5-1-1995

Cooperation and Solidarity, Rejection and Mistrust: The Rocky Road to Inclusive Theological Education

Donna Runnalls

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus

Cooperation and Solidarity, Rejection and Mistrust: The Rocky Road to Inclusive Theological Education

Donna Runnalls

Professor of Religious Studies,
McGill University, Montreal

When I was invited to make this presentation I understood that I was to try to locate where we are at this point on the road to the inclusion of both women and men in our theological institutions in order that we might consider what we should now do with regard to this issue. I will divide my discussion into three parts.

1. Since questions of participation, authority and power are basic to assessing the present reality, I will give a summary of what has happened in ATS institutions since 1970. As this will involve the use of some statistics, you may wish to note them in the text.

2. Since these statistics give us a picture of only a very short period of time, I will ask some questions about the ways in which social change occurs and new concepts take root to create a transformed society; here I will make use of the theory of Victor Turner, a concise version of which is found in *The Ritual Process*. We have seen in the history of the church periods when women played a significant public role. Why has this happened and then been forgotten? Is our own period to be any different? Is it possible that we should have the confidence found in the words of Second Isaiah:

> From this time forth I make you hear new things,
>> hidden things which you have not known.
> They are created now, not long ago;
>> before today you have not heard of them,
>> lest you should say, "Behold, I knew them."
> You have never heard, you have never known,
>> from of old your ear has not been opened (Isaiah 48:6b–8a).

3. By bringing into conjunction one historical example of the role that women played in education in the church with

some of the theory of the social anthropologist Mary Douglas which she has presented in the book *How Institutions Think* I will attempt to make some suggestions about issues which it may be important for us to address if we are to see a new and creative future.

You will notice that throughout the presentation I will be asking questions more than suggesting answers. I hope that many of the questions are yours as well as mine and, if so, that these will open up a great many conversations as the conference goes on. I want to add that if the kind of theoretical analysis I will be outlining has any viability, then it should also suggest ways to address other questions of inclusion in theological education beyond that of gender inclusion.

The Present Situation

Let us begin with a review of the present situation as it relates to the participation of women as students, teaching faculty, and administrators.

The 1991–92 ATS Fact Book[1] gives the following information concerning the enrolment of women in our theological institutions. There were 18,103 women enrolled [Head Count] in the fall of 1991. This constituted 30.1% of total enrolment and was an increase of 3.3% from 1990. Since 1974 the percentage of women has increased from 14.3 to 21.1% in 1979 to the present level of 30.1%. The greatest increase in enrolment is in the M.A. (special) followed by the M.Div. program.

Some specific statistics should be noted:

1. Professional/academic post-baccalaureate (e.g. M.R.E., M.T.S., special M.A.) programs have an enrolment of 45.8% women.
2. M.Div. programs have 24.85% women.
3. Post M.A./M.Div. graduate programs together have 22.7% women, while Ph.D. enrollments are reported as 28.7% women.

In the *Status of Women Supplement* published in the April 1993 issue of the *CAUT Bulletin*[2] it is reported that in 1991–92 the proportion of women enrolled in doctoral programs was 27.4% in Theology and 35.6% in Religious Studies.

A number of questions arise from these statistics. Why is the largest proportion of women students in ATS related institutions found in the professional/academic post-baccalaureate

programs? Is something significant happening when the pro-
portion of women in the M.Div. is growing at the same time
that the percentage of all M.Div. students in our institutions
is dropping in relation to those in other programs? Between
1987 and 1991 while the total Head Count enrolment in all
programs increased by 7.2%, total M.Div. enrolment dropped
by 5.8%.

