How to educate professionals for learning new knowledge?

A comparison of learning approaches in Dutch and Norwegian pastor education.

Is there a way to know how to deal with and to act when unexpected challenges press on? In this article, I will explore how to educate for learning new knowledge in value-based professions. Taking a starting point in the sociomaterial learning theories of Paavola and Hakkarainen (2005) I analyse the course descriptions in the professional pastor education in the Netherlands and in Norway. The findings show unexpected and various practices of learning new knowledge in the Dutch and the Norwegian pastor education. Based on these findings I present a model for how professional education can develop learning new knowledge.

Av Ingrid Reite Christensen (f. 1974), Ph.D, førsteamanuensis i pedagogikk ved Høgskolen i Sørøst-Norge. E-post: Ingrid.reite@hbv.no

Keywords: Professional learning, professional education, knowledge creation, changing knowledge society, pastor education

WHAT ARE THE LEARNING CHALLENGES OF PASTORS IN THE CHURCH OF NORWAY?

Pastor Ole: 'It is to listen to...what others perceive. Because...we have an academic background and have grown up in a church context and have in a way...our frame of references there. And then others with a quite different background, education, all different references, another life, a totally different everyday life, who will hear a text and relate to a text and find out what this text is about. And then you can get some surprises'.

Pastor Omar: ‘So, we have learned from these immigrants and the local needs, then. We have really done that. Even though we haven’t precisely made a revolution in the local church in any way, but we have… we don’t only read the holy scriptures, we try to read our local community too.’

These quotes are fetched from a fieldwork interview about education and work among pastors (Reite 2013, Reite 2015). Many of the pastors expressed how education often facilitate learning strategies of memorizing and retrieving knowledge. They saw weak links between education and professional work, and that education offered few possibilities for handling new situations at work and new strategies for professional learning. As a lecturer of future teachers at the University of Southeast-Norway, I am continually faced with the same challenges in teacher educa-
My colleagues and I have a quite good apparatus for setting aims for competencies and knowledge in our subjects. We also evaluate and measure particular learning outcomes. What is often more blurred, is how a student can develop strategies for new learning in professional education, which is the theme for this article.

Some would maybe question why I bring up learning new knowledge in theological education. What about learning the foundations of the theological discipline, the common history and practices, the core of pastors’ professional knowledge?

Learning, I hold, is not only a process of transferring a settled knowledge base to students. Instead, learning happens in various ways, equipping the future professional for learning in different degrees. On the one hand, there is one kind of learning that typically describes how to learn something “by heart”, or how to refer to certain information. According to such a view, learning represents a defined and ready-made knowledge package (Sfard 1998). On the other hand, we speak about another way of learning when people say they have to “learn by doing” (Ibid.). They learn from living, from taking part in an activity or experiencing something. These ways of learning can be valuable. However, in this article I want to focus on yet another learning practice. It is labeled “learning new knowledge” (Paavola & Hakkarainen, 2005). This can mean knowing how to deal with and to act when unexpected challenges press on. In addition, the professional discipline of pastors does not necessarily represent a settled knowledge base. Theology and religion are not only are object to change, but are change (Afdal, 2013; Henriksen, 2014). Learning new knowledge is what might be the only way of learning for many professionals, as they experience rearrangements and new challenges at work. Thus, as in the quotes from pastor Ole and pastor Omar above, to develop “professional expertise” calls for much more than recalling predefined knowledge.

In this article, I will revisit a pedagogical debate about how to educate for learning new knowledge in value-based professions. I will explore the curricula of the pastor education in Norway and in the Netherlands, arguing that there is a need for developing conceptual tools for learning new knowledge, and to bring these tools into use. Professional learning in education is not the same as teaching methods. Instead, I focus on the foundations for how learning can happen. This means that the framing of knowledge and methods all together make a ground for particular ways of knowing and learning. In this article I ask: How do the professional education of pastors in the Netherlands and in Norway develop learning of new knowledge?

