDIX B
Dear Brother Doe:

The attached survey is part of a study I am conducting about the Evangelism/Missiology Program at The Criswell College. This is for work toward a doctor of philosophy degree at the University of North Texas. The title of the dissertation is "The Development of the Evangelism-Missiology Program at the Criswell College: A Case Study."

Your response is invaluable since the survey is directed only to graduates of the program in the years 1987-1992. Your experience and opinions can provide helpful information to evaluate the courses offered and the value of the total program.

If you will complete the enclosed form before February 15th and return to me in the stamped envelope also enclosed, it will be much appreciated. The information is needed to carry out other phases of the research. Your response will be held in confidence and I welcome any comments you may have concerning the form or the program itself.

Thank you for your help. Please call me collect should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Betty Brown

P. S. The attached $2 bill is the real thing--just to say thank you for helping.
INTERVIEW GUIDE USED WITH THE EVANGELISM-MISSIOLOGY FACULTY

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION
   A. Education
   B. Teaching Experience
   C. Philosophy of evangelism and missions

II. CRISWELL COLLEGE
   A. How long at the College?
   B. Duties at the College
   C. Any research and publication?
   D. Attend scholarly meetings?

III. EVANGELISM-MISSIOLOGY PROGRAM
   A. In comparison to other missiology programs with which you are familiar, how do you rate the quality of education in the E-M program at The Criswell College?
   B. On the basis of intellectual rigor of instruction, would you recommend this program to a person who respects your opinion?
   C. How well do you think the present program prepares students for work in evangelism and/or missions?
D. Do you believe there is sufficient student-faculty interaction outside the classroom?

If NO, what suggestions do you have for facilitating this interaction?

E. What do you view as the greatest strengths of the E-M program?

F. In your view what are the greatest weaknesses of the program?

G. What are some possible additions to the program you would like to see?

H. How do you view the future of this program at The Criswell College?

I. Compared to other library facilities with which you are familiar, how do you rate the adequacy of the library of The Criswell College as it pertains to E-M studies?

J. What kind of follow-up on E-M program graduates would you like to have?
I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION
   A. Education
   
   B. Academic Experience

II. CRISWELL COLLEGE
   A. Time of association with the college
   
   B. Duties at the college

III. EVANGELISM-MISSIOLOGY PROGRAM
   A. Recollection of the inception of the program
   
   B. Strengths of the program
   
   C. Weaknesses of the program
   
   D. Future of the program at the college
   
   E. Do you believe there is sufficient student-faculty interaction outside the classroom?
      
      If NO, what suggestions do you have for facilitating this interaction?
F. What do you view as the greatest strengths of the E/M program?

G. In your view what are the greatest weaknesses of the program?

H. What are some possible additions to the program you would like to see?

I. How do you view the future of this program at The Criswell College?

J. Compared to other library facilities with which you are familiar, how do you rate the adequacy of the library of The Criswell College as it pertains to E/M studies?

K. What kind of follow-up on E/M program graduates would you like to have?
APPENDIX D
Doctor of Missiology Degree in North American Theological Schools

In June 1956 the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) in the United States and Canada approved the standards for offering the Doctor of Missiology (D.Miss.) as a professional degree that prepares the Master of Divinity (M.Div.) for admission. This action was based on the following introduction and standards established for the degree.

Introduction

The Doctorate of Missiology (D.Miss.) is a degree that has a tradition of more than half a century, particularly among Roman Catholics. The Gregorian University has granted this degree since the founding of its faculty of Missiology in 1932 and the Urban College since the establishment of its Missiological Institute in 1933. Congruent with the European tradition, the D.Miss. at both universities is a research degree. The fact that in the Roman Catholic church missiology is related to the work of missionary orders, however, gives to the Doctorate of Missiology a "professional" dimension inasmuch as most of its candidates are missionaries. Elsewhere in Europe and North America, missiology has been a discipline within the theological encyclopaedia. As such, it has been part of the regular curriculum of free-standing or university-related theological schools since the nineteenth century. Missiology has been a track or major in the Doctorate of Philosophy since the last decade of the nineteenth century. Even the Kennedy School of Missions, which was founded in 1931 in response to the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland, did not offer a Doctorate in Missiology as such, but rather the Ph.D.

