

Copyright © 2011 You Jung Jang

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including without limitation preservation or instruction.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING
IMPLEMENTED BY CHRISTIAN ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL TEACHERS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
You Jung Jang
December 2011

APPROVAL SHEET

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING
IMPLEMENTED BY CHRISTIAN ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL TEACHERS

You Jung Jang

Read and Approved by:



Dennis E. Williams (Chair)



Brian C. Richardson

Date December 9, 2011

To my parents,
Chun-Myoung and Hansook,
who always pray for me,
to Young,
my support, my husband, my friend,
to our two children,
Samuel and Chloe,
and to Christian educators
who serve in restoring God's kingdom in education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
PREFACE	x
Chapter	
1. RESEARCH CONCERN.....	1
Research Problem	2
Christian School Teachers	3
Pragmatic Scholasticism	6
Integration of Faith and Learning	6
Research Purpose	8
Delimitations of the Study	9
Research Questions	9
Terminology	10
Research Assumptions	14
Procedural Overview	14
2. PRECEDENT LITERATURE	26
History of Christian School Education	28
Identity of Christian School Education	57

Chapter	Page
Integration of Faith and Learning	83
Summary and Proposed Study	102
3. METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN.	104
Research Questions Synopsis	105
Design Overview	105
Population	107
Sample	108
Delimitations	109
Limitations of Generalization	109
Instrumentation	110
Procedures	115
4. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS.	120
Compilation Protocol	121
Findings and Displays	122
Characteristics of the Sample	123
Teachers' Implementation Level of the Integration of Faith and Learning	126
Teachers' Management Concerns and Implementation Level	127
The Most Difficult Academic Subject in Integrating Faith and Learning	129
The Difference in Teachers' Implementation Level according to Educational Background	130
The Difference in Teachers' Implementation Level according to Demographic Data	134

Chapter	Page
Influential Factors on Teachers’ Implementation level of the Integration of Faith and Learning	137
Evaluation of the Research Design.	138
5. CONCLUSIONS	142
Research Purpose	142
Research Questions	143
Research Implications.	143
Research Applications.	152
Further Research	156
Summary of Conclusions	157
Appendix	
1. Survey Instrument	159
2. Endorsement Letters from ACSI Regional Directors	165
3. Invitation Letter	168
4. Follow-up Letters	171
REFERENCE LIST.	176

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AACS	American Association of Christian Schools
ACSI	Association of Christian Schools International
CBAM	Concerns-Based Adoption Model
IC	Innovation Configuration
LoU	Levels of Use
R&DCTE	Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
SoC	Stages of Concern
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Levels of use of the innovation	19
2.	Integration of faith and learning empirical model	22
3.	The growth of Fundamentalist schools from 1976 to 1984	55
4.	Categorization of questionnaire statements	113
5.	Criteria for assigning implementation levels	116
6.	Gender and age of teachers	123
7.	Teaching experience in Christian school	124
8.	Educational background of teachers	125
9.	Preparation time for the integration and learning	125
10.	Teachers' proficiency in implementation of faith and learning	126
11.	Distribution of teachers by implementation levels	127
12.	Teachers management concerns	128
13.	Correlations between teachers' management concerns and implementation level	129
14.	Proficiency of integration faith into academic subject	130
15.	Difference in proficiency of integrating faith into academic subject according to implementation level	131
16.	Difference in implementation level according to educational background	132
17.	Difference according to educational background:	

Table	Page
Attending Christian school (<i>t</i> -test)	133
18. Difference according to educational background: Taking class in theology (<i>t</i> -test)	133
19. Difference according to educational background: Taking degree on theology (<i>t</i> -test)	134
20. Difference according to educational background: Participating in training (<i>t</i> -test)	135
21. Difference in implementation level according to gender	135
22. Difference according to gender (<i>t</i> -test)	136
23. Correlations between demographic factors and implementation level	136
24. Multiple linear regression: Influential factors	138

PREFACE

The completion of this research would never have been possible without the help, support, and insight of many others. First of all, I thank my parents, Chun-myoungh Jang and Hansook Kim, for their sacrificial and unconditional love. My mother's endless prayer for me and my father's encouraging and affirming words have kept me focusing on this academic work. I am also indebted to my friends who have kept me in their prayers. Especially, I deeply appreciate the financial and spiritual support from my church members throughout this project.

This research project would never have been completed without the invaluable assistance of Dr. Dennis Williams, my supervising professor. His helpful suggestions have made this research project proceed in the right direction. It is God's blessing that I met both him and his wife, Cornelia, in the foreign country. They taught me what genuine love is, as caring for me as my parents. In addition I would like to express thanks to Dr. Brian Richardson for his willingness to serve on my dissertation committee.

It would be difficult to find the words to adequately express my love and gratitude for the patient support of my husband, Young. He has allowed me to keep focusing on research and studying during this academic exercise in spite of his busy schedule as a full time senior pastor. I have to also acknowledge the love of our children, Samuel and Chloe. They are surely God's gifts to encourage me. Of course, this project would not be produced without the ability, wisdom, and insight that have come from a

loving God. With gratitude from my heart, I praise God who has guided me until now
and filled me with His infinite love.

You Jung Jang

Gyeongsangbuk-do, Korea

December 2011

CHAPTER 1

RESEARCH CONCERN

During the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, Evangelical Protestantism's dominant culture-shaping force has gradually declined while secular humanism has increased its influence in American culture (Hunter 1983, 37). Secular humanism has exerted influence on public schools and "since the mid-1960s, fundamentalist and evangelical Protestants and their churches . . . have been establishing and patronizing alternatives to public education that are usually referred to as independent Christian day schools or fundamentalist academies" (Caper and Layman 1995, 10). Christian schools have sought to distinguish themselves from public and other private schools by placing "the living Word, Jesus Christ, and the written Word, the Bible," at the center and most Christians involved in Christian schools have believed that "the Christian student attending a secular school is being sheltered from the truth; consequently he is conforming to the world rather than to the image of Christ" (Haycock 2005, iv).

Frank Gaebelein indicates that the problem, however, is that it is also possible for children to be sheltered from truth even though they attend Christian schools. The schools may try to employ Christian teachers. They may strongly emphasize Bible study classes, chapel services, and revivalism. They may recommend teachers to open their classes with prayer (Gaebelein 1954, 42). Like Richard Edlin asserts, these things,

however, cannot bring about a Christian school even though they are to be encouraged “when the basic curriculum (the real core of what the school is all about) is still framed and studied as if God does not exist!” (Edlin 1999, 35). Edlin argues that the education of such schools is considered “as a veneer to obscure an otherwise non-Christian core” (Edlin 1999, 35-36). Introducing considerable debate in Christian education, George Akers and Robert Moon clearly point out this problem and state,

There is a group who feel that the church school system has actually been masquerading, that what is called Christian education is, in reality, only a good secular education with ecclesiastical window dressing—with tacked-on worship, tacked-on Bible classes, tacked-on chapels, revival weeks, and weekend services. . . . Critics charge that all subjects are taught just as they would be in any good public school, except that in the Christian school you have “the good guys up front” and maybe a more select student group. They maintain that church schools are just providing good private education in a *religious environment*—that it’s the social impact of the religious climate (everyone is Christian) that makes all the difference. (Akers and Moon 1980, 20)

Then, Akers and Moon ask, “Is this enough?” (Akers and Moon 1980, 20). Recognizing the same problem in Christian school systems, Mark Eckel, in his book *The Whole Truth*, suggests that every Christian educator should deal with the urgent question, “What makes Christian school education distinct?” (Eckel 2003, 48).

