❧

THE ADOPTION OF COMMUNICATION THEORY MODELS IN HOMILETICS

MIKE CHANDLER
St. Cloud, FL

ABSTRACT

Communication theory grew out of the mathematical theories of Claude Elwood Shannon and Warren Weaver. In the two decades that followed, their theories were carried forward by the likes of Fearing Franklin, Milton Dickens, Wilbur Schramm, and others. Since then, numerous homileticians have taken notice of communication theory and adopted theorized models for speech-communication and mass-communication into their own homiletics writings. Examination of relevant works in homiletics reveals the communication models adopted in the last fifty-five years have remained mostly unchanged in that time. The present article reveals the extent and the static state of the adoption of communication theory in homiletics.

INTRODUCTION

Modern communication theory permeated at least a portion of the field of homiletics, as reflected in its presence in the works of homiletics authors of the last fifty-five years.[1] Beginning in 1948, Claude Elwood Shannon, Warren Weaver, Fearing Franklin, Milton Dickens, Wilbur Schramm, Donald F. Roberts, Bruce Westley, Malcolm MacLean, David K. Berlo and others theorized on the characteristics and function of communication. Their theories can be traced into the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries in the homiletics writings of: Clyde H. Reid, J. Daniel

Baumann, Merrill Abbey, Chester A. Pennington, George E. Sweazey, J. Randall Nichols, Myron Raymond Chartier, John Stott, Bryan Chapell, J. Randall Nichols, Jerry Vines and Jim Shaddix, Wayne McDill, Hershael W. York and Bert Decker, and Stephen Rummage. Even the later authors neglected to consider developments in communication theory beyond the mid-twentieth century. The field of communication theory itself offered them few favors, itself falling into a malaise of possibly-outdated models requiring further evolution based on more-modern trends. Robert T. Craig described the malaise:

> The "field" of communication theory came to resemble in some ways a pest-control device called the Roach Motel that used to be advertised on TV: Theories check in, but they never check out. Communication scholars seized upon every idea about communication, whatever its provenance, but accomplished little with most of them—entombed them, you might say, after removing them from the disciplinary environments in which they had thrived and were capable of propagating. Communication scholars contributed few original ideas of their own.[2]

Craig's indictment suggests theories in the field are readily welcomed and piecemealed with previous ideas, to be accepted permanently and without question. His indictment may be unfair since the field is less than a century old. However, his words serve as a warning against complacency in the field itself and certainly a cautionary word against other fields that adopt communication theories without considering the need for updated models. If homiletics authors continue referencing theories now more than sixty years old, perhaps they risk complacency as well.

The purpose of the present work is to assess the level to which mid-twentieth century communication theory has been adopted in homiletics works of the last fifty-five years (the period of time since David K. Berlo's *The Process of Communication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*).

Communication Theory Models

Littejohn and Foss outlined the history of communication theory models in their *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*. They wrote, "Early communication theory took the form of models," which C. David Mortenson suggested must be viewed "as a systematic representation of an object or event in idealized and abstract form."[3] No communication theory model can account for every human circumstance. Each model may only attempt to capture the thoughts, attitudes, and perceptions of the time in which it was created (and homiletics authors of this century continue referencing models of the 1960s!). The field of study is fluid and therefore the development and adoption of its models are likewise.

ADOPTION OF COMMUNICATION THEORY IN HOMILETICS

In the last fifty years, some authors on preaching have adopted many of the conceptualized models of communication theory developed in the mid-twentieth century. The adoption is peppered in homiletics writings since the 1960s. In 1976, Chester Pennington also suggested the adoption was societally phenomenological. He wrote:

> In bewildering profusion, mass media have multiplied during the past quarter century. Radio, magazines, newspapers, and TV have assaulted our senses with amazing power and variety. Some of the best talents of our time, funded with apparently limitless financial resources, are dedicated to the not always noble arts of manipulation and persuasion. Small wonder that serious students of communication theory speak of an information explosion, or communication explosion, and of total immersion in a welter of input overload.[4]

According to Pennington, patterns of consumption conditioned people for specific patterns of thought and therefore patterns of communication as well. Such conditioning was naturally reflected in homiletics literature as much as it appeared in other fields of study. The adoption of communication theory was phenomenological—invading and occupying the thought and speech patterns of preachers and congregations everywhere.

