

Framing Vocational Holiness: Exploring Implications of a Pentecostal Model of Call to Pastoral Ministry^{*}

Susan L. Maros[†]

Introduction

As many who work in multicultural and cross-cultural contexts have discovered, the adage “seeing is believing” often times may be more accurately stated “believing is seeing.” This turn of phrase applies to many aspects of life from the mundane to the serious. What a person believes—how they frame their understanding of the world—has a significant effect on what they become aware of as they encounter and make sense of life experience. The cognitive lenses through which a person views the world profoundly impact what they perceive.

Eugene Peterson offers an example of this phenomenon from a painful season early in his pastoral ministry when, as he puts it, “an abyss opened up before [him].”¹ This abyss was the chasm between his expectations of ministry and his experience in ministry. Like many others entering vocational ministry, Peterson had an idea in his mind; he had a mental model of what ministry would “look like.” And, like many others, he discovered that the everyday realities, the expectations of the congregation, the demands of the religious institution were at odds with his mental model(s) of pastoral work.

Yet Peterson’s abyss was not just about the gap between an ideal image of ministry and the reality of ministry lived out in experience. More daunting for Peterson was the chasm between commitments about ministry which he held simultaneously and yet found impossible to live out at the same time. Where he had assumed natural congruence between his personal faith as a Christian and the spiritual work of pastoral ministry, Peterson instead discovered he held values that could not be lived out simultaneously. “Being a Christian,” he writes, “more often

* An earlier form of this essay was originally presented at the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies held March 21-23, 2013 in Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, Washington. The current paper benefits from fruitful conversations with Eric Newberg and DeLonn Rance, the insightful questions of Clifton Clarke and Trevor Grizzle, and the methodological insights of Mark Cartledge. Any remaining flaws in this essay remain the author’s responsibility.

[†] Susan L. Maros has served on the faculty of The King’s University since 1997. She is a Ph.D. Candidate in the School of Intercultural Studies at Fuller Theological Seminary. Her passion for intercultural ministry began with her experience as a missionary kid in Brazil. She lives in Los Angeles with her husband and two children.

than not seemed to get in the way of working as a pastor. Working as a pastor, with surprising frequency, seemed to put me at odds with living as a Christian.”²

An experience of an abyss of the sort that Peterson describes represents fertile ground for exploring the impact of mental models on ministry formation. People preparing for vocational ministry have ideas about what constitutes a call to pastoral ministry.³ Furthermore, they have an ideal in mind of what kind of person they should be as they are called. How does what a person believes about call to vocational ministry impact what they perceive and pay attention to regarding ministry development? Exploring the mental models people use to frame their understanding of call opens a window into exploring this dynamic.

With insight into how people frame their understanding of call comes the possibility of suggesting one potential precipitating cause for why lack of character may remain entrenched in a promising leader’s life despite all efforts to foster formation. Or, in other words, reflecting on a cognitive model of call offers one suggestion for why “vocational holiness”—to use the phrase Peterson coined—seems to be difficult to cultivate in the lives of emerging leaders. The suggestion is this: the model evident in one context intimates that a Pentecostal understanding of call to vocational ministry includes an expectation of spiritual *maturity* but lacks an expectation of spiritual *formation*. The model assumes the presence of character but ignores the development of character. As one respondent phrased it in reflecting on this dynamic, in a Pentecostal context, all too frequently, “anointing trumps character.”

I will first comment briefly on theological perspectives regarding call to vocational ministry and then identify the theoretical framework and the methodology that was the basis of this research. My focus on call to pastoral ministry in this essay reflects an emphasis that exists in the context in which my research was conducted. I will then outline the cognitive model of the experience of call to pastoral ministry that predominates in one environment along with two corollary elements of the mental model of pastoral leader. Finally, I will reflect on the implications of these findings for how we think about the practice of formation of vocational holiness.