Research Problem

This study was designed to find the answer to the question, “What makes a Christian school distinctly Christian?” Many Christian educators have recognized the importance of the integration of faith and learning and considered biblical integration as the factor that makes a Christian school Christian. Most Christian schools portray a distinctive biblical philosophy of education which supports biblical worldview integration. Their mission statements reflect the efforts to integrate the biblical

worldview in the academic areas. Ruth Haycock, in the *Encyclopedia of Bible Truths*, discusses the importance of “developing a Christian worldview through the careful and articulate integration of God’s Word into the broader academic curriculum” (Haycock 2005, iii). She quotes Ken Smitherman, the president of the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI), when he addressed the impact of today’s Christian schooling on countless number of students around the world by stating,

Christ-centered schools are effectively changing young lives for the cause of Christ. Regardless of the subject being taught, when permeated with scriptural principles, a worldview is being intricately etched in the students’ hearts and minds, impacting their thinking and decision making for a lifetime. (Haycock 2005, iii)

Emphasizing the significant place of the integration of faith and learning in Christian school systems, abundant literature tries to define biblical integration and develop its philosophical viewpoints. The problem, however, is that they often fail to address the questions: “What does integration of faith and learning actually mean in operational terms?” and “How do teachers help students to integrate faith and learning?” (Korniejczuk 1994, 4). Larry Burton and Constance Nwosu in their research on student perceptions of the integration of faith, learning, and practice deal with this problem.

They assert,

The integration of faith and learning (IFL) is a critical issue on Christian campuses. However, when the topic is discussed, it is often in the context of philosophical terminology instead of classroom realities. . . . The reality for K-12 and college teachers alike seems to be that everyone talks about the importance of IFL, but few persons describe what it is or how to do it. (Burton and Nwosu 2002, CCTEPaper.pdf)

Christian School Teachers

Hebert Grove asserts that “a common idea in education is that the major influence upon the learning process in the classroom is the classroom teacher. The

classroom teacher usually has the greatest control over both what is studied and how it is studied” (Grove 1990, 1). Dealing with the significant role of teachers in the integration of faith and learning, Frank Gaebelein shares his conversation with Karl Barth, who stated that “the most effective way to integrate every subject of study with Christianity is through teachers with a genuinely Christian world view” (Gaebelein 1954, 36).

Gaebelein continues to state,

This is why the school or college that would develop a Christ-centered and Biblically grounded program must fly from its masthead this standard, ‘No Christian education without Christian teachers,’ and must never, under any condition, pull its colors down. Compromise of this issue, if persisted in, always results in the progressive de-Christianizing of an institution. (Gaebelein 1954, 37)

Arthur Holmes particularly argues the importance of developing a “climate of faith and learning” and asserts the key function of the teacher in the climate (Holmes 1975, 81). He then states, “It is important that the teacher be transparently Christian as well as an enthusiastic and careful scholar, and that he not compartmentalize the two but think integrationally himself” (Holmes 1975, 83). Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk also views the important place of teachers in Christian school systems and asserts, “Without question, the most important manifestation of faith-learning integration is the daily life of the Christian teacher. But in addition to the hidden curriculum, Christian schools and colleges are charged with the responsibility of purposely and consciously making faith connections throughout the formal or planned program of study” (Korniejczuk 1994, 4). Then, she raises a considerable question, “To what extent is this latter responsibility carried out by Christian teachers?” (Korniejczuk 1994, 4).

The problem is that it is not easy to find teachers in Christian elementary, secondary or colleges who are able to integrate their faith into the subjects they teach.

Mark Eckel points out the reason for this problem. According to him, even though Christian schools claim a Christ-centered curriculum in their mission statements, it appears that when they hire teachers, they look for teachers who meet government regulations and who are excellent in their subject rather than teachers who have the ability to discern disciplines christianly. While placing intellectualism before Scripture, Christian schools, accordingly, often ignore the fact that “maintaining a Christ-centered curriculum and Christian interpretation of life is critical to making a distinctively Christian school” (Eckel 2003, 44). Gangel notices this problem and states its danger by saying,

Integration of any kind can never rise from theological ignorance. This has long been a major problem in Christian elementary and secondary schools as well as Christian colleges. While requiring adequate credentials in a particular age-level or content specialization, we require only the most rudimentary biblical instruction. Schools often hire faculty with little or no formal training in biblical and theological studies, expecting that strong church affiliation and personal devotions will fulfill that side of the requirement. Such teachers can no more construct an evangelical world and life view than a practicing pastor can integrate Scripture and astronomy from watching several episodes of ‘Nova.’” (Gangel 1988, 76)

He also points out a lack of intimate knowledge of Scriptures on the part of the administrators who are in charge of hiring teachers and he argues that it exacerbates this problem (Gangel 1988, 76). Frank Gaebelein observes a dilemma of a president of Christian schools who is “confronted by a choice between the tolerant humanist who is a good scholar and a good teacher, and true believer who is a somewhat inferior scholar and teacher” (Gaebelein 1954, 37-38). He argues that the president often choose the former, and such decision “will in the long run pack a faculty with ‘tolerant humanists’ for the reason that administrators who adopt it will inevitably take the easy way of

appointing benevolent unbelievers rather than searching persistently and prayerfully for teachers who are both scholars and Christians” (Gaebelein 1954, 38).

Pragmatic Scholasticism

Phillip Johnson points out that the wider academic community regards Christianity as more of a curious object, and he mentions that in much of academe, “the most favorable thing you can say about a Christian theist is that his work is so good you would never have guessed he was a Christian (Johnson 1994, 24). Many Christian schools and educators often ask the question, “Can we be Christian and excellent too?” and try to pursue the excellence, which people in our hedonistic society define depending on “a test score, I.Q., placement on the social register, a grade-point average, or a six-figure annual income” (Brantley 1995, 5). Christian educators in Christian schools must keep in mind, however, that “a Christian label is not a Christian education. Academic standards are not a replacement for biblical integration. Where graduates attend university is not the focal point of why Christian schools exist. Degrees, test scores, professional placement, or the amount of take-home pay does not indicate success for academies built on a Scriptural foundation” (Eckel 2003, 52).

Integration of Faith and Learning

Integration of faith and learning has been a popular topic for Christians, in particular Christian educators who work with Christian schools, and it has appeared in abundant literature on Christian education. Frank Gaebelein’s *The Patterns of God’s Truth* and Arthur Holmes’ *The Idea of a Christian College* and *All Truth is God’s Truth*, emphasize the importance of biblical integration in every level of Christian school

systems. Harold Heie and David Wolfe's *The Reality of Christian Learning* defines the integrating of faith and learning with a philosophical viewpoint and Kenneth Gangel's article "Integrating Faith and Learning" presents its principles and process. The current research, however, reports that even though Christian educators and authors put stress on the significant role of the integration of faith and learning, a large number of Christian school and college teachers still do not know how to implement it in a practical way in their teaching in the classroom (Korniejczuk 1994, 4). Raquel Korniejczuk explains this problem as saying, "Describing the integration of faith and learning in terms of lofty platitudes offers little help with the task of implementation" (Korniejczuk, 21cc_377-394.htm). She then points out that it is necessary to answer the questions, "In clear and operational terms, what does integration of faith and learning look like in the classroom and school? How it done?" (Korniejczuk, 21cc_377-394.pdf).

