

Challenges for teaching Theology through technology in Institutions of Higher Learning.

Dr Kelebogile Thomas Resane
University of the Free State
PO Box 339
Bloemfontein 9300
South Africa
+2751 401 9331
ResaneKT@ufs.ac.za

Abstract

The article explores and examines the challenges facing teaching theology through technology. The generation gap between the lecturers and the students, the world trends of online courses, the classroom arrangements, theology in natural sciences and humanities, are all highlighted to expose the need for theology lecturers and students to convert to the usage of technology in teaching and learning processes. These challenges serve as a call to change the methods of teaching in order to be on a par with the world of technology. However, caution is called for defining the importance of *promotive* interaction or *interactive* learning in teaching and learning of theology; since these promote holistic development of students, especially in the areas of modelling values, leadership and people skills, and character formation. Technology is here to stay in its dynamic form; and must be utilized for maximum results to be achieved in preparing theologians for effectiveness in their varied fields.

Key Words: Teaching, learning, Theology, technology, students.



Source: <http://www.worshiplinks.us/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Teacher.jpg>

Introduction

Technology is a scientific method of capturing, collating, and verifying the information in order to validate the intended and final outcomes (facts or truth). In the postmodern era, which is a current era that started around the 1950s, technology is an inevitable teaching and learning tool in all disciplines and studies. Newby, Stepich, Lehman and Russell(2000:9) quote Galbraith (1967:12) by defining technology as “the systematic application of scientific or other organized knowledge to practical tasks.” Technology is here to stay and will forever remain part of humanity in this life. In its dynamic format, teachers of theology must be current and keep up with technology. All the stakeholders in teaching and learning of theology must accept the inevitability of change towards the modern technology, lest they become irrelevant or redundant in their methods of teaching. “Change is a metaphor for life and it seems to become more and more so in the global, digital, post-modern world we are living in” (Oliver, 2003). The higher learning institutions are a context heavily influenced and shaped by modern science and technology. The fact of the matter is that “the introduction of the Internet is a natural progression in the evolution of technology use in both face-to-face teaching and distance education” (Bates and Poole, 2003:126). There are number of challenges the theology teacher faces regarding instructional technology such as the generation gap, the world trends, the current classroom arrangements, the place of theology within the natural sciences, and theology as part of the humanities.

The Generation Gap.

Many lecturers in the institutions of higher learning are from the baby boomer generations with very few of them just about to retire from their teaching professions. The students they are facing are the Generation Y, commonly known as the millennials. They were born around 1990 – 2001. These millennials are in the process of shaping the contemporary and the future world. Kerr Lassen of the City Press newspaper (1 February 2015) recently alluded to the fact that “while the millennials have often been considered as narcissistic or lazy, they are also known to be tech-savvy, liberal and with an insatiable desire to ‘give back’ to the world despite a poor economy.” They change with technology rapidly, while their teachers still lag behind.

The millennials makes up the majority of the university students component. The recent researchers call them with different names such as the Internet Generation, the Homeland Generation or, even the Google Generation. I have read somewhere, where they were dubbed dot.com generation.¹ Imparting knowledge to them is an

¹**Generation Z** is the generation of people living in Western or First World cultures that follows Generation Y. Experts differ on when the earliest members of Generation Z were born, ranging from 1990 to 2001, though a majority opinion claims about 1996. Several other names have been used to refer to this population group,

ethereal pedagogical attempt, whereby teachers struggle to identify their characteristics of learning. The same newspaper article cited above highlights the fact that “millennials play by a different set of rules, which can frustrate their Generation X managers.”

These students are in the environment of higher exposure and levels of technology. This technology had become inevitable in pedagogy and didactics alike; and according to the website referred to here, it creates space and opportunities “for customized instruction, data mining of student histories to enable pinpoint diagnostics and remediation or accelerated achievement opportunities.” Their teaching and learning is a highly sophisticated media and in computer environment with more internet savvy and expert than their tutors.

In the meantime, their tutors, who are in majority, the boomers, are the sceptics whose tendency is to equate efforts with the outcome. Hard labour should result in good returns. The fruit of the labour is the sign of the good effort. The millennials are tutored by the boomers and the Generation X. These are the risk takers and survivors. They make their own survival through the warrior spirit. The Generation X is arguably the best educated generation, and strives to form the best social structures and cohesion, so learning through participative activities is vital for their progress in teaching and learning. Participative or interactive learning activities are important. The current university student prefers to interact with a machine in order to learn, and is sandwiched between the boomer teacher who is content based and Generation X tutor who cries for more class interaction.