Pennington marked the phenomenon by its devaluation of words.[5] However, it is more accurately defined by the loss of trust in the words associated with its era. Pennington wrote, "Many of the cleverest efforts at communication are commercially motivated. Their persuasive earnestness is an act design to sell us something. Words are used in order to manipulate us—and we know it. As a consequence, the integrity of language is destroyed."[6] David Martin Lloyd-Jones described a similar sentiment in conveying the ideas of Stanley Baldwin: "… if a man is a great speaker he is a man whom you cannot trust, and is not quite honest."[7] As Rosenstock-Huessy put it, "Words are trifles, to most men. They have heard them too often. It is all fake, advertising, propaganda, lying. Indeed it is."[8] Pennington added, "Words do not necessarily mean what they say. The real peril may be that we have learned to live with dishonesty and to accept it as an everyday fact."[9] As much as man had lost confidence in words, Pennington asserted he has lost confidence in the relevance of discourse, speaking specifically of preaching:

> During the past decade or so it has been asserted that communication theory demonstrates preaching to be an outmoded means of communication which should be replaced by something more appropriate to our electronic age. So it has gone for thirty years, and all these emphases still continue side by side, in fact, all mixed up with one another. You can imagine the cumulative unsettling effects of all the turmoil.[10]

By the 1970s, Pennington sensed popular communication theory threatening the relevance of homiletics. He asserted many of his

time had begun to see preaching as outdated and therefore ineffective in modern communication.[11] He wrote, "Every year the schools of theology graduate a new generation of ministers. In each generation, there is a significant number of persons who have been persuaded that preaching is not an important aspect of the ministry."[12] Pennington desired to turn the tide, asserting:

> Preaching is a communicative event. That is, a sermon is an occasion when people come together in the context of corporate worship to engage in the communication and celebration of the gospel. What happens depends on how the sermon is preached and how it is heard. Communication is likely to be most effective when we, congregation as well as preacher, understand how communication between persons actually takes place.[13]

Pennington might have hailed preaching's early adoptions of communication theory in the 1960s and 1970s as "just in time."

Communication Theory in Modern Homiletics Literature

In the past five or six decades, vernacular and concepts common in communication theory have become evident among some homileticians and their written works. Below is an examination of the communication theory content evident in a selection of fifteen homiletics books from the last fifty-five years.

Clyde H. Reid: The Empty Pulpit: A Study in Preaching as Communication (1967)

Reid's contribution to homiletics provides evidence of one of the early-most adoptions of communication theory in homiletics. Reid was in favor of a "two-way flow of information" between the church and its leaders and the fields of "communication theory and research."[14] He believed communication theory as well as media theory (including Marshall McLuhan's theory that "the medium is the message") all held important wisdom for

gospel preachers who should be "deeply interested in understanding the nature of communication."[15] Reid explored the historical developments of communication theory from World War II through to his present day, including theories in mass communication and Schramm's idea's on feedback as a common characteristic of "communication as dialogue."[16] Reid built a framework for understanding the process of communication, building on the work of Melvin L. DeFleur and Otto N. Larsen, who themselves synthesized a set of theories derived in-part from Shannon and Weaver as well as Schramm. His communication process included: transmission, contact, feedback, comprehension, acceptance, internalization, and action.[17] His process was mostly linear on paper, but he believed the element of feedback was continually molding the transmitted message.

J. Daniel Baumann: An Introduction to Contemporary Preaching (1972)

Baumann adopted communication theory as the basis for his proposed preaching methodology. He cited Shannon and Weaver, Schramm, Westley and MacLean, and Berlo by name. He adopted Berlo's SMCR model, adding that sender, message, channel, and receiver are "overlapping dimensions in a dynamic process."[18] He implicitly included the concept noise, exploring various types of contemporary noise (for example neglect of contemporary application, "communication overkill," breakdown of integrity, and more).[19] Perhaps most telling is that Baumann's exploration of the applications of communication theory constitute the first chapter of his text! The subject matter is not hidden away in a latter chapter as food for thought, but poured as a foundation for the entire book.