Kenneth Gangel also observes the problem and contends that Christian educators can talk about the integration of faith and learning better than they can practice it in their teaching, and says, "In some quarters it almost becomes a symbol, a shibboleth to be uttered but not demonstrated" (Gangel 1994, 396). George Knight articulates that the "problem for Christian educators has not been to find the pattern of knowledge in relation to its center; their problem has been to apply what they know" (Knight 1998, 211). James Cunningham and Anthony Fortosis also assert that for many Christian teachers, biblical integration is an unknown quantity and they do not know how to implement it in their teaching because they teach in the way they were taught as "the products of secular influences, through public schools, secular colleges, and the media" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 80). Frank Gaebelien recognized this weakness of

Protestant attempts at education around four decades ago by calling it “scholastic schizophrenia,” and his points are still true in today’s Christian schools (Gaebelein 1964, 40). He asserted that Christian education

neglect[s] of full reliance upon Scripture. And let it be noted, this is true even of the theologically conservative groups; in doctrine they are thoroughly Biblical, but they have failed to see that the great truths of Scripture embrace even the so-called secular fields of knowledge. Despite their adherence to fundamental gospel truth, they have either not seen the unity of all truth in God or, recognizing this unity, have done little to make it a living reality throughout the whole of education. Thus much of evangelical educational thought has yet to move beyond a kind of scholastic schizophrenia in which a highly orthodox theology coexists uneasily with a teaching of non-religious subjects that differs little from that in secular institutions. (Gaebelein 1964, 40-41)

Like Mark Eckel asserts, “Biblical integration is not one more thing: it’s the main thing” (Eckel 2003, 56). Integration of faith and learning makes Christian schools to be Christian. Biblical integration, therefore, should be recognized and understood by teachers in Christian schools, and more crucially it should be practiced by them in their teaching. Have Christian school teachers developed a proper understanding of biblical integration? What do Christian school teachers think about biblical integration in their teaching? Do Christian school teachers have proficiency in accomplishing integration of faith and learning? How do teacher education programs teach them in terms of biblical integration? These questions point to the problem that this study attempts to address.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the study was to examine the self reported proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in achieving the task of integrating faith and learning across the academic curriculum, and to analyze the factors that influence teachers when they implement the integration of faith and learning.

Delimitations of the Study

Integration of faith and learning is a popular topic among Christian educators from all levels of Christian education, from elementary education to higher education. This study was limited to biblical integration implemented by elementary school teachers in Christian schools. This study also was delimited to the elementary school teachers who were in charge of a classroom and teach common academic disciplines taught in the elementary school. This study excluded teachers who taught exclusively subjects such as music, health, or art. It also was delimited to ACSI affiliated Christian schools because their philosophy of education is thoroughly biblical, and teachers in the schools are expected to integrate the biblical philosophy with their daily teaching activities. The elementary school teachers chosen for this research were the teachers in the schools listed in the ACSI directory of schools.

The main purpose of this study was to examine teachers' self reported proficiency level to integrate faith and learning in their daily teaching and to see if there are any factors that influence teachers when achieving biblical integration. This study, therefore, did not articulate how teachers implemented the integration of faith and learning or described the specific methods used by teachers to accomplish it.

Research Questions

1. How proficient are elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in integrating faith and learning?
2. Which academic subject do elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools feel is the most difficult to integrate faith and learning?
3. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning between elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools who attended Christian schools and those who did not?

4. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning between elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools who attended seminars or training events on the implementation of faith and learning and those who did not?
5. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning by elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools according to demographic factors?

Terminology

Academic disciplines/ subjects. These two terms were used interchangeably in this study. These two terms referred to subjects that elementary teachers teach in the classroom, such as science, music, mathematics, social science, language, arts and health.

ACSI. The Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) is an organization that strives to enable and equip Christian educators and schools worldwide to effectively educate children and young people with the mind of Christ (The Association of Christian Schools International 2008, Default.aspx)). The ACSI vision statement is that Christian school students worldwide acquire wisdom, knowledge, and a biblical worldview as evidenced by a lifestyle of character, leadership, service, stewardship, and worship (The Association of Christian Schools International 2008, Default.aspx)

Biblical integration/ integration of faith and learning. These two terms were used interchangeably. In this study these terms meant “a deliberate and systematic process of approaching the entire educational enterprise . . . from a Christian perspective” (aiias.edu 2008, ifl_definition.html). According to Frank Gaebelien, the integration of faith and learning has the assumption that all truth is God’s truth, so there is no dichotomy between God’s truth and secular truth. “It must see that truth in science and

history, in mathematics, art, literature, and music belongs just as much to God as truth in religion (Gaebelein 1962, 13). In short, the integration of faith and learning is “the teaching of all subjects as a part of the total truth of God” (Gangel 1994, 396).

Christian education. In this study, Christian education meant “a Bible-based, Holy Spirit-empowered (Christ-centered) teaching-learning process” (Graendorf 1981, 16). It is “the deliberate, systematic, and sustained divine and human effort to share or appropriate the knowledge, values, attitudes, skills, sensitivities, and behaviors that comprise or are consistent with the Christian faith. It fosters the change, renewal, and reformation of persons, groups, and structures by the power of the Holy Spirit to conform to the revealed will of God as expressed in the Scriptures and preeminently in the person of Jesus Christ, as well as any outcomes of that effort” (Pazmiño 1997, 87).

Christian school. Schools that are privately operated by Christians that seek to provide an education based on a biblical philosophy of education. Christian schools are distinctive from public schools and other private schools because of their Bible-based and Christ-centered education. They may or may not be in conjunction with a church or a denomination.

Core curriculum. In this study core curriculum referred to the subjects that all students are required to study at a Christian elementary school such as religion, language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, arts, and health.

Christian elementary school teachers. In this study Christian elementary school teachers were defined as those who teach all the core curriculum subjects taught in the elementary school, such as religion, language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. Teachers who only taught a specific subject, such as music, art, or health,

were excluded.

Christian elementary school. In this study a Christian elementary school was a Christian school that provides an educational program for the child in grades 1 through 5 or 6.

Faith. In this study faith meant trust and relationship with God and was “the area of personal communion with God – it values traits such as trust and love rather than precision of thought or emotional detachment” (Wilhoit 1987, 78). It represented the sphere of understanding as revealed by God in His Word, so it cannot be tested and rationalized by man.

Hidden curriculum. In this study, hidden curriculum meant “the norms, values, and social expectations indirectly conveyed to students by the styles of teaching, unarticulated assumptions in teaching materials and the organizational characteristics of educational institutions” (icaap.org 2008, dict.pl).

Integration. Integration is the process of combining separate components into a unified whole. It is derived from the Latin *integraie*, which means “to make whole” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 79). According to Badley, there are five main paradigms of integration in the literature. Fusion integration occurs when “two (or more) elements flow together, or mesh, becoming one new entity” (Badley 1994, 24). Incorporation integration “seems to imply that one element disappears into, dissolves in, or infiltrates the other” (Badley 1994, 24). Correlation integration is “a pedagogical or strategic activity” – rather than as “structural/formal relationships” – because “in correlation integration, someone, usually a teacher, shows the relationships between two subjects by noting points of intersection or common interest,” instead of blending or

combining elements (Badley 1994, 24- 25). Dialogical integration is “a sufficiently high and continuous degree of correlation that we can properly claim a conversation had begun between two areas” (Badley 1994, 25). In perspectival integration, which Badley advocates, “the entire educational enterprise is viewed from a specific perspective” (Badley 1994, 25). He believes that “the Christian worldview makes a special contribution of faith and learning because it contributes the overall framework, or perspective, in which learning takes place” (Badley 1994, 28). In this study, integration was perspectival integration that is to develop and articulate a Christian perspective and to relate the perspective to all the academic disciplines.