The corridors and the lecterns of the faculties of theology are still occupied by the boomers and the Generation X educationists. They fit Christie’s description of being the conservatives who:

... prefer the old, established ways of doing things. The existing system suits them as it is. Usually they have benefited from it and they see no reason to change it. They argue that throwing away the old ways leads to problems in society (1996:20).

The bottomline is that higher education teaching and learning is faced with explosion of technological knowledge and advance. This technology must be utilised with less efforts and time because it facilitates teaching effectiveness (Verma and Sharma, 2003:9). From the dawn of the twentieth century, the appearance and the utilization of technology in business and education surfaces as an inevitable reality to reckon with in teaching and learning. Teaching and learning is impossible without technology – the truth is brought home by Jordan, Carlile and Stack(2009:230) who

including "Generation V" (for *virtual*), "Generation C" (for *community* or *content*), "Generation Cox", "The New Silent Generation", the "Internet Generation", the "Homeland Generation", or even the "Google Generation" (http://www.esds1.pt/site/images/stories/isacosta/secondary_pages/10%C2%BA_block1/Generations%20Chart.pdf). 10/11/2014

state that “modern computers are powerful multimedia devices that can offer multiple modes of experience and interactivity to hold learners’ attention and suit a variety of learning styles.”

The competition with world trends.

One of the challenging and pertinent questions in higher learning and teaching institutions is: “Is there a future for physical university structure?” Opening the normal newspaper, web page, or a magazine, a reader is bombarded with some appealing adverts of earning degrees online. There is a proliferation of institutions the world over, offering qualifications online. The e-books and e-study guides downloadable online have eclipsed in a recent past. The emerging e-assessment methods make the situation larger than can be stated. The advent of skype and chat lines in the social media world are subliminally corroding, lessening, and eliminating the need and importance of the physical structure of the university. Some students achieve qualifications without any personal visit to the physical or geographical institution – not to mention any personal contact with the tutors, except by technological device of some sort. However, it is still maintained that “instructional technology is a means of connecting the teacher, the instructional experience, and learners in ways that enhance learning” (Newby, Stepich, Lehman and Russell2000:10). How true this statement is remains a question of debate. The bottom line is the modern instructional technology is or has created a distance and a gulf between the learners and the teachers. In fact some students view the teacher’s academic intervention as of no importance or significance anymore, hence see no need to attend the classes.

The physical university connects the academia with the real life experiences. It is the convergence point where the old and the young meet, the experienced and the naïve interact, the conservatives and the progressives’ dialogue; and the atheists and the religious encounter each other. The university is visibly the *theatrum* on which *historia* and modernity proclaim the legitimacy of *Sitz im Leben* (sociohistorical situation). University education without dynamic and diverse interactions is very limited in shaping the society for the future. The modern online course offers rob education of these dynamics of interactive learning whereby “students discuss and work cooperatively in pairs or small groups” (Schultzand Schultz 1993:143).

The physical university offers an atmosphere of excitement and enrichment through interactions. These interactions enhance and enrich imaginations with the capacity to transform knowledge. The accessibility to the resources is one of the major advantages of the physical university.

The resources of the university can provide enrichment for the discipline of the study of theology. It is enriching, to be sure, to deal with colleagues in allied fields such as church history, New Testament, missions, Christian

education, and homiletics. These are areas that say much to the discipline of theology and without which theology would be arid and stultified (Brown, 1967:362).

However, one should not only perceive the online education trend negatively. A positive paradigm enhances theological education and training. The benefits and positives include:

- a) The financial cost that hampers many to enter the physical university is eliminated or minimised. In the words of Oliver (2014); “Learning can take place anywhere and anytime and no longer needs to be costly.”
- b) The geographical distance between the student and the physical university is also minimised. “Technology can erase obstacles like geographical distance and time differences.” (Oliver, 2014).
- c) The student, especially the one engaged in ministerial duties is not physically eliminated from the field and; therefore receives practical experience as learning takes place while on duty.

