

## DIFFERENCES IN EVALUATION OF POST-COMMUNIST WORLDVIEW SHIFT MODEL BY PARACHURCH MINISTRIES LEADERS OF UKRAINE

Sergei Golovin

Sergei Golovin, D. Min. (Asbury Theological Seminary, USA), M.Sc. (Physics of the Earth, Tavrichesky National University, Ukraine), M.A. (Practical Theology and Ministry, TCM International Institute, Austria), B.Sc. (Education, Simferopol State University, USSR); Christian Center for Science and Apologetics Founder and President; Simferopol Christian Church Senior Elder. Author of papers published in Soviet Union Academy of Sciences journals, and books on Christian Apologetics and Missiology: *Biblical Strategy of Evangelism*, *Introduction to Systematic Apologetics*, *Worldview*, etc. as well as patented inventions in the areas of laser optics and geophysics. See [www.scienceandapologetics.org](http://www.scienceandapologetics.org)

The initial study made during the time of the postcommunist Great Awakening<sup>1</sup> revealed the inconsistency of worldviews among people who considered themselves believers. That inconsistency indicated that the postcommunist transformation in society did not fit the biblical concept of conversion because it did not affect the people's worldview much. The explanatory model of the worldview transformation in postcommunist society was offered. This paper represents a follow-up qualitative research with the purpose of verifying the extent of the accuracy of the explanatory model of the worldview transformation in postcommunist society.

An independent parachurch ministry called Spiritual Revival Association printed the results of the initial research as a brochure<sup>2</sup> through an independent publisher, and supplied the population of the study with copies of the brochure accompanied by a questionnaire for evaluation of participants' opinions on the model's validity. A "snowball sampling" approach encouraged the participants to recommend others as potential respondents.

The study was focused around six major issues related to the explanatory model of worldview transformation in postcommunist society.

First, the respondents had to evaluate how much the model is biblically grounded. The role of the worldview persuasion in evangelism as well as the classification of the basic worldviews upon which the model is based corresponds both to the immediate texts used for its development and to the general context of the Scripture.

Secondly, the respondents had to share their opinion on to what extent the researcher-developed explanatory model of worldview transformation in postcommunist society corresponds to the actual processes in the society during the period of the postcommunist Great Awakening.

The next issue of the interview dealt with the fuel analogy in order to find out how much is appropriate as an inductive visualization of the model. Its intent was to find out if the analogy was more helpful for clarification of the model's understanding or more confusing and/or misleading.

The main part of the interview was getting the respondents' opinions on how useful the model could be for the development of appropriate evangelism methods for postcommunist societies. Also the respondents had to share their opinions about the extent to which the model

---

<sup>1</sup> Sergei Golovin, "Worldview: the Missing Dimension of Evangelism in Post-communist Society." *Religion in Eastern Europe* 28.3 (August 2008): 27-64.

<sup>2</sup> Golovin, Сергей. *Мировоззрение [Worldview]*. (Симферополь, Украина: ДиАйПи, 2008).

could be applied to world evangelism in general and particularly to the societies with plural worldviews.

Finally, the respondents had to evaluate the applicability of the model for educational purposes. They had to determine how helpful it could be for the teaching, training, and equipping of missionaries, evangelists, and church planters for effective evangelism in various worldview contexts.

The structure of the interview was identical on every parameter. The respondents had to rate the given parameter of the model in general and then provide an explanation of what they considered to be the strong and weak features of it. The interview structure and content were identical for all respondents.

The target population for the research included three groups of national parachurch ministries leaders. Representatives of the first group were involved in the ministry before the collapse of communism. The second group included those who became actively involved in Christian ministry during the time of the so-called postcommunist Great Awakening. They still continue to serve the kingdom today when apathy replaced evangelistic excitement in society, and most of the Western support of people and funds became considerably reduced. The third group consisted of the representatives of the next generation of national leaders who came into ministry after the period of the Great Awakening and are involved in the ministry actively today in various parts of the postcommunist world.