Espoused Theology of Call

The concept of “call” has long been part of the biblical/theological discussion within the Church. William Placher gathers examples of writings related to call from across two thousand years of Western Christianity.⁴ Noting that “call” and “vocation” are linguistic synonyms (vocation comes from the Latin word which means “to call”), Placher suggests four historical periods in understanding the nature of call: being “called out of the world” in the Early Church, call as religious vocation in the Middle Ages, every job as vocation in the Reformation, and growing discomfort with call/vocation in the “post-Christian age.” This begs the question: does Placher’s fourfold distinction reflect different historical periods or four different competing mental models in the present day?

Much of the recent biblical/theological reflection on call echoes the view of vocation that developed during the Reformation. From this perspective, we have a general (or “spiritual”) call to become a Christian and a particular call to serve God and the world in whatever situation God has placed us. Within this framework, writers attempt to reflect on the relationship between who we *are* and what we are to *do*. For example, Os Guinness defines call as “the truth that God calls us to himself so decisively that everything we are, everything we do, and everything we have is invested with a special devotion and dynamism lived out as a response to his summons and service.”⁵ The majority of theological writings about call/vocation in the past twenty years reflect this Reformed perspective.⁶

Although Pentecostals are known for talking about living out one’s call from God, nevertheless, few Pentecostal scholars have written on this subject.⁷ The emphasis within the Pentecostal tradition historically is on calling people to salvation. Any further discussion of call tends to focus on vocational ministry, particularly that of pastor, evangelist, or missionary.⁸ Most of this discussion is in the form of personal testimony rather than formal theology. Eric Newberg highlights the wealth of Pentecostal testimonies of missionary call that exists in early Pentecostal publications.⁹ Steven Fettke and Robby Waddell recently published a volume of testimonies of vocational call of ten Pentecostal academics.¹⁰ Little work has been done to analyze these testimonies either from a social science or theological perspective. Claudia Wahrisch-Oblau’s examination of pastoral call narratives in immigrant church leaders in

Germany and DeLonn Rance's consideration of call among missionaries to El Salvador are perhaps the outstanding exceptions.¹¹

A few Pentecostal scholars have reflected briefly on call from a theological perspective, focusing most on vocation as a general concept rather than a specific life role. Frank Macchia presents a theology of call that grounds the concept in our vocation to be image bearers of God¹² and Cheryl Bridges Johns in the ontological vocation of being fully human.¹³ Miroslav Wolf rejects the concept of vocation as "the dead hand" that "needed to be lifted from the Christian idea of work"¹⁴ stating instead that "since the whole life of a Christian is by definition a life in the Spirit, work cannot be an exception, whether that work is ecclesiastical or secular. *Work in the Spirit is one dimension of the Christian walk in the Spirit.*"¹⁵ Perhaps all three of these authors are responding to the tendency within Pentecostal circles to view "call" as limited to the vocational ministries of pastor, evangelist, and missionary and are thus attempting to suggest a corrective.

Biblical/theological writings give some insight into the themes from which people in a Pentecostal/charismatic context draw to talk about call. The challenge with theological reflections, however, is that they articulate the ideal more than they reflect how people functionally think and make sense of their lives. If there is a space between mental models demonstrated in what people profess and models demonstrated in what they practice, the literature outlined so far neither identifies the gap nor distinguishes what lies in the second category. For this examination, the resources of anthropology offer useful perspectives and tools.

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

Cognitive anthropologists discuss mental models in terms of "learned, internalized patterns of thought-feeling that mediate both the interpretation of ongoing experience and the reconstruction of memories."¹⁶ Mental models are stored in the neurological structures of the human brain. These structures are shaped by experience and, in turn, impact the interpretation of further experiences. Mental models function as cognitive maps helping us to navigate a complex world, impacting how we make sense of circumstances personally and corporately.¹⁷

Mental models act as “salience-enhancing templates,”¹⁸ focusing the individual’s awareness on what is significant. Thus, mental models serve to filter sensory data: input that fits a model receives attention while the input that does not fit the model is ignored. This useful function saves people from being overwhelmed by the sheer volume of sensory data received on a daily basis. The same quality becomes problematic, however, when it prompts a person to ignore information that should otherwise be given consideration. What a person believes affects what they see, sometimes to their detriment.