The aim of this article is to explore how learning new knowledge is conceptualized and which forms this kind of learning that the curriculum of the professional education for pastors employs. The article is structured as following: First, I give a short review of research of learning in theological education. Then I give an outline of methodological stances with descriptions of features of the empirical material and the elaboration of an analytical tool for exploring the learning of new knowledge. Taking a starting point in Paavola and Hakkarainen’s theoretical concepts of knowledge creation, I then analyse the approaches to learning new knowledge in the pastor education in Norway and in the Netherlands. The findings of the analysis reveals a spectre of concepts for learning new knowledge in the pastor education curriculum, which might bring a new dimension to
the development of pedagogy in professional education.

RESEARCHING LEARNING IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Professional learning is a vast field, and so is research about theological education. There is huge engagement in the international debate about how learning in theological education should go on, both theoretically and empirically. These studies can be divided into two major categories:

On the one hand, there is a discussion of fruitful learning methodologies in theological education. Many have raised theological education as an interactive process between teachers and students. Education should be anything but seeing students as ‘empty bottles to be filled’ (Buhrman, 2011; Raja & Rajkumar, 2010). Instead, theological seminaries require a complex body of theological knowledge to develop people of faith and vocation (Calahan, 2011; Fuller & Fleming, 2005). This complex theological knowledge is conditioned by for instance experiential learning and reflective practice. Experiential learning provides a fruitful context for integrating affective, performative as well as intellectual perspectives of religion (Heywood, 2013; Oldstone-Moore, 2009). Sng (2011) takes this one step further. She argues that inquiry is one way to acquire quality in theological education. Through following a specific method of inquiry-guided learning, students can develop skills, attitudes and habits of independent thinking. Wickett (2005) brings elements from all these approaches together. He frames how new models of learning are taken into use in different traditions of theological education, including self-directed, experiential and transformative learning.

On the other hand, many have thematised the learning as an existential enterprise and creating conditions for theological knowledge that expands traditional education frames. As Jarvis and Hirji (2006) underline, religious learning is existential – and demands moving past the frames of cognitive learning theories. Learning is not only ‘in the head’. Jarvis holds that learning should be an extensive term and include knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, emotions, beliefs and senses. All these elements can be framed as ‘experiences’, establishing traces of lifelong learning (Jarvis, 2006:6). Jarvis’ understanding forms a relevant background for how new knowledge is conceptualized in this article. So is also Harkness’ (2012) survey of learning approaches in theological education. He emphasises how meta-learning and critical thinking can enable life-long personal growth and professional development. What seems to be important in both national and international debate is how different learning practices are not only matters of pedagogical methodology and didactics. Instead, creating new knowledge touches upon how learning also represents existential and ontological matters for theological education.

The last five years there has been an increased focus on how pedagogy and learning create particular conditions for the pastor profession. For example, Schøien (2011) takes on a didactical position and investigates how clergy learn oral skills in theological education. Mosdøl (2015) discusses how different approaches to learning change the pastor role in a church service reform. My former PhD project established learning as a key issue for how the profession and expertise of pastors are radically changed (Reite, 2013; Reite, 2015). The focus on creating new knowledge is explored by for instance Nygaard and Afdal
Prismet forskning (2015) in their study of theological education for deacons. Reite and Mogstad (2014) investigate learning approaches in Norwegian and Dutch curricula for theological education. The results of this study show that the Norwegian curriculum favors learning as ready-made knowledge and learning acquisition, and to some degree sees learning as participation in learning fellowships. The Dutch curriculum emphasizes learning new knowledge to a larger degree than the Norwegian curriculum. In this article I will go further into how learning new knowledge is part of the curriculum of professional pastor education, and which forms this new knowledge takes.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO LEARNING NEW KNOWLEDGE

In this article I do not see learning only as a pathway from A to B. Neither do I only understand learning as teaching methods. Instead, I explore the grounds for how education facilitates professional learning. Paavola and Hakkarainen (2005) offer a meta description of learning that might be useful (Reite, 2013) for analyzing learning new knowledge in pastor education. They label learning new knowledge as “knowledge creation”, being my analytical term for learning new knowledge in this article. Paavola and Hakkarainen hold that it is not only the society “around” professionals that changes. Along with these changes, the conceptions, practices and social organization of learning can also be transformed (2005:541).