The population of the study represents a limited number of national Christian leaders whose opinions may be different from many others involved in the postcommunist transformation of the society. All the respondents are those whose allegiance to the kingdom was tested continuously, and they proved to be faithful. Therefore their particular opinion, wisdom, and discernment are extremely important for the evaluation of the unseen to others aspects of the processes. Moreover, all the respondents play an active role in training the next generation of Christian leaders in the former Soviet Union, and their opinions have the biggest impact on the future of the church in postcommunist countries.

Thirteen individuals responded out of more than twenty questionnaires distributed. The names of the respondents were replaced with coded indication by letters from *A* to *M*. A comparative analysis of the rating of the model by the group of respondents followed the combined analysis of the findings of the study.

### **Combined Findings of the Study**

Following the questionnaire, the respondents both rated the aspects of the model and provided their opinion on its strengths and weaknesses.

### **Aspects of the Model Rating**

A combined rating from one to ten by all respondents A-M of such aspects of the model as its biblical grounding (BG), sociological reliability (SR), visualization (V), particular practical value (PPV), general practical value (GPV), and educational value (EV) as well as average values per aspect (APA) and per respondent (APR) is represented in Table 1.

As one can see from the table, all respondents highly appreciate the model. The average per respondent (APR) rate has the total average value 8.88, the dispersion of the value is equal to 3.00 and spreads from 7.00 (respondent E) to 10.00 (respondent C).

Table 1. Combined Rating of the Model Aspects

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Years In Ministry</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>SR</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>PPV</b>	<b>GPV</b>	<b>EV</b>	<b>APR</b>
A	30	7.5	8.5	10	8.5	8.5	10	<b>8.83</b>
B	15	9	9	10	9	10	10	<b>9.50</b>
C	13	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10.00</b>
D	12	10	10	9	10	10	10	<b>9.83</b>
E	12	7	5	10	7	6	7	<b>7.00</b>
F	12	10	8	10	9	10	8	<b>9.17</b>
G	11	9	9	8	8	9	10	<b>8.83</b>
H	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	<b>9.83</b>
I	10	10	7	5	9	10	10	<b>8.50</b>
J	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	<b>9.67</b>
K	8	8	8	6	7	7	8	<b>7.33</b>
L	5	8	8	7	9	7	9	<b>8.00</b>
M	5	9	8	8	9	10	10	<b>9.00</b>
<b>APA</b>		<b>9.04</b>	<b>8.50</b>	<b>8.46</b>	<b>8.88</b>	<b>9.04</b>	<b>9.38</b>	<b>8.88</b>

The average per aspect (APA) demonstrates more conformity. The dispersion of the value is 0.92, and it spreads from 8.46 to 9.38. The APA combined rating is represented in descending order in Table 2.

The highest value of the average per aspect combined rating value (9.38) belongs to the educational value of the model. The applicability of the model for the educational purposes of teaching, training, and equipping of missionaries, evangelists, and church planters for effective evangelism in various worldview contexts is the feature the respondents appreciate the most.

Table 2. The Average per Aspect Combined Rating

<b>Aspects of the Model</b>	<b>APA</b>
Educational Value of the Model	9.38
Biblical Grounding of the Model	9.04
General Practical Value of the Model	9.04
Particular Practical Value of the Model	8.88
Sociological Reliability of the Model	8.50
Visualization of the Model	8.46

Two aspects have equally high values (9.04): biblical grounding of the model (the extent of its correspondence to both the immediate texts used for its development and to the general context of the Scripture) and its general practical value (the extent to which the model could be applied to world evangelism in general and particularly to the societies with plural worldviews).

Surprisingly, the particular practical value of the model (the appreciation by the respondents of the usefulness of the model for the development of appropriate evangelism methods for postcommunist societies) is considerably lower than its general practical value. It is

8.88, and that value is remarkably equal to the average per respondent / average per aspects total average value.