Furthermore, in the midst of this process of making sense of experiences, there exist both those mental models of which we are conscious—our “espoused theory”—and those mental models about which we are not conscious but which are demonstrated in our behavior—our “theory-in-use.”¹⁹ At times, the difference between espoused theory and theory-in-use is like the difference between the layers of an onion: there is the layer that is visible on the surface with multiple, unseen supporting layers underneath. Underlying the mental model of pastor as a special role, for example, are additional beliefs about why and how the role is special as well as what implications this has for how a person can know they are called to the role. At other times, the difference between espoused theory and theory-in-use is a matter of competing models—commitments simultaneously held that are, nevertheless, in tension with one another. It is just such a competing commitment that this essay explores.

In investigating cognitive models of the experience of call to pastoral ministry, I am dealing with theologies of call at one level. What my research participants espouse about call, what they profess to believe, is significant. At another level, I am interested in identifying what undergirds a person’s understanding of call, how they categorize experiences as being related to call, and how they make sense of those experiences. I could ask people about their theology of call and I would elicit information about what they are conscious of believing. However, I am interested in exploring how people determine what is and is not “call” and what frames they use to interpret experiences as indicating someone is called to pastoral ministry. Thus, my task is to find ways to draw out how people frame reality, identifying mental models that are perhaps more deeply embedded than their conscious beliefs.

Roy D’Andrade’s advice regarding eliciting mental models was the starting point for the design of this research; he writes, “it is better not to ask informants directly about their models, but rather to ask something that will bring the model into play; that is, something that will make

the person *use* the model.²⁰ I needed to *not* ask people to define call or to explain call, nor to directly ask them their theology of call. Rather, I needed to ask them to interact with material that would require them to *use* their mental models related to call. In particular, I focused on asking people to make choices since, as Naomi Quinn demonstrates in her research on an American schema of marriage, how people reason is culturally dense discourse.²¹

For this research, thirteen men and eleven women aged 29 to 60 who were students at a Pentecostal/charismatic university participated in semi-structured interviews. In this sample, 46% of the individuals identified themselves as Caucasian, 25% as Black/African American, 17% Hispanic, and 15% Asian American. All but two participants had some ministry experience; eleven of the participants (46%) had between four and fifteen years of full-time vocational ministry experience at the time of their interview.

The interviews consisted of four written exercises and participants' comments on those exercises. Three of these exercises utilized methods developed early in cognitive anthropology for exploring cognitive domains: a triads test, a free list, and a pile sort.²² The fourth exercise utilized vignettes—short statements of a person's sense of call to pastoral ministry. Demographic information was also collected for every participant including their denominational background, ministry experience, and history of landmark spiritual experiences such as conversion, baptism in the Spirit, and call to ministry.

Both quantitative and qualitative data were elicited by these means. The quantitative data included the results of the exercises such as the items listed on the free list or the items in each of the piles in the pile sort. This data was analyzed utilizing ANTHROPAC software²³ and examined for indications of consensus²⁴ in the structuring of the cognitive domain(s) related to call. The qualitative data consisted of the comments participants made and the stories they volunteered. This data was analyzed for linguistic and conceptual evidence of the factors and structures of the participants' mental model(s) of call.²⁵

A Cultural Model of Call

The analysis of the data suggests four dominant factors in a mental model of call shared by all the research participants in this context and two dynamics of pastoral leadership that appear to be correlated. The four factors are the individual, God, knowing, and a specific role.

The model of pastoral leadership related to call focuses primarily on the pastor as God's representative and the pastor empowered by God. These models assume character or spirituality in the leader but neither the model of call nor the model of leader had character formation as a principal element.