Teaching theology through technology raises numerous questions. Theology belongs to the Social Sciences or Humanities. It is a living science where the soul of the tutor and that of the student, must somehow connect. Since it is a science that shapes the thoughts and character, interaction is vital. Much of theological education is concerned with helping people know what their tutors know and are. As a social science, theology is not just the facts transmission, but *promotive interaction* whereby individuals encourage and facilitate each other’s efforts towards the task and achievement of learning goals (Johnson and Johnson, 1997:28). As part and parcel of education, it galvanizes both the tutors and the students towards learning for character formation. In the words of Marsh: “Education should make us live life with zest, with gusto, with exuberance.”²

The ontological challenge facing teaching and learning is the diminishing of contact education. Human instrumentality is replaced by portable technology devices. The distance, contact, exorbitant fees, and relocation of the university student and the campus is shrinking at the alarming rate. Agreement with Bates and Poole (2003:126) is to be reached that “online distance courses are more flexible and more convenient for students than either face-to-face teaching or videoconferencing.” This is the cultural context in which teaching and learning takes place in the twenty-first century. It is the context in which teaching and learning theology should be relevant, because “theology is a far more context-sensitive discipline since theological content cannot be divorced from cultural context” (Gregersen and van Huyssteen, 1998:185).

²Daniel L Marsh, “The Place of Religion in Education,” in Personal Growth Leaflet 150 (Washington: National Education Association), 14-16 (Jump to: Daniel Lash Marsh (April 12, 1880 – May 20, 1968) was president of Boston University from 1926 to 1951. His Letters were not formally published.

The theological educationists must take a fresh look at their pedagogical methods and presuppositions so that theological education can be undertaken in a worthy manner of relevance to the students' environment. It must apply and embrace technology in order to accelerate teaching and learning.

Current classroom arrangements

Most of the universities were built in the previous century when the Greatest Generation (born 1901 -1924) and their preceding generation were in charge of education. These were the conventional generations whose proclivity was conference room and sloping auditorium. Didactics and the pedagogy of the time were centred on the professor. This professor had the authority of the subject matter and had to master the learning environment, especially the classroom. Since the tutor was the central figure in a learning environment, the students had to face her at the front. With the Generation Z in the class, preferring to face the teaching machine, the educationists such as Winter and McAuliffe (2009) discovered that there is some subliminal cry for interaction. The participative learning processes still play a pivotal role for these students. The current physical arrangements of learning facilities make it difficult for participative or interactive learning activities. As a social science, theology is a highly interactive discipline that calls for the classroom environment that is conducive to group-work, discussions, role-playing, etc. Examples to cite is when students would like to present the theological truth in a form of a skit, drama, simulation or small groups in a circle or so.

Teaching theology with technology faces this challenge, and subverts the direct instruction type of teaching which is highly ineffective for the modern generation. There is a new teaching theory known as *academagogy*. This “was developed to allow academics to select and use the most appropriate learning and assessment style for each required learning experience and activity in the curriculum” (Winter and McAuliffe, 2009:992). The old *pedagogical* approaches of transmitting knowledge from the educator to the learner must now be replaced with *academagogical* methods that are *andragogical* (addressing the immediate and practical needs of context-dependent learners) and *heutagogical* (focusing on self-directed, flexible learning). *Andragogy* is a learning theory based on transaction; in other words, it addresses the immediate, practical needs of context-dependent learners (Knowles, 1970), while *heutagogy* is a learning theory that focuses on self-directed, flexible learning (Hase and Kenyon, 2001).

Labelling theology as a ludicrous or grotesque subject is in itself ludicrously odd. It is a living science that is dynamic and efficient when appropriated in teaching and learning activities and environment. Theology cannot be confined to traditional or ancient formalisms such as when the expert transmits knowledge or dictating the facts from the text book. Hardy (Regan and Torrance, 1993:29) addresses the failing

of theology ascribed to two lines of thoughts: That if theology can be seen in the formalisms of the past, with the intellectual procedures of the past; and that causes it to be marginal to, confrontational with, the methods of today. The second line of thought is that theology should be or ought to be disengaged from its engagement with intelligent understanding. Both thoughts pose the danger of making theology irrelevant in the modern technological age.

