Table 1. Forman's taxonomy of historic and recent theological institutions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Historic | Recent |
| Location | Close to villages. Students connected to familial networks. | In major urban centres. Students removed from familial networks. Requires travel and increased accommodation costs. |
| Curriculum | Taught in vernacular. Curriculum includes theology, literacy, and gardening, to ensure sustainability. | Courses taught in English. Greater library resources, but in an ‘alien’ tongue. Implementation of international higher education benchmarking. Curriculum includes theology and sociology. Theoretical frames allow critique of context and tradition. |
| Practices of learning | Lower pre-requisites.Less time for study, due to practical gardening requirements. | Higher pre-requisites. More time for study, due to a decrease in the time needed for gardening. |
| Economic | Cheaper, requiring less staff and based on a gardening economy, which is essentially self-sufficient. | Requires significant external funding, both for staff and student support. |
| Educational | Theological colleges were the main educational option and gained the most capable students. | The rise in educational options across the Pacific means theological colleges are competing for students. |
| Demographics | Average age 40. | Younger cohort in twenties. |
| Teaching resources | One teacher. | Team of specialists, often with a high degree of dependence on foreign personnel. |