The sociological reliability of the model (the extent of its correspondence to the actual processes in the society during the period of the postcommunist Great Awakening) and visualisation of the model (how helpful the analogy is for clarification of the model's understanding) both unexpectedly got the lowest values close to equal (8.50 and 8.46 respectively).

The way the respondents explain the strengths and weaknesses of aspects of the model provides some clarification.

#### **Aspects of the Model Strengths and Weaknesses**

The respondents shared their opinions on strengths and weaknesses of every aspect of the model.

**Educational value of the model. Strengths.** The respondents demonstrate their appreciation of the model's usefulness for educational purposes as clearly understood and thought provoking. They see it as important for making the training of ministers, missionaries, and evangelists practice-oriented on the one hand and rooted in the Bible on the other hand. The focus on the importance of the study of strategies and approaches practiced by Jesus and Paul meets the favor of the respondents, especially in making students prepared for the Incarnational approach to the ministry. It provides a sufficiently "big picture" for developing culturally related particular models and analogies, as well as teaches people to develop personal approaches to evangelism instead of using traditional methodics borrowed from different contexts. As an educational tool the model highly motivates students for the analytical approach and encourages a long-term commitment for the ministry. According to the respondents, it should be included into every evangelism training program and shows a direction for the changes necessary in the Christian education system.

**Educational value of the model: Weaknesses.** On the other hand two respondents of thirteen show their concern that as an educational tool the model underestimates the role of God in a conversion process. It also needs more systematic practical recommendation and requires constant updates.

**Biblical grounding of the model: Strengths.** Among the strengths of the biblical grounding of the model most of the respondents stressed its high appreciation of the authority of Scripture and universal meaning of the Good News; its balance of using both immediate and general biblical contexts; its careful study of the methods of Jesus and apostles in debates, in persuasion, and in using the criteria for truth.

Respondents also notice the well-grounded emphasis of the model on how the understanding of the Good News depends on the worldview of the audience and on the need for different approaches to Gentiles and Jews. They consider the model as Christocentric and demonstrating the Incarnational nature of evangelism. It is convincing in grounding the need for the work of "preparing the soil."

**Biblical grounding of the model: Weaknesses.** The main weakness of the biblical grounding of the model indicated by the respondents was the one-sided situational interpretation of the parable of the sower. On the other hand they noticed the limited usage of the Scripture, while more texts could be involved into the model biblical development. It also underestimates the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion on the one hand and uses limited classification of the worldview types on the other hand. The respondents mentioned also that usage of the term "Jews" for the type of worldview may be confusing anyway, whatever disclaimers were made.

**General practical value of the model: Strengths.** As the main strength of the general practical value of the model the respondents see the model as general enough to be used as a blueprint for the development of the local particular models in various contexts. They consider the model well-developed within the limits of its applicability, as well as flexible enough to fit various cultures. It opens new horizons for cross-cultural ministry; provides the opportunity of the worldview classification of a given area; warns about dangers and limitations of the worldview persuasion. The model is clear for understanding and easy for practical application. It brings together universal Biblical principles and the focus on the individual approach.

**General practical value of the model: Weaknesses.** As the weaknesses of the general practical value of the model, the respondents mentioned that it is too general for figuring out particular details in a given society. It also interprets the “traditional” methods of evangelism in too general way.

**Particular practical value of the model: Strengths.** Most of the respondents agree that the model is a necessary tool for evangelism in the region. They appreciate it for providing an opportunity to figure out a starting point for approaching a particular person; its motivating potential for the restoration of an unchangeable biblical foundation of evangelism as well as of a need to be flexible in changing of the approaches depending on actual situations. It shows topicality of biblical methods; demonstrates worldview elements of the culture; helps to build a “big picture” of the society’s worldview structure; helps to make the analysis that leads to the practical recommendations; and allows the development of relevant strategy. The model is flexible enough to fit any subculture of the society; it inspires both for the work of “preparing the soil” and for step-by-step follow-up.