Merrill Abbey: Communication in Pulpit and Parish (1973)

Abbey's entire text is an application of communication theory to homiletics. He explored communication theory models in-depth,

citing Shannon and Weaver specifically as well as Berlo. He developed his own model for pastoral preaching, counseling, and teaching, which was based on a combination of Shannon and Weaver, Schramm, and Berlo. His model assumed a possible proliferation of continually-functioning channels, each carrying a type of message (verbal or nonverbal) to a type of receiver. The receiver was assumed capable of both verbal and nonverbal feedback, which had an impact not only the pastor/teacher/preacher, but the context of communication (or "current situation" in which communication occurs).[20]

As with Reid, Abbey believed communication theory held important wisdom for the field of homiletics. Likewise, he paid particular attention to the concept of feedback in the "field of communication." Abbey called feedback the "vital link" between preacher and congregation.[21] According to Abbey, feedback is what enables adaptation on the fly. He wrote, "This role of feedback in guiding both sender and receiver makes it far more than a device by which the sender finds the sensitive points to which to direct his appeals."[22] Rather,

> For the communicator who enters the interdependent relation of true communication and is fully sensitive to those with whom he is dealing, this aspect of feedback makes it a channel for the reconciliation of differences. Through it a sense of community can develop. By its aid the parties to the communication can mature together.[23]

His ideas required congruence with Fearing's belief that communication cannot be decoupled from ethics, since such reconciliation requires mutual trust. Abbey's reflections were optimistic for the preaching moment. He saw communication theory models as a framework for understanding how to harness the power of the field of communication for mutual understanding of a biblical text between preacher and listener.

Chester A. Pennington, God Has a Communication Problem (1976)

Pennington adopted a communication model that included concepts from Shannon and Weaver, Dickens, Schramm and Roberts, and Berlo. His mode was also two-way. He wrote,

> It is frequently observed that communication is a two-way process. This is true in church too. Some critics of preaching portray it as a one-way attempt at communication, in which the members of a congregation are passive receivers. This is not really true; at least, if preacher and congregation know what preaching is all about, it need not be true.[24]

Pennington pointed out, "In any thoughtful design of a sermon, the congregation has already had significant input. Their needs, their joys, their crises have helped shape the sermon."[25] Greg Heisler pointed out the same concept in examining the effects of indeterminacy on a sermon.[26] In defending the argument that a "sermon is not a sermon until it is preached," Heisler wrote, "in a real sense the preacher who is open to the Spirit's leading and sensitive to the dynamic of indeterminacy must learn to work with what the audience or the context gives him."[27] Pennington added,

> But it is also true that a congregation can be active throughout the entire experience of worship. The people communicate with the preacher as they participate in the liturgy and receive the sermon. Indeed they communicate with each other. In a congregation, communication is not only two-way; it proceeds in many directions at the same time.[28]

Though Pennington's model does not seem explicitly two-way, his writing suggests a preacher receives a constant stream of feedback in the preaching event to help him overcome barriers, shape his speech, and account for their needs. Pennington also

included the concepts of "barriers" and "ambivalence" to describe the obstacles between sender and receiver—a likely reference to Shannon and Weaver's concept of "noise source." Pennington's model was more thorough than most modern models found in preaching manuals.

George E. Sweazey: Preaching the Good News (1976)

Sweazey widely adopted communication theory, suggesting "every sermon is a multimedia communication" in which "the preacher is by sound and sight transmitting over multiple channels."[29] He adopted a simple model, crediting Shannon and Weaver by name. He also referenced Berlo (and cited him in his bibliography), for instance, highlighting the role of the receivers senses in decoding the transmitted signal so it can "penetrate his consciousness and be taken up by his apperceptive faculties."[30] He asserted, "any contact between two people … is manipulative"—a possible callback to Berlo's assertion that all thought requires the "manipulation of symbols."[31] Though the imagery he provided aligned closely with Shannon and Weaver, his writing included reference to more-circular ideas of communication, including interaction through informative and reinforcement feedback. Sweazey's text provides further evidence of early adoption of communication theory in homiletics.