The number of women faculty in ATS institutions is also
growing. In 1971 the percentage of women faculty was 3.2%;
in 1981 it was 8.9% and by 1991 it had risen to 15.4% (413
women out of 2,675 faculty).[3] On the other hand, a quick count
of the names reported in the Churches' Council on Theological
Education 1991–92 *Directory of Teaching Faculty in Canadian
Theological Schools* may indicate that for Canadian institu-
tions the number of women faculty is one to two percent lower
than this. Trying to take into consideration the many different
ways of reporting, my quick count for full-time staff showed
the following:

1. Of the full-time staff 21% are women, but 5.3% are listed
   as administration and 2.1% are librarians.
2. I presume, therefore, that the primary responsibility of
   about 13.6% is teaching in the theological curriculum:

Theology	24
Pastoral Theology	18
Religious Education	14
Biblical Studies	7
Church History	5
Field Education	4
Other fields	1 each

While these statistics would suggest an encouraging trend
toward inclusion of a significant number of women in theo-
logical faculties, we need more information before we can see
whether this is a true indicator of a sustainable long-term
change. Is there a sign of the future in the fact that the present
enrolment of women in Ph.D. programs is higher than that of
post M.Div. academic Master's programs? In other words, has

the wave of women going into Ph.D. programs crested or are potential Ph.D. candidates by-passing Master's level studies? At McGill in the last three years we have experienced a considerable decline in the number of women enroling in Ph.D. studies.

Are women attracted to the possibility of a career in theological education? Do the present women faculty experience the kind of job satisfaction which means that they encourage others to prepare themselves for a teaching career? A recently published ASHE–ERIC Higher Education Report written by Martha Tack and Carol Patitu and titled *Faculty Job Satisfaction: Women and Minorities in Peril*[4] identifies some interesting issues that are relevant to sustaining the presence of women faculty in theological institutions.

In the introduction to this study Jonathan Fife has noted the reasons that faculty give for experiencing job satisfaction.

> Research on why people enjoy their work has identified four major areas that produce satisfaction. First and most important is that people feel appreciated for their efforts. Second is their perception that their efforts have a significant impact. Third is working or living in an environmentally pleasing or aesthetic location. And fourth is the equity in the remuneration for their work. The degree that a person is satisfied with each area is quite idiosyncratic. What does not vary is an individual's need to have an overall sense of well-being when all four areas are taken as a whole. This sense of satisfaction is especially critical for higher education for two reasons: quality of work and developing future faculty.[5]

As recruitment of new faculty will depend to a large degree on the job satisfaction that present faculty communicate to students, it is important to consider the evidence presented in the study which suggests that for institutions of higher education as a whole women experience less job satisfaction than do men and to ask whether this holds true for women in theological education. Perhaps, as I outline the various factors, you can think of how they may or may not relate to your own institution.

The study differentiates between internal stressors which are the factors of the workplace which affect job satisfaction and life-style stressors, such as marriage and child rearing, which place a greater burden on women than they do on men. While both types of stressors are important to individual

women faculty, the ones which institutional policy can directly address are those which are related to institutional life and management. Let me summarize briefly the five which I see as related to our institutions.

1. *Teaching*. Women were found to teach more hours than men. At the same time, faculty who have heavier teaching loads experience more pressure in terms of meeting their job demands and report less job satisfaction.

2. *Achievement and recognition for achievement*. Studies over the last 15 years have consistently shown that women are likely to be evaluated more harshly than men, particularly in traditionally male areas. They are still seen as having less authority, and their opinions are accepted less readily.

3. *Salary*. For the 1991–92 academic year the comparison of men's and women's salaries by category, affiliation, and rank again showed that in all cases, the average salaries for women were lower than the average salaries for men. This is despite the fact that as early as 1972 Sheppard and Herrick had found that: "Among men and women in the same income ranges, differences in work dissatisfaction tended to disappear. So much for the job dissatisfaction problem among women! The theoretical solution is simple: equal employment opportunity!"[6]

4. *Tenure*. Because women tend to be clustered at the lower end of the academic ranks, they are less likely to have been granted tenure. In fact, this study reported that compared to 10 years ago a smaller percentage of women are now tenured. Does this indicate that there is more movement of women in and out of academic employment? If so, what would that mean for institutional stability?