**Particular practical value of the model: Weaknesses.** The main weakness of the particular practical value of the model mentioned by the respondents is lack of practical recommendations. Some also consider it too general; some are afraid it can be used for the development of manipulative techniques development.

**Sociological reliability of the model: Strengths.** Most of the respondents believe the model does reflect actual transformation processes of worldview shifts in society. It represents well the features of the churches during the period of transformation as well as the situation in society afterwards. The respondents consider the model as the best one on the sound representation of the situation with evangelism in Ukraine and in the world. It is built on clear statistical results; is logically well grounded; provides complex analysis and sound stages approach; and results in sober evaluation without either superficial excitement or painful self-reproach.

**Sociological reliability of the model: Weaknesses.** The overall weakness of the social reliability of the model mentioned by the respondents is its generalization: it does not reflect all particular processes in the facets of the society. It uses too broad worldview categories without any intermediate gradations. It also overlooks the negative impact of the faithful (rigidity; arrogance; isolationism; ignorance; mass emigration; separatism of the clans of believers—denominations, “brotherhoods,” and groups of congregations).

**Visualization of the model: Strengths.** The major strength of the visualization of the model is the analogy with the process. That helps in representing the dynamics and allows understanding of situation development. The model is also simple to understand and clear in showing the importance of pre-evangelism. The analogy is original and practically helpful; it is spectacular, simple, memorable, and easy to reproduce.

**Visualization of the model: Weaknesses.** Surprisingly, many respondents declared the fuel analogy gender-biased. They consider it not easily understood by those who do not know how an engine works, by ladies in particular. I will reserve commentary on this issue till the comparative analysis by the groups of the respondents.

Pretty insightful are critiques of the model saying that while identification of Jews with a gas tank helps to understand the dynamics of the actual transformation in society, it is confusing for the picture of the church, because the gas tank is a part of the motion system, while all non-Christians are actually outside, and a gas station would probably be a better analogy for that purpose. Also, the model represents an individual's worldview transformation in too mechanistic a way. As for other aspects, visualization is also mentioned to be too general. It simplifies the diverse actual picture, and not every actual process fits it.

### **Comparative Analysis of the Study**

Comparative analysis involved grouping of the respondents by their ministry experience and by their main occupation.

#### **Grouping by Ministry Experience**

The major interest of the study was the presumed difference of the model appreciation by the respondents depending on their involvement in the ministry either before the transformational period (Group One, more than 20 years in the ministry), during (Group Two, 11-20 years in the ministry), or after it (Group Three, 1-10 years in the ministry). The study results were unexpected in several ways.

**Group One (more than 20 years in the ministry).** One could naturally expect the Group One potential representatives to be most vocal on the discussed issues from the position of their experience. Surprisingly, instead they happened to be most lackadaisical. A response came from only one person (A in Table 1.) who meets the requirement for being listed in Group One. Discussion of the situation with the Research Reflection Team resulted in four major reasons for the inactivity of the Group One potential representatives: custom to uniformity, lack of education, potential embarrassment, and mass emigration.

First of all, the Group One potential respondents spent most of their life in communist society with a stable uniform social environment, and following the changes both inside of the church and outside of it as the understanding of the model requires is hard for them.

Secondly, because the communists did not allow Christians to study at colleges and universities, most of the Group One potential respondents are undereducated people who are not used to the analysis, strategic planning, results reflection, and systematic approach to ministry that the model is designed for.

Thirdly, because the initial study demonstrates failures of the postcommunist ministries, the Group One potential respondents may feel the analysis of the situation as a threat to their traditional approach, an accusation of failure or even offense, and are embarrassed to respond.

Finally, not many people who meet the requirements for the Group One potential respondents were still in the country because most of them emigrated to the West as soon as communism collapsed.