J. Randall Nichols: Building the Word (1980)

Nichols' work was pregnant with communication theory concepts. He adopted the concept of metacommunication into preaching, referring to it as common and helpful. He wrote, "we automatically [metacommunicate] all the time when we include in our messages certain instructions, sometimes overt and sometimes implicit, for how we want the receiver of those messages to respond."[32] He asserted nonverbal communication is equally responsible for metacommunication, though it usually happens within a complex combination of all the characteristics

of communication available to us.[33] However, a preacher with effective metacommunication preaches sermon that are easier to listen to and understand than most.[34] He applied the concept to the entire worship service as well, proposing that in the congregational setting everything before and after the sermon can easily metacommunicate something about the sermon content as much as the preacher himself.[35]

Myron Raymond Chartier: Preaching as Communication (1981)

Myron Raymond Chartier wrote extensively on the application of communication theory to the field of homiletics. Among his contributions to the application of communication theory in preaching is his exploration of both verbal and non-verbal communication through the communication channel. He differentiated between the words "used as symbols to represent objects, events, and ideas" and "all other form of message behavior: (1) sign language, (2) action language, (3) object language, (4) space, and (5) time."[36] He also introduced exploration of intended versus unintended communication through the both verbal and nonverbal communication.[37] He wrote, "Much communication research has focused on intentional communication. … Activity or inactivity, words or silence—all have message value: They influence others, and those others, in turn, cannot not respond to those communications, and one thus finds oneself communicating."[38] Chartier also differentiated between intrapersonal and interpersonal communication. Intrapersonal communication "occurs within … individuals and involves the processing of internal and external messages."[39] However, interpersonal communication "refers to interaction between persons."[40] Chartier seemed to draw these concepts from Berlo's fifth chapter of *The Process of Communication*.

Chartier also identified small-group communication ("face-to-face interaction of a group of people"), organizational communication (in "highly structured settings"), mass communication ("transmission of a message to masses of

people"), and intercultural communication ("between private individuals, groups, or government officials of more than one nation").[41] The latter concepts were not explicitly named by Berlo, however, Berlo examined similar concepts in his sixth chapter of *The Process of Communication*.

John Stott: Between Two Worlds (1982)

Stott examined the "rich and diverse process" of learning in which "we are assimilating knowledge and experience all the time, directly and indirectly, consciously and unconsciously, by words and images, by listening and looking, by discussing and discovering, by passive absorption and by participating in the action ourselves."[42] He cited Berlo directly, adopting ideas regarding an encoding-source, a message, a channel, and a decoding-receiver.[43] He suggested preaching is unique, as there is "no other form of communication which resembles it," since there is no other form of communication for which the source is divinely appointed for a specific receiver.[44] He asserted the message must be "God's own Word" for communication to count as preaching. [45] In the preaching moment, the "divine terms" applied to the SMCR model must be understood as "God speaking through his minister to his people."[46] Stott purported no matter the development of technology or media, preaching will always remain a purely unique type of communication (nothing else is "God's people assembled in God's presence to hear God's Word from God's minister"). [47]

Bryan Chapell: Using Illustrations to Preach with Power (1992)

Chapell included theories on communication in his text devoted to illustrations. He asserted modern communication theory not only legitimized, but necessitated the inclusion of illustrations in sermons. He wrote, "the conclusions of … communication theorists do much to indicate why illustrations are so important."[48] He continued, "Beyond their much-cited ability to garner attention, provide nonredundant repetition, and

substation sermon interest, illustrations create experiential dynamics that actually further understanding."[49] For instance, illustrations make message transmission clearer by encoding meaning in terms easier for a receiver to decode.[50] Additionally, explaining concepts using illustrations that incorporate "lived-body experience" are able to connect to "those matters deepest in the human heart."[51] In such cases, one message in the form of a narrative analogy continues communicating on behalf of another message passing through the channel, but now with greater clarity.