Learning. Learning is generally “conceived as some form of imposition of ideas or standards upon a person or organism” (Bigge 1971, 32), and it “takes place through perception, insight, and discrimination; through practice; through problem-solving; and through identification with a person, object, or cause (Wyckoff 1961, 53). Related to the term of the integration of faith and learning, it “is represented by cautious generalizations of philosophy or the carefully controlled inductive truths of empirical science” (Wilhoit 1987, 78). It represents the sphere of understanding as discovered and recorded by man and can be verified by scientific method (Wilhoit 1987, 78).

Philosophy of Christian education. In this study a philosophy of Christian education was defined as “an attempt to arrange systematically some thoughts on education as given their meaning by the biblical teachings that constitute the orthodox Christian faith” (DeJong 1974, 16). In other words, it is a philosophy of education based upon Christian answers to the basic issues of philosophy—metaphysics, “the study of questions concerning the nature of reality”; epistemology, “the study of the nature of

truth and knowledge and how these are attained”; and axiology, “the study of questions of value” (Knight 1998, 8-9).

School provided teacher training. A teacher training program that Christian schools provide for their teachers, particularly in order to equip them with a Christian philosophy of education with training in how to integrate a biblical worldview into their teaching.

Research Assumptions

The following is the list of the research assumptions of the study.

1. All schools chosen for this study share the ACSI’s philosophy of Christian school education. The ACSI vision statement is that Christian school students worldwide will acquire wisdom, knowledge, and a biblical worldview as evidenced by a lifestyle of character, leadership, service, stewardship, and worship (ACSI Vision Statement, acsi.org). ACSI adheres to a thoroughly biblical approach to Christian school education and affirms an evangelical perspective to the Christian faith, especially in regards to its understanding of the Bible as the only infallible, authoritative, inerrant Word of God (ACSI Statement of Faith, acsi.org). The philosophy of education of selected ACSI affiliated Christian schools is thoroughly biblical, and teachers in the schools are expected to integrate the biblical philosophy with their teaching activities. All schools used in this study hold these commitments and develop their educational program accordingly.
2. Teachers in the selected ACSI affiliated schools have the intention to integrate and to share their biblical worldview and philosophy of Christian education into all subject areas of the curriculum in some way.
3. The teacher in ACSI affiliated Christian schools will answer the questions that this study addresses openly and honestly by reflecting on their daily teaching in classroom.

Procedural Overview

One of the main purposes of this study, which is reflected in the first research question, was to evaluate the proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in achieving the task of integrating faith and learning. In order to fulfill

this purpose, this study used a questionnaire developed by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk and her model of implementation of integration of faith and learning.

This study, however, revised the questionnaire by adding additional parts to answer research questions 2 through 5. In part 2, elementary school teachers were asked demographic questions such as gender, age, length of time teaching in a Christian school and the teacher's personal faith information, and in part 3, there were questions about their educational background including their experience of training or seminars on the integration of faith and learning. Part 4 asked teachers which are the most difficult subjects to integrate biblical principle.

A Model of Deliberate Teacher Implementation of Integration of Faith and Learning

In order to present teachers' deliberate process of integrating faith and learning, Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk developed a model of teacher implementation of integration of faith and learning based upon Shirley Hord and others' Concerns-Based Adoption Model and upon the philosophical model of the integration of faith and learning proposed by Arthur Holmes and systematized by George Akers. Korniejczuk revised and validated this preliminary model in her research project performed in 1994, which was to investigate "to what extent the integration of faith and learning was deliberately accomplished by teachers in six Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools located in three South American countries" (Korniejczuk 1994, 5). This study used her revised and validated model and questionnaire with her permission.

Concerns-Based Adoption Model

Several models to understand the change process in education were developed during the 70s and 80s. One of these models is the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM). This model was developed by researchers, such as Gene Hall and Susan Loucks, at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE) located in the University of Texas to “look into educational change and improvement processes in an effort to understand how change could become a successful enterprise” (Hord et al. 1987, 7).

While studying how schools might maximize the prospects for successful school improvement, the R&DCTE team verified a number of assumptions about change, upon which the CBAM model was based. The assumptions are

1. Change is a process, not an event. Change is a process occurring over time, usually a period of several years.
2. Change is accomplished by individuals. Individuals must be the focus of attention in implementing a new program.
3. Change is a highly personal experience. Each individual reacts differently to a change, and sufficient account of these differences must be taken.
4. Change involves developmental growth. The individuals involved appear to express or demonstrate growth in terms of their feelings and skills. These feelings and skills tend to shift with respect to the new program or practice as individuals pass through an ever-greater degree of experience.
5. Change is best understood in operational terms. Teachers, and others, will naturally relate to change or improvement in terms of what it will mean to them or how it will affect their current classroom practice.
6. The focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context. The real meaning of any change lies in its human, not its material, component. Furthermore, effective change facilitators work with people in an adaptive and systemic way, designing interventions for clients’ needs, realizing that those needs exist in particular contexts and settings. (Hord et al. 1987, 5-7)

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is client-centered model and the individual is “the frame of reference from which the change process is described” (Hall

and Loucks 1978, 9). Another cornerstone for this model is innovation, which is “an idea, practice, or object perceived as new by an individual” (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, 19).

One of the components of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is Innovation Configuration (IC), which is “the operational patterns of the innovation that result from selection and use of different innovation component variations” (Hall and Loucks 1978, 11). Innovation Configuration is the tool that “focuses on identifying and describing the various forms of an innovation that different teachers adopt”(Hord et al. 1987, 8). Another component of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model(CBAM) is Stages of Concern (SoC), which is the dimension that deals with “how users feel about an innovation from the time they first become aware of it until they have mastered it” (Hall and Loucks 1978, 10). Levels of Use (LoU) is the third component of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model and it defines “the various states of user behavior, that is, exactly what a user is doing with an innovation” (Hall and Loucks 1978, 10). Gene Hall and Shirley Hord developed eight Levels of Use.

Teachers in the Level of Use 1, nonuse, have little or no knowledge of the innovation and they do not plan to use it. According to Hord and other researchers, this absence of any action toward use of the innovation signals clearly LoU 0 (nonuse)” (Hord et al. 1987, 57). The next level is orientation. The teacher in this level is “taking the initiative to learn more about the innovation” and indicates that for now there is no time to prepare for beginning use but he will probably use it in the future (Hord et al. 1987, 57). Teachers in the next level, preparation, are “taking steps to get ready to begin use,” but they do not actually start using the innovation (Hord et al. 1987, 58). Mechanical use is the next level and it is characterized by teachers who attempt to use the innovation but

are struggling with the management of materials and time. They know the ideal way that the program should work but they cannot use it in that way. Level of Use 4 is divided into two sub-levels—Level of Use 4a and Level of Use 4b. Once a teacher has reached the Level of Use 4a, routine, it is common to stay there for an extended time while “making only minor adjustments in patterns of use” (Hord et al. 1987, 59). Teachers in the level 4b, refinement, change the use of the innovation for the benefit of the students. Level of Use 5, integration, is determined by two key variables: regular “collaboration between two or more persons and changes in use of the innovation for the benefit of clients” and according to Hord and other researchers, only a small number of teachers are at this level (Hord et al. 1987, 61). The last Level of Use is renewal and in this level teachers are planning or exploring to make major modifications such as seeking more effective alternatives to the established use of innovation in order to improve students’ learning (Hord et al. 1987, 62). Table 1 presents the description of the levels with operational definitions.