5. *Academic rank*. We are all well aware of the fact that as academic rank increases the percentage of women holding a particular rank decreases. Interestingly, however, Tack and Patitu draw attention to the fact that various studies show that female full professors identified more strongly with their institutions and would not leave them as readily as would associate and assistant professors.

The last category of women in theological education that I wish to consider are those in senior administration.

In the Autumn 1992 issue of *Theological Education* there is an article by Barbara Brown Zikmund entitled "Walking the

Narrow Path: Female Administrators in ATS Schools".[7] In this
article she notes that in the 211 member schools of ATS (ac-
credited and associate) 21 women serve as either president or
chief academic officer. Women thus represent approximately
10% of the top leadership in theological institutions. In under-
taking a study of women's leadership Zikmund identified two
issues which she wished to address: 1. How has ATS supported
women in leadership during the past decade? and 2. What
learnings related to women's experience and needs ought to in-
form the ATS Advisory Committee on Theological Education
Management [now called Leadership] in its future work?

Zikmund reaches a number of conclusions which are not sur-
prising: that the ATS is still not very friendly to women, but
this should change as more women are hired as faculty; that the
number of women administrators is considerably higher than
those in top leadership (in 1991, 30.5%) and their presence con-
tributes enormously to the ambience of the institutions. Her
final conclusion, however, I find quite surprising.

Zikmund notes that historically in North America, equal-
ity for women is not normative. Our cultural heritage is that
while men were engaged in the dirty public world of commerce
and business women were expected to be more concerned with
private and domestic life.

> As a result, two things happened which affect the current leader-
> ship situation of women in theological education: women became
> primarily responsible for the private and domestic side of life; and
> religion became more and more relegated to the private....
>
> On the one side this history limits the vision of institutional
> leadership for women....On the other side it suggests that what
> some have called "feminization", and interpreted to be a decline,
> may be an opportunity. If religion has become more private, and
> women are the legitimate caretakers of the private sphere, then
> it is a natural step for women to assume leadership in theological
> education....
>
> Within ATS schools my interviews with women administrators
> suggest that there are two possible scenarios on the horizon. First,
> as churches and schools sense that religion is no longer a very power-
> ful public force, and that religion is increasingly a private matter—
> they will seek to retain past prestige and power by continuing to
> appoint men to top leadership positions. Women exercising leader-
> ship in religious and public life will be resisted, for fear that their
> leadership might further weaken the already shaky status of religion.
>
> On the other hand a second response is quite possible. Churches
> and schools may accept the fact that religion is no longer a powerful

> public force, but that it has significant private importance. As men
> cease to be attracted to its leadership, no one will object when
> women take over top positions of leadership in religious institutions.
> This setting for female leadership, although ignored by the secular
> world, may give women enormous freedom to exercise institutional
> power in new and creative ways.[8]

According to the religion poll recently published by Maclean's Magazine 78% of Canadians affiliate themselves with a Christian denomination while less than one-third attend church regularly.[9] This suggests that in Canada religion also resides in the private sphere and that women in Canadian theological institutions face the same situation as those in American institutions. Nonetheless, I have difficulty with the conclusion that Zikmund reaches.

While Zikmund may be describing present reality the evaluation that she gives may be much more affected than I recognize by the American concept of the separation of church and state. From a Canadian perspective I question whether it is faithful to the Gospel simply to accept the idea that the Christian faith has only a private role to play in society and that we should simply try to make our institutions the best possible under the circumstances. If there is some relationship between the "theology" of the theological school and the organizational assumptions of the school what kind of theology would it be?[10] Is it possible for an institution to survive if there is a radical split between its theology and its organizational assumptions? Is it adequate to suggest that this is the only way in which, in the long term, women will be partners in the enterprise of theological education?