Teaching theology with technology recognises the fact that there is no rationale for retrogressing into the history of applying methods of teaching that has become irrelevant to the students. Botman (Lugo, 2000:359) is spot on that “it is not our duty to copy the past, as if we could resuscitate Calvin or Kuyper in our own context. It is our duty to make contemporary ‘good news’ and ‘good news’ contemporary in obedience to the Word of God revealed in Jesus Christ.” Technology should be recognised and accepted by theologians as a tool to advance church’s incarnational mission on earth. This mission is the mandate of presenting Christ and his works to the modern generation. Cole-Turner (Stackhouse, Dearborn and Paeth, 2000:102) allude to a theology of technology “which seeks to understand the raw frenzy of human creativity, daring to comprehend it and claim it as a new mode of God’s action, offered to the glory of God and in the service of God.” Technology aids teaching and learning and expedites the quality of life.

In a teaching situation, technology minimises the teachers’ preparations, therefore saves time and expands creativity and innovation in both teaching and learning situations. It has this dynamic resonance because it is reliable, efficient, trustworthy, and can propel towards logical conclusions. This dynamic resonance enhances the relationship of understanding and trust between the teacher and the student. Newby, Stepich, Lehman and Russell (2000:9) assert that “technology performs a bridging function between research and theoretical exploration on the one side and the real-world problems faced by practitioners on the other.” Teachers of theology in the universities must conclude that technology is here to improve the quality of teaching and learning. It aids learning towards academic development and achievement. It is the fact that “Science and technology are valuable resources for man when placed at his service and when they promote his integral development for the benefit of all; but they cannot of themselves show the meaning of existence and of and of human progress” (Lammers and Verhey, 1998:470).

Theology and the Natural Sciences.

Theology is the queen of the sciences (Thomas Aquinas), reigning and permeating across all disciplines of natural and social sciences. It is universally accepted in the humanities that theology is no longer encased in the spiritual arena of life. Theology is a multi-disciplinary social science since it influences humans’ worldview, and cosmological understanding. The contemporary natural sciences are highly

technological in teaching and learning. Contemporary theology literature is full of subjects such as public theology, theology of nature, environmental theology, street theology, theology of economics etc. This demonstrates the fact that theology is found in all disciplines or faculties of learning. The natural sciences employ and apply technology in the majority of their pedagogical events. Since theology is also found within these sciences, the theology teacher is obliged to use technology to teach theology. The application of technology as a means of verifying the theological research findings is inevitable. Technology is utilised towards logical conclusions in theological constructs and research findings in general. Theology and natural sciences scream in unison: we sink or swim together. The two cooperate to accomplish shared goals such as the ethical views of human life, the creation as a natural resource to be conserved, and the human relations as a way of harmonious living. Their didactic and pedagogical synergy is inseparable, because they complement each other in matters of methodologies of teaching and enhancing the quality of life, with the aim of shaping lives for the kingdom of God.

The cosmological inter-connectedness in social life relates to the complex connectivity of modalities via cyber-technology. This is evidenced by the usage of the e-learning mechanisms (Blackboard, Clicker, QuestionMark etc.) used in higher education institutions; and how tutors connect with students through social media (Facebook, Twitter etc.). These are the pedagogical tools manufactured to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Erickson (1993:204) argues the positive contribution of technology in Social Sciences as a contemporary chorus that all religious people have to sing. This synchronises well with Brown-L'Bahy (Dede and Brown-L'Bahy, 2005:26) that the use and development of technology "is thought by many to be beneficial to both individuals and society and is strongly associated with human progress and prosperity."

Regardless of these binary polarities, the students of theology cannot engage in learning or research without utilisation and application of technology. There is a common reference to instructional technology in teaching and learning. Basically, instructional technology is "applying scientific knowledge about human learning to the practical tasks of teaching and learning" (Heinich, Molenda and Russell, 1993:16). The instructional technology is the bridge between the researchers and those who teach and learn. This fact is driven home by Newby, Stepich, Lehman and Russell (2000:10) that "instructional technology translates and applies basic research on human learning to produce instructional design principles and processes as well as hardware products that teachers and students can use to increase learning effectiveness."