The situation in the United States changed dramatically when Fuller Theological Seminary founded a School of World Mission in 1965. Borrowing from both the Roman Catholic research-oriented tradition and from the North American professional-oriented tradition of the Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.), Fuller's School of World Mission launched a D.Miss. in the early seventies. Since then, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School has started both a School of World Mission and a D.Miss. Other theological schools with similar faculties of world mission are planning to follow suit. Thus the D.Miss. has become an advanced-degree program with the primary purpose of preparing persons for cross-cultural ministries. This purpose is reflected both in the conceptualization and in the structure of such programs.

At its June 1985 meeting, the American Society of Missiology endorsed the D.Miss. as a two-year, post-M.Div. professional degree for missionaries interested in advanced training in cross-cultural ministries, including research and teaching. The AJS Committee on Standards views the degree as being professional in orientation. The following standards are parallel to those for the doctorate in education (Ed.D.).

I. Program Goals

The Doctor of Missiology (D.Miss.) is a professional degree which is designed to provide persons for denominational leadership roles in specialized cross-cultural ministries both in North America and around the world, as well as for teaching. While the primary thrust of the program is professional, it should include theological and theoretical foundations as well as training in research skills.

II. Program Content and Duration

A. Content

1. The program shall include the following:

a) the appropriate advanced-level theological disciplines which undergird doctoral-level study of ministry across sociocultural boundaries,

b) the social-scientific components (anthropological, ecclesiastical, contextual) inherent in cross-cultural ministry both in North America and around the world,

c) the appropriate area study and cognate discipline of world religions.

2. Language requirements will ordinarily include at least one field language other than English and sub-ethnic languages as are required to complete the research project.

3. The program shall include the completion of a culminating dissertation research project, or report of field research which demonstrates a high level of research skill applied to a problem in the field.

B. Duration

The program will ordinarily involve at least two years of full-time study in missiology beyond the M.Div. or its equivalent.

III. Resource Requirements

A. Students

Admission to the D.Miss. program shall be based on the possession of an accredited M.Div. degree with a record of above-average achievement therein. At least two years of appropriate field experience are also required. Equivalency shall be measured by the educational program content of the Master of Divinity degree.

B. Faculty

There shall be faculty members with cross-cultural experience, including a sufficient number of faculty in the supporting foundational cognate disciplines which are integral to the D.Miss. program, such as the appropriate social sciences. Faculty shall have proven competence in teaching and research, with a record of publication and be currently involved in research.

C. There shall be ready access to sufficient library resources in missiology and related disciplines to enable the program to achieve its stated goals for education at the professional doctoral level.

Further information may be obtained from the Association of Theological Schools, P. O. Box 130, Vandalia, Ohio 45380-0130, U.S.A.

Notes


3. See Clay Gutierrez, La vida de los misioneros (Mexico: Editorial Ojo Buen, 1953), passim.

APPENDIX E
June 1, 1989

Dr. Paige Patterson  
President  
The Criswell College  
525 North Ervay Street  
Dallas, TX 75201

Dear Dr. Patterson:

This is in response to your letter of May 8, 1989, in which you inform the Commission of The Criswell College's intent to offer two new Master's degrees and to modify your existing two-year Master of Arts program. According to your letter, you intend to offer the Master of Divinity and the Master of Missiology.

Your request has been reviewed by Charles Nash of my staff. Based on his conversations with your staff members and a review of your proposal, you are hereby authorized to initiate the two Master's degrees in Divinity and in Missiology effective Fall term, 1989. This authorization is granted on the basis that both of these programs will be reviewed as a part of your Self-Study for reaffirmation of accreditation and will be considered by your reaffirmation visiting committee in March, 1990. At that time, the committee will consider these programs for initial or final Commission approval. If initial approval is granted, a committee may be authorized to visit the institution at a later date to consider these for final approval.

Thank you for your notification regarding these new programs and for your continued support of the accreditation activities of the Commission on Colleges.