The model of call depends upon a cultural model of self: the locus of the call in this context is the individual. The community may play a part in call in terms of formation of the person or affirmation of the call; yet, among these respondents, call is all about the *individual's* sense of what they are to do. If the individual does not have a clear sense of call, the existence of a call is questioned, regardless of what the community may think about the person. To a certain extent, this is to be expected in light of research that suggests that within the United States society is structured around the individual rather than around the collective.²⁶ At another level, it is somewhat surprising considering how often the theme of the corporate occurs in Christian theology. Apparently, theological constructs regarding the corporate are not called into play when people in this context think about essential elements of call.

That this population views call as internal to the individual should not be understood, however, as implying that they see call as having a personal *origin*. For this population clearly call "comes from God." God is viewed as the source of call and call is determined by God alone. Choosing a pastoral role because a person desires to do so, because it is a family tradition, or because other people expect it is deemed invalid. Indeed, even if a person is gifted and has had years of success in ministry, this group still wanted to know that the call was from God. One participant put it this way, "I will say that there are probably many clergy men and women who are *not* called by God in those roles. [But] a *true* ... servant of God in the church is called by God." Vocational ministry is a call if and only if it is the role that *God* intends for the person.

If God is the origin of call and the individual is the locus of call, the link between the two for this population is "knowing." The theme of knowing had two key elements. The first essential element was that the individual have a clear personal knowledge of having been called by God. That clear knowledge is demonstrated by the ability to articulate the sense of call in relation to specific experiences. If a person could not make a clear statement, the existence of a call was questioned. For example, responding to a vignette about a pastor's kid early in ministry development, one respondent said, "People spoke of him as having tremendous pastoral leadership potential but I'm like, what do *you* think about yourself and your call?" In this

instance, the fact that the individual did not explicitly make a personal statement of their internal sense of call negated every other point of the story that suggested call may be present.

Once that clear personal knowledge was articulated, however, the next essential element was that the knowledge be confirmed—by a senior leader and/or by perseverance and fruitfulness in ministry. Respondents wanted to know “what did your pastor say?” or “How do you know God called you?” This confirmation only had merit, though, if it was preceded by the individual’s clear personal sense of call. Having a clear statement could sometimes render an otherwise doubtful candidate an acceptable one or turn an otherwise acceptable candidate into a questionable one.

That a person should clearly know their call from God related to a further aspect of the mental model of call: that the call would direct them toward a specific role. A few of the participants demonstrated an awareness of the Reformed framing of call by referring to a person’s primary call to be a Christian. Even in those cases, however, the focus of the discussion was still upon particular roles that a person would take up having been called to them by God. As one participant put it, “I believe that a calling is a specific instruction or specific role that God has put in someone’s life.” Participants desired and expected specificity and clarity in relation to a person’s role. “Call” in this context does not relate to what a person should *be* so much as it relates to what a person should *do*.

Furthermore, for this group, the emphasis of call is on roles distinct from “just a job that anyone can do.” The role that God calls a person to requires equipping and preparation, possibly including training of some form. The less skilled a job is—such as janitor or assembly line worker as compared to astronomer or architect—the less likely it was to be viewed as a role to which a person would be called.

Additionally, while recognizing that a person needs to have some source of income to live, this group was adamant that pastoral ministry should never be engaged in for the sake of earning a pay check. When presented with an example of a gifted pastoral leader with fifteen years of fruitful ministry, the fact that this individual needed the job to support his or her family was considered to be reason to doubt their call. One participant phrased the criticism this way, “It seems like she needs a job, so therefore she’s returning to ministry. If you need a job, go work for Starbucks. The focus of ministry should not be to get paid for it.” This distinction

between “ministry” and “just a job” was a very strong dynamic and, above all, pastoral ministry should never be “just a job.”