Societies in Transition

It is a cliché to say that ours is a society going through a period of rapid social change. Nonetheless, it is important to consider what the change we are seeing means for our institutions and for the inclusion of women and men within them. I do not believe that we can address this unless we incorporate into our consideration the ways in which our social context controls the way we understand our reality.

For me, the work of the social anthropologist Victor Turner has been important because his theory of social change resonates both with what I experience in our own time and how I

understand the kind of social change which took place within the human history which constitutes the period of my own discipline. While many of you may already be familiar with Victor Turner's work, in order to situate some of my questions let me briefly review his theory.

The ways in which cultures are transformed lie, according to Turner, in the factor of temporality. Human societies are what he calls "processual". Both individuals and communities experience this process. Individuals experience stages in their lives which accompany changes of place, social position and age, and cultures develop rites of passage with established patterns of behaviour and thinking to mark these stages. However, there are times when, despite cultural conditioning from childhood on, individuals stand aside from such established rites and either innovate new ones or assent to such innovation. The individual or a grouping of those assenting to innovation then comes into opposition to the dominant group. This process of cultural life provides, according to Turner, a social drama based on a dialectic of structure/anti-structure.

Structure is the established norm which is in place at any point; it is represented by the root paradigms of the culture. Root paradigms are the cultural models for behaviour that represent the goals of the social group. They become the irreducible life stances of individuals, part of the sub-conscious, which the individual senses to be matters of life and death. Such root paradigms emerge at life crises, whether of groups or individuals and one cannot escape their consequences. These root paradigms are concretized in the institutions, roles, and patterns of behaviour in any given society. In other words public memory is the storage system for the social order. Mary Douglas shows the nature of root paradigms in describing what she means by institution.

> Here, it is assumed that most established institutions, if challenged, are able to rest their claims to legitimacy on their fit with the nature of the universe. A convention is institutionalized when, in reply to the question, "Why do you do it like this?"... the final answer refers to the way the planets are fixed in the sky or the way that plants or humans or animals naturally behave.[11]

A description of the internal structure of groups given by Ludwik Fleck and described by Douglas can be used to fill out Turner's idea of structure:

> ... an inner elite of ranked initiates exists at the centre, the masses
> on the outside edge. The center is the moving point. The periphery
> takes its ideas in an unquestioning, literal sense; ossification oc-
> curs at the rim. He envisaged many thought worlds, each with its
> center and rim, intersecting, separating, and merging....Fleck rec-
> ognized that the sheer amount of interaction could vary; the degree
> of concentration and energy at the center depends on the pressure
> of demand from the outer fringes. When this interaction is strong,
> the question of individual deviation hardly arises.[12]

Social structures are not static. Turner places them in di-
alectical tension with what he calls anti-structure. This "anti"
is not negative, but rather a generative centre, an alternative
to structure when structure becomes empty, weakened or in-
adequate to the task of expressing the root paradigms of the
cultural community. It is the centre from which new symbols
are generated when the symbol systems of structure have been
rendered useless. Within structure the relationship between
persons is different than within anti-structure: structure cre-
ates formal bonds with unequal roles and functions, while anti-
structure bonds are egalitarian, governed by what Turner calls
liminality and *communitas*.

Liminality is both the state and the process of being in one
phase in a rite of passage. Rites of passage have three temporal
and special phases: separation, margin or *limen*, and reaggre-
gation. The first phase detaches the subjects from their old
place in society; the last places them, inwardly transformed
and outwardly changed, in a new place; but the marginal or
liminal phase has few of the attributes of the past or coming
states. It is "betwixt and between", a wilderness state, a con-
dition of loss or darkness which is frequently likened to death.
Those in this phase are stripped of status and authority, exist
on the margins of society and are leveled to a homogeneous
social state. Much of what has been bounded in the previous
social structure is liberated. In the liminal phase relationships
are those of communitas: spontaneous, egalitarian, immedi-
ate and concrete. "It [communitas] is almost everywhere held
to be sacred or 'holy', possibly because it transgresses or dis-
solves the norms that govern structured and institutionalized
relationships and is accompanied by experiences of unprece-
dented potency."[13] In liminality and communitas Turner sees
the dynamism and creativity of cultural communities emerging.