Jerry Vines and Jim Shaddix: Power in the Pulpit (1999)

Vines and Shaddix adopted Berlo's SMCR model (source, message, channel, receiver), though they may have been referencing Dickens' earlier model which included source, channel, and receiver, as they cited Dickens without citing Berlo. They discussed communication theory briefly, only devoting one page to the topic. Describing the preaching moment as an application of SMCR, they wrote,

> The preacher is the source. He stands before a congregation, called of God to preach and gifted and empower to do so. He takes the message from the Bible, places it in his words, and conveys it to the waiting congregation via the medium of the spoken word. The person in the congregation receive the words delivered by the preacher and then decode them in categories that are understandable to them.[52]

Additionally, Vines and Shaddix referenced Dickens' ideas regarding communicative attitude, writing, "The preacher will be helped if he takes the attitude that he and the listeners are participating in the preaching situation as a group. His attitude cannot be 'they, the audience, and I, the speaker'"—the latter a direct quote from Dickens.[53] Rather, a preacher's attitude must be "you and I."[54] They continue,

> A minister must help his hearer sense that they are as much as part of the communicative process as is he. The idea is to create the feeling that "we are all thinking this through together." The more the preacher makes his listeners aware of their participation in what he is saying, the better he will communicate.[55]

Their concepts are similar to Merrill Abbey's regarding the field of communication as a place for common agreement around biblical truth (since by the elements of communication "parties … can mature together"[56]). Vine and Shaddix suggest communication theory to be a valuable tool for helping preachers avoid drabness and disconnection between "pulpit and pew."[57]

Wayne McDill: The Moment of Truth (1999)

McDill proposed even the "most basic" model of communication should include those elements theorized by Shannon and Warren Weaver (the only theorists he named explicitly).[58] He also referenced communication elements present in the models of Dickens, Schramm and Roberts, Westley and MacLean, and David K. Berlo. McDill also suggested his readers see the encyclopediac volumes of Ronald B. Adler and George Rodman (*Understanding Human Communication*) as well as Gail E. Myers and Michele Tolela Myers (*The Dynamics of Human Communication*) for an overview of the history of communication models.

     McDill included a communication model essentially congruent with Pennington. He provided a number of applications worth noting. First, he suggested preachers utilize more channels for communication than they aware of during the sermon, including "words, gestures, facial expressions, bodily movement, and other factors about the speaker."[59] Whereas some may limit the concept of a channel, he implied a theoretically unidentifiable number of active channels during preaching.

Second, McDill adopted the ideas regarding noise identified originally by Shannon and Weaver and further developed by Berlo. He wrote,

> Noise, in communication theory, is any distraction that interferes with the communication process. Noise can be sounds, sights, or unusual behavior, anything that hinders the reception of the message. Noise can be external to the hearer, in the circumstances of the speaker's manner. It can also be internal, in the hearer's own attitudes and thoughts.[60]

McDill noted preachers are responsible for removing the noise they can identify in their own manner, language, gestures, preaching style, vocal tone, accent, physical movement, clothing choices and more.[61]

Third, McDill adopted the "field of experience" concept popularized by Schramm. He wrote, "Every aspect of our communication is affected by our past experiences, our feelings, our attitudes, our knowledge, etc."—our field of experience.[62] Likewise, a preacher must consider the field of experience of his audience, which will unavoidably shape the way his hearings decode the message or even produce its own noise impacting the communication process.[63]

Gregory Edward Reynolds: The Word Is Worth a Thousand Pictures (2001)

Reynolds explored the intersection of media theory and homiletics, giving communication theory consideration in the fifth chapter of *The Word Is Worth a Thousand Pictures*. Citing Marshall McLuhan's assertion that the "medium is the message," Reynolds purported that the message and the channel must be understood in harmony in a modern context.[64] The outlook is progressive relative to classic theories that separated the two, and therefore, could have easily seen noise as imposing on the message or the channel separately. Modern theories saw noise

impacting the communication process holistically. In other words, Reynolds asserted that in the age of electronic media if noise impacts the channel, it impacts the message. If noise has an impact on the receiver, it has an impact on the message. In the hyper-connected communication processes, everything touches everything else and noise is all the more powerful.

Hershael W. York and Bert Decker: Preaching with Bold Assurance (2003)

Hershael Y. York and Bert Decker asserted the importance of communication theory as a framework for understanding how preachers can "convey the message that God gave in his Word" for "hearers to receive and comprehend."[65] They produced their own model, which included elements from Schramm and Roberts, but replaced communication theory terminology with homiletics terminology.[66] For instance, the source possesses its own reality (or "field of experience" according to Schramm and Roberts) and the two occupy a share space in some way (Schramm and Roberts' fields of experience converged with each other, whereas York and Decker's realities converged with a shared space).