Reference to the character or spirituality of the called individual was not absent from the discussion but it was clearly a secondary consideration. The model of call focused on the individual knowing their God-given role. It was about what the person should *do* rather than about who the person should *be*. Furthermore, the kinds of character issues that were raised were primarily about steadfastness in the face of opposition—do people persevere in doing what God has directed them to do despite resistance or despite difficult life circumstances? Character qualities referenced were traits like assurance, confidence, and perseverance. Participants cared about the character of a leader and expected a Christian leader to demonstrate mature spirituality. That this character requires formation as well as time and context for the formation is disassociated from the way the concept of call is framed.

Elements of a Mental Model of Leader

This research focused on investigating mental models of the experience of call to pastoral ministry. In this context certain expectations surfaced regarding the nature of pastoral leadership. Two key assumptions were present in the data: that pastors are God’s representatives and that pastors are empowered by God for their role. At some level, character was assumed—leaders should be mature—but this was a minor theme and only arose as an afterthought.

Within this Pentecostal/charismatic community, there is an expectation that pastors represent God—they hear from God and convey that revelation to the people they lead. Linked with this expectation of leader as representative is the belief that to legitimately be such a representative, a person must *know* God has appointed them to be a leader. Individuals are expected to have clear personal revelation if they are to be effective in the role of pastor. Participants made comments such as, “... obviously ... if you’re going to be involved in anything in ministry I think you need to know that you’re supposed to be there” and “Well, I’ve heard this so many times: you should never go into [pastoral ministry] if God hasn’t called you. It’s not going to work!”

An additional expectation about pastors was that the role can only be fulfilled adequately if the person is empowered by God. “I think that God has called us to something bigger than

ourselves,” one participant commented. “There has to be a call if it’s going to be life-giving and minister what God wants to people. Our best intentions can’t do that. He will gift and anoint that person for what he has to do.” This link between gifting and anointing on the one hand and between anointing and calling on the other was a recurring theme, especially related to the idea of call being from God. God determines who should be in the pastoral role and gives that person the gifts necessary to fulfill that role. “If [God] has called you for it,” asserted one participant, “He is going to equip you for it. He’s going to make sure that you get it done.” A person functioning “under the anointing,” then, is a person demonstrating the presence of the power of God in and through their God-given role.

This idea of “having the anointing” recurs in Pentecostal circles. For example, one participant said, “If I were to define calling, I would say that it has more to do with God’s anointing on a person’s life for what their divine purpose is.” How this group uses the idea of anointing may relate to what Cecil Robeck refers to in talking about gifted power: “it is ... Divinely bestowed power that makes it possible for the leader to lead.”²⁷

That said, however, despite the fact that all participants in this study came from a Pentecostal/charismatic context and all could identify when they were baptized in the Spirit, this group did not reference baptism in the Spirit as necessary for call to vocational ministry. This is entirely unlike early Pentecostal ministers who focused on baptism in the Spirit with speaking in tongues as an essential for ministry. Empowerment by God is important in the research context, but that empowerment is not focused on the classic Pentecostal experience of baptism in the Spirit. Furthermore, entirely absent is the classic *holiness* Pentecostal expectation of sanctification. A person must be called and empowered by God to be in pastoral ministry, according to these participants, but that empowerment is framed in general terms of giftedness and capacity, and does not include an element of character formation.

Implications for Framing Vocational Holiness

When analyzing the data from this research, comments specifically focused on the nature of call to vocational ministry did not include reference to the character of the individual. Rather, elements deemed to validate an individual’s personal sense of call were things like the confirmation of leaders, their perseverance against opposition, and the presence of God’s power

in and through their ministry. When asked directly about character, participants asserted that it is an essential quality in a pastor. At the same time, the mental model of call demonstrated in their judgments and choices indicated that, functionally, character is a secondary concern. Character of leaders and empowerment of leaders are both values for people in this context. However, anointing wins out over character. This dynamic suggests that a Pentecostal cognitive model of the experience of call to pastoral ministry lacks an expectation of spiritual formation as a part of the process of call.