The gadgets and the devices accelerate the systematic use of modern methods and technologies in teaching and learning. They assist enormously in assessments, tracking students' performance, and keeping the records in teaching and learning practices. The natural learning does not easily happen without these devices. The millennials do not carry the Bibles to church anymore. They have their Bibles in their

mobile phones and tablets. The contemporary preacher has the sermon notes in the tablet or smaller gadget. Hymn books are redundant. The lyrics are on the screen via data projector. Verma and Sharma (2003:240) hit the nail into the coffin that “the advancement in the field of science and technology combined with easier access to information, the expansion of communications and the impossibility of controlling transborder information and data-flows, the societal impact of communication is unprecedented.”

Technology integration is inevitable. The millennials can benefit enormously in teaching and learning theology through technology. The teacher preparation, orientation, and tutoring (in-service training) continue to be part of effective teaching and learning in the institutions of higher learning. The digital resources are dynamic and rapid. Teachers must be prepared to teach with technology, because “integrating technology into the curriculum indexes a teacher’s ability to use digital tools in flexible, effective ways to accomplish well-specified educational objectives” (Vrasidas and Glass, 2005:82). Teachers who aim to revolutionise their teaching-learning environment embrace technology, and constantly update themselves with technological acumen. Teachers must reform by aligning themselves with modern teaching through technology. Morrison and Lowther (2010:4) endorse the fact that “technology does have the potential to transform education if teachers reform their instructional practices to engage students in meaningful learning and use of 21st century knowledge and skills.” This is the revolution that teaching and learning must synchronise with. This truth is captured further by McDonalds and Lever-Duffy (2011: 16) that ‘for technology to succeed in enriching the instructional environment, all educators need to achieve their own technology competencies.’ Technology is here to stay and continues to be dynamic, therefore in the higher learning institutions, the faculties such as theology, must prioritise it as the tool of teaching and learning.

Theology as part of the Humanities.

The humanities’ strength is theology’s strength. The institutions of higher learning where theology is taught, in some cases, place theology under the humanities because theology is indeed a social science. This makes theology an accessible discipline to the wide range of students in humanities. The natural sciences are no more the stand-alone disciplines, but interact symbiotically with the social sciences such as theology. The future of theology hangs and falls with the future of humanities. This truth is impressed by the fact that:

In the increasing technicalization and professionalization of even those state universities which are not primarily technical and professional, theology's traditional tie with the humanities often becomes a marriage of grave illness, if not death, because the success and vitality of the humanities is

the fulcrum upon which the success of the theological disciplines rotates. It is a fact, on the other hand, that within recent history the theological disciplines have developed methods which closely approximate the methods of some of the social sciences (Ziemke, 1963).

Students of theology acquire their education in order to fulfil their sense of divine calling and desire to impact the societies in which they operate. Theologians are the social psychologists on the same level with social workers, teachers, human resources specialists; sociologists and many others. Inevitably, like all others, the theology graduates will encounter technology whether they work in ecclesiastical circles, as counsellors, consultants, or chaplains. The instructional methods applied in teaching and learning humanities should also apply in theology.

Conclusion

Teaching theology through technology poses enormous challenges due to the generation gap between the students and the lecturers. The proliferation of online courses slowly downgrades and minimizes the need for the physical university with all its accompanying benefits such as *interactive* learning, *promotive* interaction with both the peers and the educators, library accessibility, people skills; and holistic development acquired through modelling, arts, and sports. The current classroom arrangements are outdated as they are not technologically compliant. They decelerate interactive learning as they are designed for teaching and learning that elevates the educator as the controller and expert of knowledge. This is the approach that is unfriendly to the current university student.

Since theology is symbiotically linked to the natural sciences, the methods used for teaching natural sciences become relevant to teaching theology. Theology, though a queen of sciences, finds itself addressing the natural sciences issues – methods of experimentation and conclusions are applied in theological education. In other words, theology speaks unreservedly into the natural world. The symbiotic fraternity of theology and humanities makes teaching and learning through technology a necessity and a force to reckon with. Technology in teaching and learning is a mediating tool that makes learning a social and cultural rather than individual attempt (Lautenbach, 2010).

When technology is applied in teaching theology, *epistemic curiosity* accelerates to the higher level to resolve the uncertainties that may be existing (Johnson and Johnson 1997). This opens the desire, curiosity, and thirst to research more for further learning. Technology brings the lecturers and students closer by enhancing interactive learning and teaching. This saves time and makes learning experience exciting for both of them. Their community service is expedited and accelerated for quality life where they serve.