In their article, Paavola and Hakkarainen (2005) give a metaanalysis of learning theories. They take a starting point in Sfard’s (1998) two metaphors of learning, namely learning as acquisition and learning as participation. An acquisition view of learning relies on the idea that knowledge is a property of an individual mind (Paavola and Hakkarainen 2005:537.). The acquisition approach to learning highlights the role of mental models or schemata in learning. The basic unit of analysis is the individual. In pastor education, this could for instance mean that knowledge is presented as clear-cut competencies and schemata of progress. Knowledge is considered something that is processed inside of the human mind, and can be analysed separately from the material world and social environment (ibid:538). Paavola and Hakkarainen therefore see acquisition learning as “monological” (ibid:539).

The other approach is learning as participation. Participation learning labels an interactive and social process (ibid:538). Rather than acquiring a set of knowledge competencies, the aims of participation learning are to become a member of a community and acquire the skills to communicate and act according to negotiated norms (ibid.). The main analytical unit, then, is on social relations and how to participate in a culture. Learning as participation is what Paavola and Hakkarainen see as “dialogical” (ibid:539), establishing a reflective movement between learners. In theological education, this would for instance mean to teach how to conduct a church service according to existing norms and traditions.

Paavola and Hakkarainen argue that the acquisition and participation learning approaches do not in particular foreground new and innovative knowledge. Therefore, there is a need for a third approach. This approach they label “learning as knowledge creation”. “Knowledge creation” comprises learning theories like for instance the cultural-historical activity theory of Engeström (2001), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) or Bereiter (2002). Learning as knowledge crea-
tion has three major features:

First, learning as knowledge creation addresses the need for knowledge advancement and innovation (Paavola and Hakkarainen 2005: 535, 544-545). There might be objects of work that are not necessarily clearly defined, but instead are described as emergent problems (Paavola and Hakkarainen 2005: 536). This does not mean that history and former experiences are unimportant, as they play an important role in creating new knowledge (Engeström 2001). Paavola and Hakkarainen underlines, though, that learning as knowledge creation moves beyond individual reflection. According to such a view learning means to take in complex contexts in collaborative problem solving. In education, this means for instance taking everyday problems into discussion, valuing the generation of new ideas and conceptual knowledge (ibid: 551).

Second, knowledge creation learning is a collaborative work with mediating artifacts. Material tools and knowledge objects play increasingly important roles in this process. This means for instance that the main focus of an analysis is on the work situations demanding the development of material and conceptual artifacts. Typical objects for such an approach could be to collaboratively help pastor Ole and pastor Omar (above) to develop a reading of a text – but also how this text is played out by the listeners and create a movement between the pastors, the text and people. Thus, Paavola and Hakkarainen call knowledge creation a “trialogical” approach to learning (Ibid: 535, 539). In education, this could mean that the students are encouraged to make a problem more complex by triangulating new theories or experimenting in practice (ibid: 538,542).

Third, developing new objects is associated with creative ‘chaos’ and includes multiple actors and agencies (Paavola and Hakkarainen: 538, 551). In education, knowledge creation learning places less emphasis on instructional control. Instead, students are given the roles and responsibilities of expert-like learners (ibid: 542).

In this article I will explore the possibilities that Paavola and Hakkarainen’s theoretical perspectives about knowledge creation learning can offer in an analysis of new professional knowledge in pastor education. However, the way I use Paavola and Hakkarainen is not a quite deductive one; instead the methodological course descriptions and analytical strategy also contribute to developing an analytical tool for analysing pastor education. How I do this, I will describe in the next section about methodological issues.

CURRICULUM ANALYSIS – WHY, WHAT AND HOW? METHODS AND ANALYTICAL TOOL
In this article, I analyze curriculum texts as social practices, although having in mind that these are mediated differently than for instance classroom interactions. However, course descriptions can be interesting in many respects: Course descriptions are supposed to guarantee the quality of education, they bring directives and mediate underlying values of what and how to teach in the classroom. Curriculum texts are commonly worked upon through history, and by many people. In this way written texts are parts of social practices derived from space and time, and can be seen as foundational for further action (Wertsch, 2007: 112).