As noted previously, mental models are salience-enhancing templates that impact what a person pays attention to in interpreting their experiences. The Church is rife with examples of gifted leaders who, through lack of character or mature spirituality, do great damage. Is it possible that the dominant model of the experience of call to pastoral ministry in this context encourages the self-identification of one who is called while facilitating blindness to issues of character formation? If a model of the experience of call to pastoral ministry does not include character formation or spiritual formation, this may account for some of the difficulty of attending to this formation as a part of leader development.

Furthermore, it may be possible that in attempting to reflect theologically on vocational holiness our efforts fall short of their hoped for outcome because they only address our espoused beliefs. Change may not ever happen without becoming aware of and dealing with the unconscious commitments evident in our behavior. If our theology does not address the essential elements of our mental models, we will not ultimately be able to hear or apply those truths; the way we frame our understanding of the world will functionally blind us to those very principles with which we need to engage as we interpret our life experiences. All the teaching on character and spirituality, all the theologizing about the necessity of spiritual formation, *if it does not fit the essential model of call* will not ultimately be heard, remembered, or applied to the interpretation of life experiences related to call.

I suggest two areas of consideration for future research and discussion. First, our efforts in theologizing about vocational ministry need to include reflection on the underlying beliefs demonstrated in how people interpret life experiences related to call. While we go to great lengths to practice to become good exegetes of scripture, we fail to see the need to exegete our mental models. Disciplines like cognitive anthropology offer tools for exegeting culture. Having gained understanding about how a particular group of people frames their concept of call

to vocational ministry, we can reflect theologically in a way that addresses not just what we affirm and espouse about that call, but how we actually practice. The theologian and the social scientist have much to contribute to each other's work for the sake of the Kingdom.

Second, for those of us who are leader formation practitioners, serious consideration is needed regarding the means of helping our students and mentorees consider their mental models. We must learn to help them draw their assumptions into the light and reflect upon them. Like Eugene Peterson, we encounter the chasm between our assumptions and our reality, between our expectations and our experience. In this context, careful exploration of our mental models—those we espouse and those we demonstrate in our behavior, those which are congruent and those which represent competing commitments—will facilitate the hard work of thinking theologically and developing spiritually toward vocational holiness.

¹ Eugene Peterson, *Under the Unpredictable Plant: An Exploration in Vocational Holiness* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1992), 1.

² ibid, 2. Peterson's particular concern is about the spirituality of the pastor. He laments the approach to ministry that would reduce the pastoral role to a transaction in which the pastor is paid to meet the spiritual needs of the congregation, an approach he refers to as vocational idolatry. Peterson coined the phrase "vocational holiness" to refer to that deep and passionate spirituality appropriate to the fulfillment of a call to pastoral ministry—a spirituality he sought and subsequently wrote about as a result of this season of his life.

³ Peterson acknowledges that other vocations "when embraced with biblically informed commitments are likewise demanding and require an equivalent spirituality" but that his focus is on vocational ministry (ibid, 4). Likewise, I acknowledge God calls His people to a multitude of roles.

⁴ William Placher, *Callings: Twenty Centuries of Christian Wisdom on Vocation* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005).

⁵ Os Guinness, *The Call: Finding and Fulfilling the Central Purpose of Your Life* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 4.

⁶ See for example Lee Hardy, *Fabric of This World: Inquiries into Calling, Career Choice, and the Design of Human Work* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1990) and Douglas James Schuurman, *Vocation: Discerning Our Callings in Life* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2004). A multitude of popular books, most generally focusing on the process of discerning one's call, also reflect this Reformed frame. These include, but are not limited to, Kevin and Kay Marie Brennfleck, *Live Your Calling: A Practical Guide to Finding and Fulfilling Your Mission in Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004), Aubrey Malphurs, *Maximizing Your Effectiveness: How to Discover and Develop Your Divine Design* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2006), and the mega-best seller, Richard Warren, *The Purpose Driven Church: Growth Without Compromising your Message & Mission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub., 1995).