Considering the above reasons, one should conclude that respondent A can not be treated as a typical potential representative for Group One anyway. He received a good education (as a medical doctor) prior to his conversion and involvement in the ministry, and he continues to serve actively as a nationwide ministry leader looking for any effective ways of evangelism according to the changes in society. Therefore, he is an exception from a supposed group, and the very fact of his lonely response confirms that assumption. As a result, his response can not be used for the generalization, and Group One should be excluded from the comparative analysis.

**Groups Two (11-20 years in the ministry) and Three (1-10 years in the ministry).** Rating from one to ten of such aspects of the model as its biblical grounding (BG), sociological reliability (SR), visualization (V), particular practical value (PPV), general practical value (GPV), and its educational value (EV) by Group Two and Group Three respondents as well as their average value per aspect (APA) and per respondent (APR) is represented in Table 3 and Table 4 respectively.

**Table 3. Group Two Rating of the Model Aspects**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Years in Ministry</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>SR</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>PPV</b>	<b>GPV</b>	<b>EV</b>	<b>APR</b>
B	15	9	9	10	9	10	10	<b>9.50</b>
C	13	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10.00</b>
D	12	10	10	9	10	10	10	<b>9.83</b>
E	12	7	5	10	7	6	7	<b>7.00</b>
F	12	10	8	10	9	10	8	<b>9.17</b>
G	11	9	9	8	8	9	10	<b>8.83</b>
<b>APA</b>		<b>9.17</b>	<b>8.50</b>	<b>9.50</b>	<b>8.83</b>	<b>9.17</b>	<b>9.17</b>	<b>9.06</b>

**Table 4. Group Three Rating of the Model Aspects**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Years in Ministry</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>SR</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>PPV</b>	<b>GPV</b>	<b>EV</b>	<b>APR</b>
H	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	<b>9.83</b>
I	10	10	7	5	9	10	10	<b>8.50</b>
J	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	<b>9.67</b>
K	8	8	8	6	7	7	8	<b>7.33</b>
L	5	8	8	7	9	7	9	<b>8.00</b>
M	5	9	8	8	9	10	10	<b>9.00</b>
<b>APA</b>		<b>9.17</b>	<b>8.50</b>	<b>7.17</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>9.50</b>	<b>8.72</b>

As one can see, Group Two representatives who became involved in ministry during the decade of transformation appreciate the model a little bit higher (9.06) than those who came into the ministry later on (8.72), but they have a broader variety of opinions. The average per respondent (APR) rate dispersion for Group Two is equal to 3.00 and spreads from 7.00 (respondent E) to 10.00 (respondent C) while for Group Two the dispersion of the value is equal to 2.50 and spreads from

7.33 (respondent K) to 9.83 (respondent H). Nevertheless, because the model average rating difference between the individuals within a group (3.00) is an order higher, than between the groups (0.34), subjective perception probably influences a respondent's opinion more than ministry experience.

The average per aspect (APA) rating of the model is more conformed compared to the average per respondent (APR). Its dispersion is equal to 1.00 (from 8.50 to 9.50) for Group Two and to 2.33 (from 7.17 to 9.50) for Group Three, but the way respondents rated the aspects of the model is unexpectedly surprising. The average per aspect ratings for Group Two and Group Three are represented in descending order in Table 5 and Table 6 respectively.

**Table 5. Group Two Average per Aspect Rating**

<u>Aspects of the Model</u>	<u>APA</u>
Visualization of the Model	9.5
Educational Value of the Model	9.17
Biblical Grounding of the Model	9.17
General Practical Value of the Model	9.17
Particular Practical Value of the Model	8.83
Sociological Reliability of the Model	8.50

**Table 6. Group Three Average per Aspect Rating**

<u>Aspects of the Model</u>	<u>APA</u>
Educational Value of the Model	9.5
Biblical Grounding of the Model	9.17
General Practical Value of the Model	9.00
Particular Practical Value of the Model	9.00
Sociological Reliability of the Model	8.50
Visualization of the Model	7.17

The average per aspect ratings for Group Two and Group Three demonstrate many similarities. Both groups have the same highest APA rate value, 9.50, for different aspects. Both groups gave the second position to the biblical grounding of the model with exactly the same value, 9.17. Both groups have the same value, 8.50, for the reliability of the model (interestingly enough, the respondent A of the supposed Group One gave the same rating to that very aspect).