The experience of communitas is central to religion, literature, drama and art.

The dialectic of structure/anti-structure is necessary for the adequate functioning of any society. The tension between them whereby structure gives way to anti-structure which in turn becomes structure constitutes the social drama. There are four phases in the social drama: breach, crisis, redressive action, and reintegration. In the first phase the normal processes of social interaction break down. As this phase broadens and deepens, a crisis stage is reached, a stage which has a liminal character. Redressive action is demanded because the crisis stage must be limited: the structure is fighting for survival while the anti-structure is seeking formal recognition. Because this condition is considered to be extremely dangerous from the point of view of structure, situations of liminality are often marked off by rites and symbols of danger and designated as sacred in order to limit the potentiality of anti-structure. If the redressive action fails the crisis will intensify. Reintegration is the phase in which there is either the restoration of the norms and behaviour of the breached structure, or the recognition and acceptance of the alien patterns of a new social and cultural order.

The phenomena of structure and liminality suggest that there are two models for human interrelatedness: hierarchy and egalitarianism. At different historical moments the Christian tradition has identified each of these as the proper model. If we are now in a liminal phase, a time of egalitarianism, or even moving toward a new structure, how can we know that the phenomenon of women and men working together will not, as in the case of early Christian educational institutions, again be lost in that new structure? How does a system of knowledge get into orbit? How does one good idea compete with another?

How Institutions Might Change

In the introduction to her 1986 book *How Institutions Think*, Mary Douglas stated her intention to focus on the need to provide a "theory of institution that will amend the current unsociological view of human cognition... and a cognitive theory to supplement the weaknesses of institutional analysis". In other words, she wishes "to present a coherent argument about the social control of cognition".[14]

> The very idea of a suprapersonal cognitive system stirs a deep sense
> of outrage. The offense taken in itself is evidence that above the
> level of the individual human another hierarchy of "individuals"
> is influencing lower- level members to react violently against this
> idea or that. An individual that encompasses thinking humans
> is assumed to be of a nasty totalitarian sort, a highly centralized
> and effective dictatorship....Whereas reflection makes plain that,
> at higher levels of organization, controls over lower-level constituent
> members tend to be weaker and more diffuse. Many subtle and able
> thinkers are made so nervous by the crude political analogy between
> individual mind and social influences on cognition that they prefer
> to dismiss the whole problem.[15]

I do not believe it is possible for us to dismiss from our
consideration the inter-relationship between individual and in-
stitutional influence on our understanding of reality. I hope
that the following example will make this clear.

In *The Concept of Woman*[16], Prudence Allen has identified
the triumph of Aristotelianism and the growing acceptance of
the sex identity theory of Aristotle as the major factor which
led to the exclusion of women from institutions of education
as the university system developed in the thirteenth century.
Sex polarity is an important aspect of Aristotle's theory of
sex identity. While Allen describes many different facets of
this theory, let me give just one example for illustration: if the
world consists of four elements, earth, air, fire, and water, then
the male elements are air and fire, and the female elements are
earth and water. Air and fire are the powerful elements while
earth and water are the weaker elements.

Early Christian institutionalized education had taken form
between AD 800 and 1200 in Benedictine double monasteries.
For over 300 years co-educational study was a norm and female
philosophers had access to the centre of Christian philosophical
activity. Individuals like Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179) illus-
trate the height of development of female philosophers within
this educational system; Hildegard herself had written a phi-
losophy of sex complementarity not long before the triumph
of Aristotle's sex polarity theory! The shift from monastery
education to university education was a transference of edu-
cational activity from the monks to the secular clergy. This
transferred education from a communitarian institution to one
based on a military concept of knighthood. With the founding
of the University of Paris in the thirteenth century Aristotle's

argument that women were not capable of wisdom through discursive reasoning became predominant and women were excluded from this university and soon after from all others. It is important for us to note the way in which the root paradigm is reinforced by institutional structure. Both are necessary for "success".