⁷ Terry L. Cross, *Answering the Call in the Spirit: Pentecostal Reflections on a Theology of Vocation, Work and Life* (Cleveland TN: Lee University Press, 2007), 5. A search of the journal, *Pneuma*, for the key word term "vocation" resulted in the identification of just two articles: Frank D. Macchia, "Finitum Capax Infiniti: A Pentecostal Distinctive?" *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 29, no. 2 (2007): 185-87, and Jeffrey Gros

FSC, "It Seems Good to the Holy Spirit and to Us: The Ecclesial Vocation of the Pentecostal Scholar," *Pneuma: The Journal Of The Society For Pentecostal Studies* 34, no. 2 (July 2012): 167-184.

⁸ Cross, *Answering the Call of the Spirit*, 33.

⁹ Eric Newberg, Relevance of Early Pentecostal Missionary Call Narratives. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Seattle Pacific University, 2013.

¹⁰ Steven M. Fettke and Robby Waddell, eds. *Pentecostals in the Academy: Testimonies of Call* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2012).

¹¹ Claudia Währisch-Oblau, *The Missionary Self-Perception of Pentecostal/Charismatic Church Leaders from the Global South in Europe: Bringing Back the Gospel* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009), and DeLonn Lynn Rance, "The Empowered Call: the Activity of the Holy Spirit in Salvadoran Assemblies of God Missionaries" (PhD diss., School of Intercultural Studies, Fuller Theological Seminary, 2004).

¹² Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: a Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan, 2005).

¹³ Cheryl Bridges Johns, *Pentecostal Formation: A Pedagogy Among the Oppressed*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, Supplement series 2. (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

¹⁴ Miroslav Volf, *Work in the Spirit: Toward a Theology of Work* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), vii.

¹⁵ ibid, viii. Emphasis in the original.

¹⁶ Claudia Strauss, *Models and Motives. In Human Motives and Cultural Models*, edited by R. G. D'Andrade and C. Strauss. (Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3. The terms schema, frame, script, and model are all used in cognitive anthropology, often interchangeably.

¹⁷ See Peter M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook: Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization* (New York: Currency Doubleday, 1994), 164, and Geert Hofstede and Gert Jan Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005), 3.

¹⁸ Bradd Shore, *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 315.

¹⁹ Chris Argyris "Teaching Smart People How to Learn," *Harvard Business Review* 69 (1991): 99-109, and Chris Argyris, and Donald A. Schon, *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

²⁰ Roy G. D'Andrade, "Some Methods for Studying Cultural Cognitive Structures," In *Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods*, edited by N. Quinn. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 90.

²¹ Naomi Quinn, "How to Reconstruct Schema People Share, From What They Say," In *Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods*, edited by N. Quinn. (New York: Palgrave MacMillian, 2005).

²² Bernard, H. Russell. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000): 264-276.

²³ Stephen P. Borgatti, *ANTHROPAC 4.98* (Natick, MA: Analytic Technologies, 1996).

²⁴ A. Kimball Romney, William H. Batchelder, and Susan C. Weller, "Recent Applications of Cultural Consensus Theory," *American Behavioral Scientist* 31 no.2 (1987): 163-177.

²⁵ Roy G. D'Andrade, Some Methods for Studying Cultural Cognitive Structures. In *Finding Culture in Talk*, edited by N. Quinn. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

²⁶ Geert Hofstede, and Gert Jan Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005), and Robert Neelly Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

²⁷ Cecil M. Robeck, “A Pentecostal Perspective on Leadership”, In *Traditions in Leadership: How Faith Traditions Shape the Way We Lead*, edited by Richard J. Mouw and Eric O. Jacobsen. (Pasadena, CA: De Pree Leadership Center, 2006), 140.