A slight difference one can see is that Group Two appreciates the educational value of the model and general practical value of the model equally high with its biblical grounding (9.17), while Group Three rates the educational value of the model considerably higher (9.50) but its general practical value a little bit lower (9.00). On the other hand Group Three treats general and particular practical values of the model equally (9.00), while Group Two rates particular practical value lower (8.83) than general practical value (9.17). Nevertheless the average value of two aspects (9.00) is exactly the same for both groups.

Considering the general resemblance of the results of the rating of the model aspects by Group Two and Group Three both in the descending sequence and in the values, one can see a shocking difference is discovered in the way the groups rate the visualization of the model. While

Group Two gives that aspect of the model the highest rating, 9.50 (as well as the respondent A of the supposed Group One does), Group Three gives it the lowest rating of all, 7.17.

That outcome is even more surprising in light of the way the respondents explain the aspect weakness as gender oriented—they are afraid the fuel analogy is hard for the ladies to understand. If that reason were the only factor for consideration, one should expect absolutely opposite results: female drivers were the rare exception in the country in the times of communism and right after it, but they are a more common phenomena in the last decade. Therefore the critique of the analogy as gender oriented by the respondents who have been more than ten years in the ministry (Group Two and supposed Group One) would be more natural, while in fact they do appreciate the visualization of the model the most among other aspects.

After discussion of the paradox, the Research Reflection Team came to the conviction that the respondents who are in the ministry more than ten years do not consider female audience at all. They are accustomed to exclusively male leadership in the church and missions, and, as a result, they are comfortable with the supposedly gender-oriented analogy. Thus the study proves again how much the understanding of new ideas depends on the one’s worldview. If a person’s worldview does not have room for female ministry, they do not see at all the potential gender problems the model may have. On the other hand, that result shows that the post-perestroika generation of Ukrainian Christian leaders is less gender-biased compared to their predecessors, but is not free of the gender prejudices completely. They are ready to consider a lady maintaining a ministry, but not ready to consider her maintaining a vehicle yet.

### Grouping by Main Occupation

The expectations to find a considerable impact of the time period when the respondent became involved into the ministry on his appreciation of the model or various aspects of it were wrong, at least for the respondents who became involved in ministry during the time period of transformation and after it. Nevertheless, one can trace an interesting pattern in the collected data anyway.

Usually national parachurch ministries leaders ran a spectrum of ministries, occupations, and responsibilities, but one occupation could be considered a main one for most of them on the basis of the time they spend on it. Taking into consideration that main occupation of the respondents, one could easily see that the respondents C, D, and H who spend most of their time at a mission field with traditionally non-Christian (Islamic and Taoist) cultural environments provided enormously high ratings for the model aspects, while the respondents E, K, and L, mostly occupied at local pastoral and educational offices, provided considerably lower ratings.

Rating from one to ten of such aspects of the model as its biblical grounding (BG), sociological reliability (SR), visualization (V), particular practical value (PPV), general practical value (GPV), and educational value (EV) by field missionaries and local congregation pastors, as well as their average value per aspect (APA) and per respondent (APR) is represented in Table 7 and Table 8 respectively.