Holmes’ Philosophical Model of the Integration of Faith and Learning

Arthur Holmes asserts that the distinctive of a Christian college is “an education that cultivates the creative and active integration of faith and learning, of faith and culture” (Holmes 1987, 6). Even though integration is the unique task of the Christian college, Holmes contends that in reality faith and learning often interact rather than integrate, which is a dialog rather than a complete integration (Holmes 1987, 6). He clearly points out that interaction is not integration because “in interaction the two sit side by side in real contact with each other and engage in dialog on variety of particulars”

Table 1. Levels of use of the innovation

Level	Name	Operational definition
0	NonUse	State in which the user has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.
1	Orientation	State in which the user has recently acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has recently explored or is exploring its value orientation and its demands upon user and user system.
2	Preparation	State in which the user is preparing for the first use of the innovation.
3	Mechanical Use	State in which the user focuses effort on the short term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.
4a	Routine	Use of the innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is given to improving innovation use or its consequences.
4b	Refinement	State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within the immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short-and long-term consequences for clients.
5	Integration	State in which the user is combining personal efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.
6	Renewal	State in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of or alternatives to present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the system.

(Hall and Hord 1984, 84)

(Holmes 1987, 46). He continues to say, “Yet we need more than this if we are going to relate faith and learning as a coherent whole from the ground up” (Holmes 1987, 46).

While Holmes admits that interaction between faith and learning generally occurs in Christian schools, he argues that biblical integration should not become

disjunction between them. He asserts, “The Christian college will not settle for a militant polemic against secular learning and science and culture, as if there were a great gulf fixed between the secular and the sacred. All truth is God’s truth, no matter where it is found, and we can thank him for it all” (Holmes 1987, 7).

According to Holmes, conjunction is another possibility of integration, which occurs in Christian colleges. He states that “integration also transcends awkward conjunctions of faith and learning in some unholy alliance rather than a fruitful union” (Holmes 1987, 7).

George Akers, in the article, “The Measure of a School,” recognizes Holmes’ thoughts on the integration of faith and learning in Christian colleges and systematized them into four teaching models. The first model is complete disjunction. Teachers in this model separate the world of faith and the world of learning. This approach “results in a dichotomized campus” and “gives students a distorted view of reality” (Akers 1977, 44). Injunction is the second teaching model, in which the teacher “highlights differences between the two approaches to learning by debates, or at best by cordial dialog” (Akers 1977, 44). Teachers in this model like using “devil’s advocate.” The worlds of faith and learning are still posited apart, and “perhaps it could pass for a factious courtship, but hardly a ‘wedding’” (Akers 1977, 44). The third approach is conjunction. Teachers in this model strive “to bring the two together by taking advantage of natural contact points where religion seems in some way to touch subjects or illustrates a moral point” (Akers 1977, 44). According to Akers, it is the most common and the most dangerous approach “because it can so easily settle for a trite sentimentality and smug superficiality, all in the name of religion” (Akers 1977, 44). The final teaching model is integration. In this

mode, fusion is accomplished. Because one unified reality is offered, there are no dichotomies between the sacred and the secular (Akers 1977, 45).

A Model of Teacher Implementation of Integration of Faith and Learning

Based on the ways of teaching presented by Holmes and the Concerns-Based Adoption Model developed by Hall and Loucks, Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk developed a hypothetical model for teacher implementation of the integration of faith and learning. This preliminary model particularly used the stages of one of the components of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model, the Levels of Use, and “adapted the characteristics of each level to the philosophical model” (Korniejczuk 1994, 56). Korniejczuk consulted with experts in the field of education and the integration of faith and learning to improve the preliminary model. She then evaluated its validity and revised it by investigating teachers in six Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools in terms of their implementation of the integration of faith and learning. Table 2 summarizes the empirically validated model of teacher implementation of the faith and learning.

Expert Panel and Field Test

Since Korniejczuk’s survey instrument has already been validated by experts in the field of education and by teachers in Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools, the proposed survey questionnaire, which was almost identical to Korniejczuk’s, did not need to be examined on its validity by a panel of experts. Instead, in order to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of parts added for this study, the researcher had a field

Table 2. Integration of faith and learning empirical model

Level of Implementation	Characteristics	Examples
No deliberate implementation		
Level 0: No knowledge No interest	<p>Teacher has little or no knowledge of IFL.</p> <p>Teacher is doing nothing to be involved in IFL.</p> <p>Teacher is not convinced that IFL can be carried out in the subject.</p> <p>Teacher thinks that the subject he/she teaches is not related to faith.</p>	<p>“IFL is only extracurricular; cannot be implemented in the curriculum.”</p> <p>“I do not know how to implement IFL.”</p> <p>“I have other priorities in mind.”</p> <p>“I cannot do it in my subject.”</p> <p>“I know how to do it, but I do not have institutional support.”</p>
Level 1: Interest	<p>Teacher has acquired or is acquiring information on IFL.</p> <p>Teacher is aware that IFL should be incorporated in his/her classes.</p> <p>Teacher is looking for ways to deliberately implement IFL.</p> <p>Teacher thinks that it may be worthwhile to include IFL in future planning.</p>	<p>“I know very little about IFL.”</p> <p>“I do not like superficial integration, thus I am looking for appropriate ways.”</p> <p>“I am looking for information on how to implement IFL.”</p>
Level 2: Readiness	<p>Teacher knows how to implement IFL in at least some themes.</p> <p>Teacher is preparing to deliberately implement IFL at a definite future time.</p>	<p>“I am going to incorporate some integration I have tried in my course plan”.</p> <p>“I have decided to systematically introduce some things I know.”</p>
Deliberate implementation		
Level 3: Irregular or superficial use	<p>Deliberately integrated, but generally unplanned.</p> <p>There is no coherent Christian worldview.</p> <p>Irregular use. Only some themes are integrated throughout the general context of the subject.</p> <p>Superficial use. Use of spiritual content for secular purposes without meaning.</p> <p>Management concerns disturb IFL.</p>	<p>“I know that what I am doing is not the best, but this is a Christian school and I have to do something.”</p> <p>“I do not know how to plan IFL.”</p> <p>“I only feel confident with two themes: Creation and Evolution.”</p> <p>“I do not like planning IFL. I do it consciously but spontaneously.”</p>

Table 2—Continued. Integration of faith and learning empirical model

<p>Level 4: Conventional</p>	<p>There is a stabilized use of IFL, but no changes are made in ongoing use. Syllabus and objectives show IFL in at least some themes. IFL is based on teacher’s taking rather than student response. Teacher knows how to implement IFL. IFL shows coherent implementation.</p>	<p>“I include IFL in my unit planning so I can remember to do it.” “It is not often that I change what I have planned.”</p>
<p>Level 5: Dynamic</p>	<p>Teacher varies the implementation of IFL to increase impact on students. Teacher can describe changes that he/she had made in the last months and what is planned in a short term. Change of strategies and themes according to student needs or interests. Students draw conclusions of IFL.</p>	<p>“I just look at their [students’] faces and know what they are thinking. I encourage them to draw conclusions.” “I vary my IFL strategies according to the needs of my students.”</p>
<p>Level 6: Comprehensive</p>	<p>Teacher cooperated with colleagues on ways to improve IFL. Regular collaboration between two or more teachers increased impact on students. The whole school (or at least a group of teachers) provided a coherent Christian worldview and emphasized student response.</p>	

(Korniejczuk 1994, 138-39)

test of the instrument with teachers in Christian Academy of Louisville, which is one of the largest Christian schools in Louisville, Kentucky. The feedback from the teachers aided in modifying the instrument to be ready for use.