References

- Bates, A.W. & Poole, G. (2003). **Effective Teaching with Technology in Higher Education: Foundations for Success**. John Wiley and Sons Inc., San Francisco.
- Brown, R.M. (May, 1967). Teaching Theology in a University Setting. **Union Seminary Quarterly Review**, Vol. XXII, No. 4
- Christie, P. (1996). **The Right to Learn: The Struggle for Education in South Africa**. Ravan Press. Johannesburg.
- Dede, C., Brown-L'Bahy, T., Ketelhut, D. & Whitehouse, P. (2004). **The Internet Encyclopedia**. Distance Learning (Virtual Learning).
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/047148296X.tie047/abstract> (Retrieved March 3, 2015).
- Erickson, M.J. (1993). **The Evangelical Mind: Perspectives on Theological and Practical Issues**. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids.
- Gregersen, N.H. & Van Huyssteen. J.W. (1998). **Rethinking Theology and Science: Six Models for the Current Dialogue**. W.B Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids.
- Hase, Sand Kenyon, C. (2001). **Andragogy to Heutagogy**.
(<http://ultibase.rmit.edu.au/Articles/dec00/hase2.htm> (Retrieved February 13, 2015).
- Heinich, R., Molenda, R. & Russell, J.D. (1993). **Instructional Media and Technologies for Learning** (4th Ed). Merrill/Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson F.P. (1997). **Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills** (6th Ed). A Viacom Company, Needham Heights, MA.
- Knowles, M. (1970). **The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy**. Associated Press, New York.
- Lassen, K. **City Press Newspaper**. How to Talk to Generation Y. (1 February 2015), Johannesburg.
- Lautenbach, G. (2010). Expansive Learning Cycles: Lecturers Using Educational Technologies for Teaching and Learning. **South African Journal of Higher Education** 24 (5): 699-715.
- Lammers, S.E. & Verhey, H. (1998). **On Moral Medicine: Theological Perspectives in Medical Ethics** (2nd Ed). W.B Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids.
- Lowther, D.L. & Morrison, G.R. (2010). **Integrating Computer Technology into the Classroom: Skills for the 21st Century**. (4th Ed), Pearson Education, Boston.

Lugo, L.E. (Ed). (2000). **Religion, Pluralism, and Public Life: Abraham Kuyper's Legacy for the Twenty-First Century**, W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids.

Marsh, D.L. **The Place of Religion in Education, in Personal Growth Leaflet 150**. Washington, National Education Association.

McDonald, J.B. & Lever-Duffey, J. (2011). **Teaching and Learning with Technology** (4th Ed), Pearson Education, Boston.

Newby, T.J, Stepich D.A., Lehman J.D. & Russell, J.D. (2000). **Instructional Technology for Teaching and Learning: Designing Instruction, Integrating Computers, and Using Media** (2nd Ed). Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Oliver, E. (2013). Teaching Open Distance Learning undergraduates in Theology to become effective change agents, **Verbum et Ecclesia**, 34(1), Art. #845, 7 pages.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ ve.v34i1.845](http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v34i1.845)

Olivier, E. (2014). Theological education with the help of technology, **HTS Theological Studies**, 70(1), Art. #2643, 7 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i1.2643>.

Regan, H. & Torrance, A.J. (1993). **Christ and Context: The Confrontation Between Gospel and Culture**. T and T Clark, Edinburgh.

Schroer, W.J. <http://www.socialmarketing.org/newsletter/features/generation2.htm>. (Retrieved November 10, 2014).

Schultz T and Schultz J.(1993). **Why Nobody Learns Much of Anything at Church: And How to Fix it**. Group Publishing Inc.Loveland

Stackhouse, M.L., Dearborn, T. & Paeth, S. (2000). **The Local Church in a Global Era: Reflections for a New Century**. W.B Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids.

Verma, R. & Sharma, S. (2003). **Modern Trends in Teaching Technology**. Anmol Publications, New Delhi.

Vrasidas, C.and Glass V.G. (2005). **Preparing Teachers to Teach with Technology**. Information Age Publishing, Connecticut.

Winter, A, Mcauliffe M, Chadwick, G. & Hargreaves, D. (2009). **Implementing academagogy: The first case study**. 20th Australasian association for engineering education conference proceedings, University of Adelaide.

Ziemke, D.C. (1963). Teaching Theology in the University. **Lutheran Quarterly**, 15 no 1 F.