Sampling is a process of considering cultural and conceptual differences along with making equivalences (Crossley and Watson 2003). I analyze the curriculum texts of
mandatory courses from MF Norwegian school of theology (MF) in Norway and from Protestantse Theologische Universiteit (PThU) in the Netherlands. I have selected course descriptions from MF because it is one of the main institutions educating pastors in Norway.¹ The Dutch PThU is the only institution educating pastors for the Dutch Protestant Church. Norwegian theological education has much in common with the German academic tradition, whereas Dutch theological education, is to a larger degree influenced by British and American pragmatic traditions (Visser, den Hollander, & Vischer, 2010: 662). Thus, the two institutions can be considered comparable, yet with fruitful differences (Blömeke and Paine 2008). When it comes to religion, freedom and plurality of religion and culture have been central values for centuries in the Netherlands.² Protestantism represents a minority along with Roman Catholics (about 20%).³ In Norway Protestantism has been a state religion in Norway until 2012, and 82 percent of the population are members of the Church of Norway.⁴

However, there are also some important possible similarities between the two countries. In both countries, the theological education follows the European standard credit point structure of bachelor levels and higher degree levels. Both institutions offer a six-year study with a master’s degree, forming the basis for the professional title “pastor.” There are many overlapping course themes. When doing the analysis, the course descriptions from both MF and PThU have many common headings and formulations, such as ‘content,’ ‘goals,’ ‘competencies,’ ‘methods’ and ‘assessment.’ These headings form the grounds for analysis of how learning new knowledge is practiced in the curricula.

The material for the curriculum analysis consists of course descriptions from mandatory parts of the higher degree courses of the theological education at MF and at the PThU. In both countries, the graduate level extends over three years. To describe texts of the same level of detail, I choose to analyze Dutch course descriptions and Norwegian course descriptions, and I supplement these by specific semester descriptions (‘Emneark’).⁵ To identify the principal patterns, I employ certain quantitative coding strategies and counted the representation of each learning approach in every course category (Silverman, 2010: 159).⁶

Doing an in-depth content analysis, I aim to find out how learning new knowledge took shape in the course descriptions on a conceptual basis. Thus, I treat the curriculum of the PThU and MF as one set of material. The content analysis left me with various categories that could not be labelled learning as acquisi-

¹ The Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo and MHS School of Mission and Theology at Stavanger also offer theological education for pastors of the Norwegian Church. As a step in the sampling process I analysed the course descriptions from two main theological institutions in Norway, namely MF Norwegian school of Theology (MF) and Theological Faculty at the University of Oslo. The findings are published in Reite (2011). In spite of minor differences I conclude that the two institutions bring quite similar findings. MF course descriptions are therefore selected for further analyses.


⁴ Two course descriptions draw on documents from the national program, The Road to Pastoral Ministry (‘Veien til prestetjeneste’ - VTP). This program is therefore also analysed.

⁵ For further descriptions of methodological procedures, including the issues of translation, see Reite and Mogstad (2014).
I have worked out an analytical table of Paavola and Hakkarainens knowledge creation metaphor (Table 1). This table has been elaborated abductively between theoretical learning concepts and empirical curriculum material. I use them as three “pedagogical” categories: “Content” includes aims, competencies and knowledge descriptions. “Methods” describes tools, activities and organization of courses. “Relations” label formulations and words that indicate a focus on a singular student, on collectives, what kind of role the students and the lecturers play, and so on. When analyzing learning in pastor education, I will explore in detail how content, methods and relations work together and establish specific practices of knowledge creation.