York and Decker purported for communication to occur sender and receiver must mutually understand the signals being transmitted.[67] They added that in preaching the phenomenon must occur successfully from God to biblical author (which the doctrine of inerrancy purports), from biblical author to preacher (the interpretive burden of the preacher), and from preacher to listener (the homiletic burden of the preacher).[68] York and Decker's treatment was concise, but highlighted the importance of a clear signal.

Daniel Akin, David Allen, Ned Matthews, et. al.: Text-Driven Preaching (2010)

Seven years after his joint-work with Bert Decker, Hershael W. York contributed a chapter in *Text-Driven Preaching* focusing

solely on communication. He built his ideas on the same model contributed in *Preaching with Bold Assurance* and the chapter contained similar content as well. He explored the doctrine of inerrancy and its implications on encoding and decoding between God, author, reader/preacher, and congregation.[69] Inerrancy suggests the meaning is purposefully and carefully encoded and therefore, meant to be decoded rightly and understood properly. He purported meaning is "readily clear" in the vast majority of biblical texts and that the perspicuity of Scripture suggested although "we may not be able to understand everything in Scripture because of our own limitations, distance from vocabulary or context of the text, or even our sinfulness unwillingness to believe it … we can certainly apprehend the main things in nearly every text."[70] In other words, Scripture communicates well and human limitations are what make it difficult to decode.

Daniel Akin, William Curtis, and Stephen Rummage: Engaging Exposition (2011)

Stephen Rummage devoted four pages in *Engaging Exposition* to communication theory. He purported, "The goal of preaching is to communicate a message from God's Word, in cooperation with the Holy Spirit's desire to change the hearts and lives of listeners."[71] He cited Paul's writing and the command to "preach the Word" (2 Tim. 4:2 ESV), including convincing, rebuking, exhorting, and teaching—congruent with a charge for speech communication. Rummage suggested that since "when we deliver His message, we are engaged in public communication … preachers will profit from a working knowledge of how communication operates, just as they benefit from understanding principles of hermeneutics and sermon construction."[72] For such "knowledge of how communication operates," Rummage turned heavily to Berlo.

    For context, Rummage provided a model he named "The Communication Process," and which he referenced as the "Berlo mode of communication."[73] Summating the model, Rummage

wrote, "In communication, a speaker sends a message through a channel to a listener, who in turn provides feedback to the speaker. Both the speaker and the listener communicate based on their unique fields of experience."[74] Rummage's modeled expression of Berlo's theories cannot be found explicitly in Berlo's works, however it does provide a simplified expression of his writing.

Rummage's model was relatively unique among homiletics texts in the way it expressed noise. Rummage wrote, "Noise can interfere with the process of communication."[75] His depiction of noise was congruent with Berlo's assertion that fidelity is impacted by noise's interaction with other elements. The message is impact by noise's impact on the speaker as much as the listener. In Figure 2.9, the message converges with noise at the "listener" element, the "speaker" element, and both feedback elements.

SUMMARY

Communication theory had and continues to have a notable, demonstrable impact on homiletics. Many homiletics manuals of the last fifty-five years contain overt references to communication theorists and their theories. However, scholarly lacunae exist between ethnically-influenced homiletic traditions and the connection they may (or may not) have to the communication theories of Shannon, Weaver, Schramm, Berlo, and others. The gap could be remedied by scholarly assessment of the influence of communication theory on African, Hispanic, and Asian-American homiletics.

The homiletics authors referenced in this paper defend the field of communication theory as worthy of application in the domain of homiletics. Many depend on mid-twentieth century communication theory as the basis for their understanding of human verbal and nonverbal interaction. Their adopted (or adapted) communication models were derived from the vocabulary and structures of Shannon and Weaver, Franklin, Dickens, Schramm and Roberts, Westley and MacLean, and

Berlo. Therefore, one may rightfully say communication theory has been widely adopted in the field of homiletics.