Sincerely,

James R. Rogers  
Executive Director  
Commission on Colleges

JTR/CRN: rb  
cc: Dr. Charles R. Nash
August 31, 1989

Dr. Keith E. Eitel  
Chairman of the Evangelism/Missiology Department  
Criswell Center for Biblical Studies  
525 North Ervay Street  
Dallas, TX 75201

Dear Dr. Eitel:

Thank you for your letters related to the new master of missiology degree that you are offering. Please excuse the delay in answering.

Dr. Louis Cobbs sent your latest letter for me to answer on Aug. 28. It took me several days to find out who had your earlier letters and enclosures. Dr. Cobbs left the position of director of the Personnel Selection Department at the end of 1988. I have just recently come to fill this position. Now that I have your letters together, I will try to respond.

I agree with Dr. Cobbs that the 90-hour master of missiology degree that you have outlined would meet the basic educational requirements for appointment as a career missionary with our board. The master of divinity (or its equivalent) is normally preferred for assignments in church planting, general evangelism, urban evangelism, rural evangelism and student evangelism. I certainly see this master's degree in missiology as being the equivalent of a master's of divinity degree. In fact, I am rather excited about the quality of the program. We look forward to working with your students in this program.

I discussed your letter with the PSD staff the other day. Several of them have talked to your students recently. Last week I talked to one of the students who had been offered a pastorate in the Dallas area. I like this kind of contact. I encourage all of your students who wish to serve as missionaries with our board to go ahead and make contact with our department and to maintain an open application with us. Part of our job is to keep up with candidates as they prepare for missionary service. We are able to provide the kind of information they need to make good decisions. I think we are also able to encourage and to help in many ways through the preparation stage for missionary service. We have a candidate consultant who is in your area five to six times a year. Candidate consultants normally sit down with candidates and answer their questions and invite them to Missions Information Conferences. This kind of contact is certainly available to anyone who feels called to missionary service and is working on a seminary level degree. As I mentioned, we are already in contact with several students there at Criswell.
Please do not hesitate to write or call if there is any way that I can be of help. We certainly want to work together as a team to get God-called servants to the mission field. May the Lord bless you and the rest of the faculty and administration as you begin this new master's program and as you begin a new academic year.

Sincerely,

Lloyd H. Atkinson, Director
Personnel Selection Department

LHA:kjf/4
EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

For persons in the missionary category, a degree from an accredited college or university and a degree from an accredited theological seminary are required. In the missionary associate category, the college and seminary degrees are preferred. In the apprentice category, the candidate must have a seminary degree. If any candidate is a graduate of other than an SBC seminary, he or she should have adequate orientation in Southern Baptist work as determined by the Missionary Personnel Department.

For persons in the US-2 category, a degree from an accredited, four-year college or university is required.

*NOTE
This is taken from page 5 of the Missionary Personnel Manuel
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Enrollment statistics for Missiology/Evangelism students from Fall 1986 through Spring 1993 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Katherine Bryan
Assistant Registrar
APPENDIX I
APPENDIX I

26. What is your opinion of the professional competency you gained in the following areas during your program at Criswell College? (circle the number of your choice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not included</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal Evangelism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Church Evangelism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Theology of Evangelism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Current Issues in Evangelism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evangelistic Preaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. History of Evangelism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. History of Missions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Religious/Cult Belief Systems</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Biblical Missiology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Theology and Missions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Missionary Anthropology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Current Issues in Missiology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Church Planting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Bivocational Ministry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table represent the number of respondents checking each value.
APPENDIX J

27. Please indicate your satisfaction with the following items as they pertain to your program at Criswell College. (Circle the number of your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Quality of instruction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Qualifications of faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Availability of faculty for counseling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Variety of course offerings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for social contact with faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Opportunity for social contact with students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Availability of financial aid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Frequency of offering of required courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table represent the number of respondents checking each value.
APPENDIX K

28. Evaluate the following aspects of your program at Criswell College. (Circle the number of your choice.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Of Great Value</th>
<th>Of Some Value</th>
<th>Of Little Value</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Course work</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Independent readings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Relations with professors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Relations with fellow students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table represent the number of respondents checking each value.
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