This analytical concept map contributes as a tool for analyzing how learning new knowledge appears in the course descriptions of the Norwegian and the Dutch pastor education, which now comes next.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Methods/tools</th>
<th>Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge creation</strong></td>
<td>“Trialogic” or “triangulating”. Course describes a need for new knowledge and innovative learning. Either theoretical new knowledge or new knowledge in life-world experiences. A starting point in tensions and differences.</td>
<td>Collection of various resources and knowledge bases to be used as tools to create something new. Solving problems. Critical discussions. Lectures described as “resource lectures”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Analytical concept map of knowledge creation learning

**ANALYSING THE COURSE DESCRIPTIONS IN THE DUTCH AND THE NORWEGIAN PASTOR EDUCATION: SEVEN MODES OF KNOWLEDGE CREATION**

During the analysis of knowledge creation learning, one important insight was gained: Learning new knowledge cannot be described as one neat category. Instead, as I have explored the course descriptions, multiple forms of knowledge creation appeared. For instance, some course descriptions feature a critical comparison and triangulation of literature. Thus, the course descriptions encourage new knowledge as the establishment of new theoretical positions. In other course descriptions however, the students are challenged to solve very complex problems in their internship congregations. They are encouraged to figure out new solutions with the help of the local community, with the staff in the congregation as well as with theory and student discussions. In both cases, I find that the theological education facilitates learning new knowledge, but in very different ways. Thus, I have explored the course descriptions in depth, finding that there were not just a few, but many forms and modes of learning new knowledge. I categorized them into no less than seven modes of knowledge creation, which I now present in Table 2.
Table 2 shows seven forms of knowledge creation. Knowledge creation is described as “modes”. This means on the one hand that they describe different ways that knowledge creation is practiced in the curricula. On the other hand, describing them as “modes” also indicates that they are not completely separable. In the course descriptions the modes appear on a continuum, from descriptions of students reading a text with some critical distance and towards solving real-life problems in the practice field. This continuum has three main field categories, namely “Theoretical knowledge creation” (1-3), “Boundary knowledge creation” (4-5) and “Frontier knowledge creation” (6-7).

**Theoretical knowledge creation modes**

A *first* mode of learning outlines knowledge creation in the theoretical field. A theoretical approach to knowledge creation refers to courses describing a critical position by means of a theory. It describes a general critical distance between two or more theoretical texts. One example of this is for instance the Norwegian course “Ethics and philosophy of Religion”[^8]. In this course, the students shall gain ‘…insight in and a good ability to discuss how positions in theological ethics can be justified.’ The students are not only expected to intake theoretical positions, but to discuss them. When it comes to the methods, the students will be reading and discussing. The stu-

---

[^7]: The continuum takes up the question of context. “Context” may refer to sites. More importantly, in this analysis it is the complexity of contexts that constitute the continuum. According to Singleton (2011) “context” does not refer to the setting within which local practices fit or do not fit. She says that context emerges as a productive, precarious and potentially mobile effect of contexts touching. Contexts then allow alternative versions of realities. In this analysis, I tentatively describe context as the.

[^8]: ”Ethics and philosophy of Religion” (”Etikk og religionsfilosofi”).
students have a choice of readings and a choice of examination method. There are no further descriptions. Paavola and Hakkarainen hold that a common object and a problem is crucial to new knowledge. Discussing can then represent a quite moderate way of knowledge creation. When it comes to relations, however, the course still focuses on the individual in terms of ‘the student’. Paavola and Hakkarainen underline collaborative activity as crucial to creating new knowledge.

The second mode of learning elaborates the theoretical triangulations. A short example of this is the Norwegian course “Church history”\(^9\), in one of the competency goals: The students are supposed to obtain “good ability to discuss the philosophical conditions of theological work starting with Kant and Schleiermacher”. The third mode refers to relating theory to “relevant” contexts or to “society”, “church” and so on. An example of this is the Norwegian course “The Church in the religious encounter”. The course aims at “…good ability to reflect on how the religious encounter can renew the Christian self-understanding”. Thus, the student is challenged to establish a connection between theoretical knowledge and other contexts in general.

**Boundary knowledge creation**

The ‘boundary knowledge creation’ modes label an expansion of the context of professional education. Reading, observation and internship placements are combined. The fourth mode takes specific situations into account when dealing with theory. In the fourth mode theory can be confronted with specific situations in practice, like casework. One example is from the Dutch course “The message of the prophets in ancient Israel”\(^10\). It says: “In a paper exegesis of the prophetic texts [the student shall] show that he/she is capable of independently analyzing scientifically based texts from the OT\(^{11}\) and in a biblical-theological perspective apply this to preaching”. However, there are also descriptions of knowledge creation taking place in an internship place. A fifth mode of knowledge creation is based on observation. For example, when students are in an internship placement, they get a theme or a task to develop, like ‘conflict’ or ‘compassion’. The students then observe conflict in the light of theory but also relevant practice tasks in the internship placements. In this mode the pastor students experience an increasing complexity of actors and sites. Triangulation is in the fifth mode then based on observation: “Students observe, in the light of the studied theory, a relevant liturgical and homiletic practice in the internship practice”\(^12\).