NOTES

1. See Clyde H. Reid, *The Empty Pulpit: A Study in Preaching as Communication* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); J. Daniel Baumann, *An Introduction to Contemporary Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972); Merrill R. Abbey, *Communication in Pulpit and Parish* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973); Chester A. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1976); George E. Sweazey, *Preaching the Good News* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976); J. Randall Nichols, *Building the Word: The Dynamics of Communication and Preaching* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980); Myron Raymond Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981); John R. W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); J Randall Nichols, *The Restoring Word: Preaching as Pastoral Communication* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); Bryan Chapell, *Using Illustrations to Preach with Power* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992); Jerry Vines and Jim Shaddix, *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1999); Wayne McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999); Hershael W. York and Bert Decker, *Preaching with Bold Assurance: A Solid and Enduring Approach to Engaging Exposition* (Nashville: B&H Publishing, 2003); Daniel L. Akin, David Lewis Allen, and Ned Lee Mathews, eds., *Text-Driven Preaching: God's Word at the Heart of Every Sermon.* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010); Daniel L. Akin, William J. Curtis, and Stephen Nelson Rummage, *Engaging Exposition* (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2011).
2. Craig, "Communication Theory as a Field," 122.

3. Stephen W. Littlejohn and Karen A. Foss, *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2009), 175.

4. Chester A. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1976), 40.

5. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 40.

6. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*.

7. David Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Preaching and Preachers* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1972), 11.

8. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, *Speech and Reality* (Norwich, Vt: Argo Books, 1970), 46.

9. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 40.

10. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 27.

11. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 28.

12. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 29.

13. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*.

14. Reid, *The Empty Pulpit: A Study in Preaching as Communication*, 81.

15. Reid, *The Empty Pulpit: A Study in Preaching as Communication*, 63, 81.

16. Reid, *The Empty Pulpit: A Study in Preaching as Communication*, 64–68.

17. Reid, *The Empty Pulpit: A Study in Preaching as Communication*, 68–71.

18. J. Daniel Baumann, *An Introduction to Contemporary Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972), 22.

19. Baumann, *An Introduction to Contemporary Preaching*. 27–28.

20. Abbey, *Communication in Pulpit and Parish*, 47–49.

21. Abbey, *Communication in Pulpit and Parish*, 47–48.

22. Abbey, *Communication in Pulpit and Parish*, 49.

23. Abbey, *Communication in Pulpit and Parish*.

24. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 55.

25. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*, 55.

26. Greg Heisler, *Spirit-Led Preaching: The Holy Spirit's Role in Sermon Preparation and Delivery* (Nashville: B&H Publishing, 2007), 106–108.

27. Heisler, *Spirit-Led Preaching: The Holy Spirit's Role in Sermon Preparation and Delivery*, 108.

28. Pennington, *God Has a Communication Problem*.

29. George E. Sweazey, *Preaching the Good News* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976), 52.

30. Sweazey, *Preaching the Good News*, 53.

31. Sweazey, *Preaching the Good News*, 54; Berlo, *The Process of Communication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, 44.

32. Nichols, *Building the Word: The Dynamics of Communication and Preaching*, 99–100.

33. Nichols, *Building the Word: The Dynamics of Communication and Preaching*, 100.

34. Nichols, *Building the Word: The Dynamics of Communication and Preaching*.

35. Nichols, *Building the Word: The Dynamics of Communication and Preaching*, 104.

36. Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective*, 17. Chartier defined these terms: "Sign language is operating when a gesture—for instance, a V made with two fingers—is use to convey and idea, such as 'peace.' Action language is the language of the body—gesture, posture, or facial expression—which communicates unintended messages. Object language is the display of a tangible item, such as a clerical code, communicating role and status. The use of time, particularly tardiness or punctuality, communicates; the use of space—a pulpit located on the same level as the congregation, or fifteen feed above them—carrier its own message" (p. 17).

37. Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective*, 18–20.

38. Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective*, 19.

39. Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective*, 22.

40. Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective*.

41. Chartier, *Preaching As Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective*, 22–24.

42. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, 76–83.

43. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, 80.

44. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, 81.

45. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, 82.

46. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, 82.

47. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, 82.