The theory of Douglas would add that where there is coherence in the support that root paradigms provide for the principles of organization in an institution, justificatory stories of the past will be amalgamated and rationalized as part of the social process. Thus institutions will keep alive the memory of their founders and their heros, and forget other factors of their past. Moreover, institutions work best when they have a third support and that is when they harness the moral energy of their members.

> Individuals, as they pick and choose among the analogies from nature those that they will give credence to, are also picking and choosing at the same time their allies and opponents and the pattern of their future relations. Constituting their version of nature, they are monitoring the constitution of their society. In short, they are constructing a machine for thinking and decision-making on their own behalf.[17]

The example from the education of women in the Middle Ages supports Douglas' contention that new ideas which will be part of the reformulation of root paradigms will conform to a principle of coherence which is not satisfied by a purely cognitive and technological fit. Rather such paradigms must also be founded on what is perceived to be rightness in reason and accepted analogies with nature. This means that root paradigms need to be compatible with the prevailing political values, which are themselves also viewed as conforming to nature. "Inevitably, if it seems that an analogy does match nature, it is because the analogy is already in use for grounding dominant political assumptions. It is not nature that makes the match, but society."[18]

The paradigm "grounded in nature" which excluded women from the University of Paris was a theory that the world is made up of four elements, earth, air, fire, and water. What new paradigm might we create "grounded in nature"? Might it be that we should now be using the language of different proportions of the same matter? In the Middle Ages there

were theories of sex complementarity, sex neutrality, and sex polarity. Is there a new theory which can be grounded in our contemporary understanding of DNA?

In her earlier book *Purity and Danger*[19] Douglas showed how analogies based on the human body have provided some of the most important foundations for cultural paradigms. We might, therefore, ask whether new analogies based on the body which will sustain a cultural paradigm of inclusiveness are already available or beginning to appear? Should we not be suggesting that the vision of one eye lacks perspective and that two eyes see with greater clarity and depth? Are there other analogies from the body that we should be adapting to support the paradigm of women and men together in theological education?

Finally, if we are able to create new theological institutions in which women and men working together are considered part of the right order of the universe, will these institutions only represent a religion of the private sphere as Barbara Brown Zikmund has suggested? Or are there ways in which theological institutions can be models for creating a new vision of the good society?

Notes

[1] *Fact Book on Theological Education, 1991–92*, 22nd edition, The Association of Theological Schools, Pittsburgh, 1992.

[2] *CAUT Bulletin ACPPU*, Vol. 40, No. 4, April 1993. *CAUT Status of Women Supplement*, 5.

[3] These statistics are from Barbara Brown Zikmund, "Walking the Narrow Path: Female Administrators in ATS Schools," *Theological Education* 29 (1992), 62.

[4] Martha W. Tack and Carol L. Patitu, *Faculty Job Satisfaction: Women and Minorities in Peril*, ASHE–ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, 1992 (Washington: School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University).

[5] Ibid. xvii.

[6] Ibid. 39.

[7] Zikmund, "Walking the Narrow Path," 55–65.

[8] Ibid. 64.

[9] *Maclean's*, April 12, 1993 (Vol. 106, No. 15), 32–50.

[10] See David H. Kelsey, *To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).

[11] Mary Douglas, *How Institutions Think* (Syracuse University Press, 1986) 46–47.

12 Ibid. 14.
13 Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Chicago: Aldine, 1969) 128.
14 Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, ix.
15 Ibid. x.
16 *The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution 750 BC – AD 1250* (Montreal: Eden Press, 1985) 339-443.
17 Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, 63.
18 Ibid. 90.
19 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966).