**Frontier knowledge creation**

Some courses go further and challenge the students to take part in and evaluate relevant activities. This represents a sixth mode of knowledge creation. The Norwegian course “Pastoral Internship and Liturgical Training”\(^13\) aims at giving the students the “ability to cooperate in the planning, perform-

---

9 “Church history 1: History of theology and dogma” (“Kirkehistorie 1: Teologi- og dogmehistorie”).
10 The example is from the Dutch course “The message of the prophets in ancient Israel” (“De boodschap van de profeten van Israel/Exegese OT”).
11 The Old Testament
12 The example is from the Dutch course “Practical Theology/Worship II” (“Geloofspraktijken in sociaal culturele netwerken II”).
13 The course is called “Stiftspraksis og liturgisk øvelse” in Norwegian.
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mance and evaluation of services, and to lead a church service workshop”. The context and real needs of the student are brought into the light, and out of this the student is supposed to find out what kind of knowledge sources are necessary to answer special challenges or problems. Against the background of the internship period, knowledge seems to be defined out of what the students have “a special need to acquire”, what challenges and “areas of growth and change”. However, there is even a seventh and more complex knowledge creation mode. This is when theory, practices and relevant situations are challenged from different perspectives. One good example of this is the Dutch course ”Ministry and leadership” (“Ambetelijk leidinggeven”): “The student can support learning of faith in different contexts, inside and outside the church”. Another example from the same course is the following: “The student manages the tension between the congregation and the preacher, grasps the embedded cultural and social cultural customs of the church and initiates a new, transformative strategy”. In other words, there is a triangulating and culmination of contexts that the pastor student is supposed to handle, solving real-life problems on a collective basis.

ANALYZING (EV ANALYSING) COURSE DESCRIPTIONS: WHICH KNOWLEDGE CREATION MODES DOMINATE?

During the exploration of knowledge creation modes in the pastor education, I became curious about what kind of knowledge creation learning dominates in Norway and in the Netherlands. I found that the two countries showed quite different knowledge creation profiles. In the following, I present an overview of which modes dominate the picture of knowledge creation in the Dutch and the Norwegian curricula. I also analyze which kinds of courses emphasize one mode or another.

In Table 3 I separate the analysis of knowledge creation modes in the Norwegian courses from the Dutch courses, and specify which of the seven modes of knowledge dominate each course category. The ”dominant” is the category with a clear dominance. The ”few” has typically zero or just a few (up to two) references in the course descriptions. The light grey represent “some references”. The overview in Table 3 also gives an impression of the knowledge creation modes in the methods and contents.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Norwegian courses lean heavily on the theoretical knowledge creation that refers to having a critical position to a theory, triangulating theoretical positions in new ways. I found knowledge creation references in all course categories, but not in both content and methods. In the integrative course categories, however, there were only references to the frontier problem solving modes in methods. This might indicate segregated practices of knowledge creation in the Norwegian curriculum. The many white spots in the Norwegian part of Table 3 also indicate an absence of different knowledge

14 For pragmatic reasons, this analysis includes content and methods and not relations.
creation modes. Altogether, I understand these bits and pieces of knowledge creation learning as limited or fragmented practices of knowledge creation in the Norwegian curricula.

The Dutch courses, however, have a richer palette of knowledge creation learning modes. In some course categories, knowledge creation could include both theoretical triangulation, orientation towards the boundary and the frontier knowledge creation modes. The Dutch courses have an emphasis on the boundary modes of knowledge creation. When I consider content and methods, there is no specific pattern of knowledge creation modes, but the whole range of modes seems to be integrated in the curricula of the Dutch pastor education.

**SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNING NEW KNOWLEDGE IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION**

How do the professional education of pastors in the Netherlands and in Norway develop learning of new knowledge? The main finding shows that learning new knowledge in the Dutch and the Norwegian pastor education has rich and multiple practices. The analysis displays seven entire modes of knowledge creation. These seven modes of learning describe a continuum. In the one end of the scale, pastors learn new knowledge from theoretical tasks, demanding limited triangulation. In the other end, pastor students must be frontiers and deal with complicated cases, demanding a collaborative effort and a wide range of knowledge sources. The Norwegian courses emphasize the theoretical knowledge cre-
ation modes, and in quite fragmented ways. The Dutch courses develop an integrated loop of all knowledge creation learning modes.

The Norwegian curricula display a constrained and fragmented approach to knowledge creation. The very same education is also dominated by reproducing learning approaches (Reite and Mogstad 2014). The findings in this article reinforce the picture of a Norwegian pastor education with a limited repertoire for developing new knowledge. I therefore argue that there is a need for further development of the conceptual and practical tools for learning new knowledge in pastor education.

A limited knowledge creation profile of pastor education might be compared with the challenges of other value-based professions in Norway. The results of extensive research projects on learning among different professions in Norway show that teachers develop new knowledge or engage with new knowledge only to a limited extent (Jensen, Lahn, & Nerland, 2012; Klette & Carlsten, 2012). Teachers often find themselves without necessary tools to mediate between scientific knowledge advancements and practical work (Fenwick, Jensen, & Nerland, 2012; Nerland, 2012). One consequence is that “teachers may find themselves in a vacuum, restricting the space of knowledge engagement” (Nerland 2012:41). Another consequence can be that professionals might lack the appropriate knowledge provisions for further development (Klette og Karlsten 2012:80).

What are the challenges when value-based professions fall short of learning new knowledge? A limited learning profile can challenge the strength of a professional mandate. In many value-based professions, the boundaries of professional knowledge are often weak (Klette & Carlsten, 2012). On the one hand, a limited knowledge creation profile can show that education becomes a separated practice from work. If this is the case, education also becomes weaker as a space of professional formation and consolidation. Furthermore, limiting the knowledge engagement might challenge pastors’ abilities to meet with everyday needs in professional work. Thus, pastors have less opportunities to meet its societal mandate (Fenwick et al., 2012).

Would Pastor Ole and pastor Omar have solved their challenges more easily if they had been educated with a more extensive apparatus of learning new knowledge? To meet the learning challenges of pastors, there is a need for more than definitions of the essence of professional knowledge. Instead of freeze-framing professional knowledge, professions gain their strength by developing their knowledge- and learning cultures (Nerland 2012).

The seven modes of knowledge creation might represent more than a practical organizing of theory and internship placements in education. Instead, elaborating on knowledge creation is one way to conceptualize and establish tools for mapping and developing professional education. A knowledge creation approach can for instance establish new sites for knowledge, more extensive ways of using internship placements and possibilities for being part of a research-oriented practice.

There is a huge need for further explorations of the possibilities for learning new knowledge among value-based professional education. The curriculum approach in this article is only one way to conceptualize and map how education facilitates knowledge creation practices. Classroom observations with informal decisions and complex interactions would bring valuable additions to what learning new knowledge is and can be in professional education.
Developing knowledge creation learning in pastor education does not undermine dogma, history, traditions and established church practices. However, instead of keeping to reproductive learning approaches, the knowledge creation modes can contribute towards putting established knowledge into practical use through discussion, testing and elaboration. Thus, this article is a challenge for professional education to expand notions of learning new knowledge. The seven knowledge creation modes might offer a way to connect students to the many times and spaces that their profession represents.

A professional mandate is continually created, deconstructed and recreated (Abbot 1988). In this article I pinpoint how the pastor education is on the move, and also expand the ways of how the future pastors can move along. Thus, change and knowledge creation learning are not stumble stones for any professional mandate, but rather a possibility for strengthening the position of a profession. In a changing knowledge society, it is crucial to take new ways of learning into account. The way students learn shapes what kind of professionals they become.
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