Data Collection

In order to gather data to answer the five research questions of this study, the finalized survey instrument was posted in a website, www.surveymonkey.com, as an online survey. The elementary classroom teachers in the Southeast region of ACSI,

including the states of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, and teachers in the Mid-America region including Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin were asked to visit the website and to complete the finalized survey instrument. The data from the survey instrument were analyzed to examine the level of proficiency of the Christian elementary school teachers to implement integration of faith and learning in relation to their experience of training, educational background of attending Christian schools, and other factors.

In order to have the elementary school teachers to participate in this research, it was required to obtain their email addresses. The directors of Southeast and Mid-America regional offices of ACSI were contacted to ask current database of school administrators' contact information including email addresses.

After making a list of email contacts, an invitation letter was delivered via email to the selected school administrators to ask them to send emails to their teachers to participate in this study by completing the survey questionnaire. The invitation letter outlined the purpose of the research and the nature of teacher participation needed. A week later follow-up reminders were sent to enhance participation of the teachers who have not responded to complete the survey. Two more follow-up letters were sent.

When the response count reached to the number of the completed survey instruments required for this study, survey collection was stopped. Collecting responses was completed and a summary of the results was downloaded. The collected raw data was coded and analyzed using the SPSS statistical package for descriptive statistics. A

content analysis was completed to define each teacher's level of implementation of the integration of faith and learning.

The researcher categorized teachers based on their educational background—the existence of educational experience of participating school-provided training for biblical integration, or experience by taking degrees or classes on theology or religion. The researcher sought to examine the degree of implementing biblical integration of faith and learning among the categories of teachers. The responses for the question on the most difficult subject to integrate biblical principles were coded to identify any relationship between the academic subject and the level of the teacher's proficiency to achieve integration of faith and learning in teaching. Additionally, the researcher observed if there were demographic factors that affected the level of teacher implementation of biblical integration.

CHAPTER 2

PRECEDENT LITERATURE

Because people were created as rational beings, education was necessary to bring the image of God in humanity to full bloom.
Gregory of Nyssa

What makes the Christian school Christian? This has been a major question among Christian educators who have worked with Christian schools for a number of decades. Regarding this issue, it is necessary to listen to Frank Gaebelin's statement. He argues that there are "some schools and colleges that, with a strong emphasis upon Bible courses, chapel services, and revivalism, have the name of being outstandingly Christian, though in reality there is too little difference between their teaching of most subjects and that of the teaching in a secular school or state university, except for the fact that in the Christian school classes may be opened by prayer" (Gaebelin 1954, 42). Charles Colson points out this problem in today's Christian school in an interview. He declares that, because of today's radical individualism, a Christian usually focuses on a private transaction between the individual and God and has "no concern for a biblical informed world-view. We come to Jesus, we're saved, and we live happily ever after . . . in a protected environment" (Eckel 2003, 52). Christian schools educate children in the liberal arts or sciences in a Christian environment. Christian school students go to chapel, attend Bible studies, and are required to keep a certain code or rules to live as Christians. Colson calls such a school environment "some kind of protected Christian enclave" and

indicates that children in that protected enclave have the same kind of education they would have at another school system (Eckel 2003, 53). He continues,

Christian education has failed to make a convincing case that it is different from secular education, that we see all of education influenced by our understanding of revelation and truth from a Christian perspective, where every discipline is undergirded by a basically distinctive or Christian view of reality. If you're simply offering a Christian adaptation of what you're given in secular schools then I would probably be urging my grandchildren to go to secular [schools] which are better known and would give them a better shot at [further education]. (Eckel 2003, 53)

Richard Edlin also observes the same problem in a number of Christian schools that are “private schools, which erroneously lay claim to the title of Christian schools” (Edlin 1999, 35). He makes an expression of “icing on the cake” in describing the same school environment, which Colson calls “protective Christian enclave” (Edlin 1999, 35). Edlin asserts that a Christian school teaches the basic learning subjects as if God does not exist and “is still expounding the real world irrelevancy of the same Lord whom it proclaims in its chapel services” (Edlin 1999, 35). He, then, makes a convincing statement:

Christian education must not be seen as a veneer to obscure an otherwise non-Christian core. It is not just icing on an otherwise rotten cake. Obedience in one area doesn't cancel disobedience in another. A little bit of Bible study on top of disobedience education doesn't equal obedient education. (Edlin 1999, 36)

The observations of these authors on today's Christian schools provide an answer to the question, “What makes Christian schools Christian?” Their point can be summarized in this way: Christian schools should be developed based on a Christian perspective or biblical worldview, which forms the basis for educational practices and undergirds every discipline touched in the classroom. In short, they turn our attention to a popular phrase among Christian educators – “the integration of faith and learning.”

This chapter will be developed according to the question, “What makes Christian schools Christian?” It will review selected literature in three areas: the history of Christian schools in America, the identity of Christian schools, and the integration of faith and learning.

History of Christian School Education

Paul Kienel identifies Christian school education as “the second oldest form of continuous education in the Western world, second only to Jewish schools” (Kienel 1998, 7). For a proper understanding of the history of Christian school education, it is important to start with the Hebrew origins of Christian education including Jewish schools. Ken Badley argues that “our present Christian educational system is rooted in the past, grounded in Jewish tradition” (Badley 1994, 14). In explaining the debt of today’s Christian education to Old Testament pedagogy, Michael Anthony and Warren Benson also contend, “Tracing these early origins of Hebrew education provides a glimpse into God’s original design for education” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 17).

Gangel and Benson observe Hebrew education and assert, “Education was always a passion with the Hebrews, so the Scripture is full of pedagogical concepts” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 21). Frederick Eby and Charles Flinn Arrowood agree with them and say, “No mention of a school, as such, is anywhere found in the Old Testament. The Hebrew language, however, was rich in words that have to do with instruction; at least thirty-four root words imply the idea of teaching, and the words *teach* and *teacher* were frequently used (Eby and Arrowood 1940, 140). Samuel Kahn also contends that it is certain that the Jews were committed to instruct and train their children, even though there is no word for school used in the Old Testament with the exception of Samuel’s

“School of the Prophets,” implied in 1 Samuel 10:5; 19:20 (Kahn 1960, 160). For Jewish people “life itself was the content of instruction” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 25). “Their life-style precluded the founding of permanent schools. Education was natural and informal, including all aspects of life” (Reed and Prevost 1993, 45).