**Table 7. Rating of the Model Aspects by Field Missionaries**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Years in Ministry</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>SR</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>PPV</b>	<b>GPV</b>	<b>EV</b>	<b>APR</b>
C	13	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>10.00</b>
D	12	10	10	9	10	10	10	<b>9.83</b>
H	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	<b>9.83</b>
<b>APA</b>		<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>9.33</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>9.89</b>

Field missionaries who serve in traditionally non-Christian (Islamic and Taoist) cultural environments unanimously appreciate the model extremely high (total average 9.89). Their average per respondent (APR) rate dispersion is equal to 0.17 and spreads from 9.83 (respondents D and H) to 10.00 (respondent C). All of them gave the highest rating of 10 to all aspects of the model except its visualization (APA=9.33), which is probably lower than others due to the reason explained above.

**Table 8. Rating of the Model Aspects by Local Pastors**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Years in Ministry</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>SR</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>PPV</b>	<b>GPV</b>	<b>EV</b>	<b>APR</b>
E	12	7	5	10	7	6	7	<b>7.00</b>
K	8	8	8	6	7	7	8	<b>7.33</b>
L	5	8	8	7	9	7	9	<b>8.00</b>
<b>APA</b>		<b>7.67</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.67</b>	<b>7.67</b>	<b>6.67</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>7.44</b>

Local congregational pastors appreciate the model much less (7.44), but have a wider variety of opinions. Their dispersion of the value is equal to 1.00 and spreads from 7.00 (respondent E) to 8.00 (respondent L). Their average per aspect (APA) rating of the model is more diverse as well—its dispersion is equal 1.33 (from 6.67 to 8.00). The average per aspect (APA) rating of the model by local pastors is represented in descending order in Table 9.

**Table 9. Average per Aspect Rating by Local Pastors**

<b>Aspects of the Model</b>	<b>APA</b>
Educational Value of the Model	8
Biblical Grounding of the Model	7.67
Particular Practical Value of the Model	7.67
Visualization of the Model	7.67
Sociological Reliability of the Model	7.00
General Practical Value of the Model	6.67

The pastors appreciate the educational value of the model most of all (8.00). They equally (7.67) treat the biblical grounding of the model, its particular practical value, and visualization. Sociological reliability of the model and its general practical value got the lowest positions (7.00 and 6.67 accordingly). That result does not sound reasonable: if a model is not reliable and has a low general practical value, by definition it can not have a good educational value. The opinion of the field missionaries, who rates those aspects equally, is more consistent from my point of view. I would explain the difference in the rating of the model in general and its particular aspects by field missionaries and local pastors by the way they feel the challenges of the situation and the need for change in the mission field. The felt needs of the field missionaries are very different from the pastors who teach at the church, and that explains the distressing growth of separation between the mission work and church life in the country.

## **Conclusion**

The results of the study lead to the conclusion that the explanatory model of the worldview transformation in postcommunist Ukraine presented in my previous article in *REE* is in general a

reliable representation of the actual worldview shift processes in the society after the collapse of the totalitarian communist regime in the Soviet Union with its uniform worldview environment. The model proved to be sufficiently grounded biblically and, as a valid generalization, could be helpful for the educational purposes of teaching, training, and equipping missionaries, evangelists, and church planters for effective evangelism in various worldview contexts, as well as for practical evangelism in the societies with plural worldviews. Particular practical value and sociological reliability are less dependable because, as a generalization, the model is not able to cover all specific particulars.

The comparative analysis on the basis of the ministry experience of respondents did not find considerable difference between the appreciations of the model by those who came into the ministry during the period of transformation and those who became involved later. The comparative analysis on the basis of the main occupation of the respondents discovered considerable difference between appreciations of the model by field missionaries and local ministers. The respondents who spend most of their time in the mission fields characterized by traditionally non-Christian (Islamic and Taoist) cultural environment appreciate the model unconditionally, while the respondents mostly occupied at the local pastoral and educational offices treat it more reservedly.

Differences in the extent of the model appreciation by the national parachurch ministries leaders depending on their ministry experience and main occupation discovered by the study, tell more about those leaders than about the model.