48. Chapell, *Using Illustrations to Preach with Power*, 57.

49. Chapell, *Using Illustrations to Preach with Power*.

50. Chapell, *Using Illustrations to Preach with Power*, 59.

51. Chapell, *Using Illustrations to Preach with Power*, 59.

52. Vines and Shaddix, *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons*, 305.

53. Vines and Shaddix, *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons*; Dickens, *Speech: Dynamic Communication*, 17.

54. Vines and Shaddix, *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons*.

55. Vines and Shaddix, *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons*; Dickens, *Speech: Dynamic Communication*, 17.

56. Abbey, *Communication in Pulpit and Parish*.

57. Vines and Shaddix, *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons*, 304.

58. McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery*, 61. Shannon worked with Weaver to develop the theories commonly connect with Shannon.

59. McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery*, 62.

60. McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery*, 64.

61. McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery*.

62. McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery*, 65.

63. McDill, *The Moment of Truth: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery*.

64. Gregory Reynolds, *The Word Is Worth a Thousand Pictures: Preaching in the Electronic Age* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2001), 184.

65. Hershael W. York and Bert Decker, *Preaching with Bold Assurance: A Solid and Enduring Approach to Engaging Exposition* (Nashville: B&H Publishing, 2003), 136.

66. York and Decker, *Preaching with Bold Assurance: A Solid and Enduring Approach to Engaging Exposition*, 136–9. The authors do not explicitly cite any communication theorists, nor to they provide a bibliography of sources consulted from which they developed their theories.

67. York and Decker, *Preaching with Bold Assurance: A Solid and Enduring Approach to Engaging Exposition*, 137.

68. York and Decker, *Preaching with Bold Assurance: A Solid and Enduring Approach to Engaging Exposition*, 138.

69. Akin, Curtis, and Rummage, *Engaging Exposition*, 229.

70. Akin, Curtis, and Rummage, *Engaging Exposition*, 229–30.

71. Daniel L. Akin, William J. Curtis, and Stephen Nelson Rummage, *Engaging Exposition* (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2011), 252.

72. Akin, Curtis, and Rummage, *Engaging Exposition*, 252-53.

73. Akin, Curtis, and Rummage, *Engaging Exposition*, 254.

74. Akin, Curtis, and Rummage, *Engaging Exposition*.

75. Akin, Curtis, and Rummage, *Engaging Exposition*.

FACULTY POSITION NOTICE
Baylor University

Baylor University is a private Christian university and a nationally ranked research institution, consistently listed with highest honors among *The Chronicle of Higher Education's* "Great Colleges to Work For." The University is recruiting new faculty with a deep commitment to excellence in teaching, research and scholarship. Baylor seeks faculty who share in our aspiration to become a tier one research institution while strengthening our distinctive Christian mission as described in our strategic vision, *Pro Futuris,* (www. baylor.edu/profuturis/) and academic strategic plan, *Illuminate* (baylor. edu/illuminate). As the world's largest Baptist University, Baylor offers over 40 doctoral programs and has more than 17,000 students from all 50 states and more than 85 countries.

Baylor seeks to fill the following faculty position within the **George W. Truett Theological Seminary:**

<div align="center">

Raborn Chair in Pastoral Leadership
Practical Theology
Associate Professor or Professor

</div>

Candidates should possess an earned doctorate in the appropriate field of study with preference for those also holding the M.Div. The applicant will need to hold a PhD, ThD or EdD with concentrations in the various expressions of practical theology: congregational studies, pastoral care, pastoral ministry/leadership, pastoral theology, preaching, etc.

Applicants will be asked to provide a letter of interest; curriculum vitae; transcripts; and philosophy of teaching statement. Pastoral ministry experience is expected and publications are required. Semi-finalists will be asked to provide three letters of reference. Salary is commensurate with experience and qualifications. Review of applications will begin September 15, 2021. Applications will be considered until November 1, though early applications are encouraged.

To learn more about the above position, the George W. Truett Theological Seminary, and Baylor University, please visit the appropriate URL: **https:// apply.interfolio.com/92165; www.baylor.edu/Truett**; or **www.baylor.edu/ hr/facultypositions.**