Even though priests and prophets took educational roles to train and teach the people in the law during the Old Testament era, parents hold the primary responsibilities to discipline their children in God’s commandments and “the family was the primary means of schooling and instruction” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 25) until the Exile. After the Exile, the Jews used religious education to instruct their people to keep God’s laws and commands exhorting them to reject idolatry and to renew their hearts by repenting. Since they did not have access to the temple, and the home was not sufficient for such religious instruction after the exile, the Jews established the synagogues for the need of a new form of educational institution (Anthony and Benson 2003, 34). The synagogues, which were “the earliest, the most widespread and the most enduring of all the educational institutions after the exile” (Swift 1919, 90), were used for worship, education, and local law courts by the Jewish community and every synagogue complex included a school building called a *Beth Hasepher* (Kienel 1998, 28). Lewis Sherrill explains that *Beth Hasepher*, the House of the Book, was the elementary school for teaching of the Scriptures, the written Torah (Sherrill 1944, 55). Eby and Arrowood deliver the following description on Beth Hasepher:

In these elementary schools boys from six to ten years of age were taught by a scribe assisted by the hazzan, or by the hazzan himself. This official was the attendant of the synagogue. The textbook was the Pentateuch, beginning with the creation story. The chief task, however, was the memorizing of the Levitical Deuteronomic law. Reading, writing, and arithmetic were taught. Arithmetic was necessary in calculating the tithe and in transacting business. Some knowledge of

chronology would also be generally necessary for calculating the Sabbath and the time of the annual feast. (Eby and Arrowood 1940, 146)

First-Century Christian Schools

Under Emperor Hardrian, Jerusalem was totally demolished in A.D.132 and the destruction dispersed Jewish Christian believers and thrust them into a pagan city of Rome. The city was so pagan that it was “much easier to find a god than a man” (Cubberley 1920, 82). In explaining such polytheistic Roman religion as means to gain the approval of diverse deities, Paul Kienel points out one interesting factor in the Roman culture and says, “Roman gods neither offered a standard for personal morality nor required acceptance of a belief statement or creed” (Kienel 1998, 2). Kienel continues to describe the dilemma of Jewish and Gentile Christian parents who were struggling with teaching and instructing their children in the hostile, pagan world of Rome. Elmer Wilds also observes the dilemma of the parents in the early church in Rome and contends,

They were bitterly opposed to the subjects taught in the pagan schools, and blamed pagan culture for the vices and corruption of pagan society. To them its literature was full of impurities; its art depicted immoralities and was associated with immoral religions; its philosophy undermined and destroyed Christian faith, because it led to trusting one’s own wisdom. . . . the pagan school was the enemy of the church, and its curriculum was to be despised by all true believers. (Wilds 1971, 160)

How the Christian parents living in the pagan culture of Rome chose to solve the dilemma was obvious—they established their own schools. According to literacy historian Harvey Graff, in opposing the pagan culture of the Graeco-Roman world, the early Christians either developed distinctly Christian schools or withdrew from Roman schools. Graff argues that “a new tradition, of Christian schooling, dates from these early centuries” (Graff 1987, 30) and writes,

In part, it was the tradition of *lectio divina*: the centrality of reading the Holy Scriptures, reflecting that aspect of Christianity's origins that stressed the Word as written and building on the Greek and Roman achievements in alphabetic literacy and in its popular dissemination. At the heart of this impulse was the inseparable connection of schooling with morality, which constitutes a major legacy. (Graff 1987, 30)

Rise of Christian School Education

Since most Christians throughout the Roman Empire refused to worship the Roman emperor or worship Rome's pagan deities, the dictatorial Roman emperors controlled them harshly. Paul Kienel observes that "over a period of 249 years (A.D. 64-313), there were ten Roman emperors who inflicted horrendous persecution on Christians" (Kienel 1998, 37). Lewis Sherrill describes this period like this:

There were periods of peace, but for approximately two hundred and fifty years no Christian knew when he might have to choose whether he would do honor to the person of the Emperor as divine and thus deny the Lord whose sovereignty he had taken upon himself, or whether he would refuse to meet the state's requirements and thus incur the charge of treason to the Empire. The common penalty for the latter was death. (Sherrill 1944, 172-73)

From the early years of the fourth century, however, the situation began to change and Christianity was favored over other religions. Emperor Constantine accepted Jesus Christ as his Savior in A.D. 312 and he issued the Edict of Milan in 313 and Christianity became the Emperor-approved religion of the empire (Knight 1940, 90). Ellwood Cubberley describes two other historic events, which brought Christianity complete victory. The Emperor Theodosius forbade pagan worship in 391, and in A.D. 529, Roman Emperor Justinian decreed that pagan schools were illegal and it was the end of pagan education as the official philosophy of public education in the Roman Empire. Related to the latter event, Harry Good asserts, "The edict of Justinian (A.D. 529) closing pagan schools was hardly needed because most of these institutions had already

disappeared” (Good 1960, 63). Under the heavy taxation, Roman citizens no longer considered their schools as “the passport to wealth and power” and this caused the Empire to reduce generally the support for school teachers and facilities (Boyd 1950, 96). In considering the disintegration of education and scholarship as one of the unfortunate outcomes of Rome’s demise, Michael Anthony also observes this situation. According to him, many schools supported by Rome “came to an abrupt halt in terms of expansion and growth” while schools associated with the church began to flourish as Rome was brought to an end (Anthony and Benson 2003, 131). As the centuries progressed, the body of Christian believers increased throughout the Roman Empire and the schools established by the church began to grow, while the number and influence of the pagan schools diminished. According to Kienel, “at the turn of the fourth century, the empire’s pagan educational system had lost much of its momentum” (Kienel 1998, 42) and Christian school education had replaced pagan education.

Christian School Education in the Middle Ages

The Roman Catholic Church was the most important institution of the Middle Ages (Good 1960, 58; Reed and Prevost 1993, 163). The church accumulated massive land holdings and obtained political power, and the illiterate masses showed a blind obedience to it. Harry Good and James Teller illustrate the governmental organization of the church during this period:

In the early Middle Ages the governmental unit of the church was the city with its congregations. This was a diocese, meaning district, or governmental unit. The bishop was the ruler and head of the clergy of the diocese. His throne, or *cathedra*, was in the cathedral church, which often had a school. . . . The dioceses or areas of bishoprics were grouped into sees under metropolitans, or patriarchs. In the entire East there were four patriarchates. . . . In the West there was only one comparable

center, Rome. When East and West separated, Rome remained as the site of the papacy. (Good and Teller 1969, 64-65)

Under the strong system of church government, the church leaders considered themselves as God on earth and “the king became the mere deputy of the pope” (Ullmann 1946, 181). Michael Anthony describes the problem of the church in this time as following:

The church emphasis began a slow transformation from being about a personal faith held by someone who desired an intimate relationship with his or her creator God to a corporate faith that was marred by multiple layers of structural hierarchy. In time, the clergy grew distant from God. Immersed in concern for political and economic control over land and the people who lived there, the clergy began to make appointments to church leadership on the basis of expediency rather than spiritual qualifications. The need for increased economic support made the church adopt nonbiblical means of fund-raising. (Anthony and Benson 2003, 137)

Most historians agree that the Catholic Church was not interested in teaching common people and many were illiterate. Charles Eavey describes the neglect of education in the early Middle Ages in this way:

Even the education of the clergy . . . was very much neglected. By the beginning of the seventh century education was largely in the hands of bishops, priests, and monks, many of whom were themselves illiterate. . . . many of the clergy did not understand the meaning of the services they conducted and the prayers they recited. (Eavey 1964, 102, 107)

Few other informal educational opportunities existed, such as chivalric instruction, which was the process of training for knights, and guilds, which were organizations of craftsmen to train craftsmen. The only interest the Catholic Church had, however, was in what H.I. Marrow called “ecclesiastical education,” which was for young men who wanted to become clergymen by focusing on Catholic theology and canon law (Marrow 1964, 462). The monastic school “dominated the educational scene of Europe from the sixth to the tenth or eleventh centuries” (Gangel and Benson 108; Reed and Prevost 115).

Its main religious purpose was to instruct and equip boys for the priesthood, even though in the ninth century “it was broadened to include nonvocationally oriented instruction” (Anthony and Benson 142). In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, cathedral and episcopal schools became leading educational institutions with the similar purpose of monastic schools—to educate clerics. The cathedral schools, however, also trained teachers for the liberal arts and theology, and “the leading cathedral and professional schools provided the impetus to the origination of the university” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 109).

Development of Universities

James Reed and Ronnie Prevost contend that “the rise of the universities in the twelfth century is perhaps the highest educational achievement of medieval Europe” (Reed and Prevost 1993, 140). During the late Middle Ages, the attitudes toward education, even among church leaders, had been changed. They realized the need for educated clergymen believing that survival of the church depended on them. The Crusades, which were “to free the holy lands from Muslim domination” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 144), stimulated trade and travel between the Eastern and Western worlds and a new commercial age was opened. “Suddenly there was a need for banking, factories to make salable products, and a higher level of literacy and scientific knowledge to keep pace with the growing economy” (Kienel 1998, 91). In this changing situation, a new level of education was needed. Frederick Eby and Charles Arrowood observe the change of education in these ages and write,

The function and balance of the Roman Catholic system had been worked out. Bishops, abbots, and the Pope himself were promoting and fostering scholarship and schools. Under that fostering care two of the most important developments in the

intellectual history of the western world were soon to take place: the intellectual revival of the twelfth century and the founding of European universities. (Eby and Arrowood 1940, 713)

The structure of the medieval university looked remarkably similar to that of modern universities. Paul Kienel asserts, “It is not an overstatement to say there is no modern institution that has more ties to the medieval past than a Western university” (Kienel 1998, 102). James Reed and Ronnie Prevost agree when they say, “Modern universities resemble their medieval ancestors in organization and degree nomenclature. European universities during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries helped preserve past knowledge while laying a foundation for future education” (Reed and Prevost 1993, 150). Elmer Wilds describes a university in the Middle Ages and helps to understand its basic organization:

It began as an association of teachers—in effect, a guild—which was chartered by the pope, emperor, or king and was, therefore, much more independent of [local] ecclesiastical authority than was the cathedral school under the bishop or the monastic school under the abbot. It was also independent of any political or secular control. Many privileges, hitherto granted only to the clergy, were vouchsafed to its members under the charter; among them, exemption from taxation, exemption from military service, special courts outside of civil jurisdiction, and immunity from arrest by civil authorities. (Wilds 1971, 186-87)

Scholasticism

A dominant system of thought in the late Middle Ages, Scholasticism, was to combine philosophy with Christian theology to make a reasonable faith. Robert Ulich writes,

Scholasticism was the attempt to support the Christian creed by a philosophical structure of sufficient strength to withstand the ever rising doubts among Christian theologians who, partly because of Arabic influences, no longer felt safe in their faith as did their predecessors of earlier centuries.” (Ulich 1968, 50)

Historians mostly consider Thomas Aquinas as the principal figure in the Scholastic movement. By synthesizing Christianity with Aristotelian philosophy, Aquinas saw faith and reason as reliable epistemological sources because both were from God. He agreed with the statement that all truth is God's truth, and he believed that "if it seemed unreasonable to integrate biblical teaching with philosophy, then the fault must lie in man's ability to understand clearly what God intended in His Word. Faith was always to be viewed as superior to reason" (Anthony and Benson 2003, 150). His approach to the integration of faith and reason is demonstrated in a theory of education developed in his book, *De Magistro*.

1. Education, like life itself, is purposeful; it is a means to an end. Human beings' ultimate destiny is the beatific vision of God, and education should contribute to realizing that goal.
2. Reality exhibits two dimensions, one spiritual and one physical. Education relates to both dimensions of human nature: the soul and the body. It should prepare the human being for what needs to be done on Earth and what will contribute to the salvation of the soul.
3. Reality—both supernatural and natural—is hierarchically structured as is society, both secular and religious. Because not all things are equal, education, especially areas of study received the greatest priority. (Anthony 2001, s.v. "Thomas Aquinas").

Renaissance

Michael Anthony asserts that "the Renaissance was one of history's most significant transitional periods" (Anthony and Benson 2003, 180). Wallace Ferguson and Geoffrey Bruun agree with Anthony when they say,

So far as it can be defined, the age of the Renaissance was an age of chaotic change, in which there was much that was still medieval, much that was recognizably modern, and much also that was peculiar to itself. It bridged the gap between the High Middle Ages and modern times, but it was also a cultural period in its own right, filled with a great political, social, and intellectual ferment." (Ferguson and Bruun 1969, 311)

Gerald Gutek also observes this transitional period and writes, “The Renaissance was, among other things, a revival of secular learning, another instance of man’s endless search for true knowledge. In many ways this revival was a radical departure from medieval views of the world, of life, and of culture—views developed under domination of the church” (Gutek 2001, 133).

Michael Anthony considers educational humanism as the traditional influence on education during the Renaissance. Humanism is “the concept that man should be in control of his destiny rather than the church or the state” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 171). Francis Schaeffer in his book *How Should We Then Live* argues that humanism “was exemplified most clearly by Erasmus at Rotterdam” (Schaeffer 1976, 51-52). As the “prince of humanists” (Kienel 1998, 110), Erasmus believed that the primary aim of education was to create a good, intelligent Christian, who was “a well-rounded Christian individual who, after learning the meaning of goodness, would be good for the good of society” (Reed and Prevost 1993, 182). Lin Johnson appreciates his contribution on education and writes, “Erasmus emphasized studying the nature of children, the importance of games in education, praise and rewards instead of discipline, helping students, and providing more education for women. Moreover, he was one of the first people to champion systematic teacher training” (Anthony 2001, s.v. “Desiderius Erasmus”).

Christian School Education in the Reformation

On October 31, 1517, Martin Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of the church at Wittenburg, Germany and it was the beginning of the Reformation (Alan 1967, 12), having three cardinal principles: “justification by faith, supremacy of Scripture,

and priesthood of the believer” (Reed and Prevost 1993, 191). Michael Anthony describes the primary characteristic of the world at that time as one word, change. “Everything seems to have been subject to change and transition. Much of what we knew about the world was going through radical rethinking” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 188). Kenneth Latourette states that the Reformation “ushered in a new state in the history of mankind” (Latourette 1965, 159). Frederick Eby also observes the great influence of the Reformation and says,

The reformation was the most far-reaching and profound awakening in the history of western civilization. To think of it merely as a reform of church organization or moral practices and doctrine is to misinterpret its broader significance for human progress. No aspect of human life was untouched, for it involved political, economic, religious, moral, philosophical, literary, and institutional changes of the most sweeping character. (Eby 1934, 1)

Martin Luther, the Education Reformer

In appreciating the influence of the Reformation on education, Paul Kienel says, “Martin Luther spent nearly as much time establishing Bible-centered Christian schools as he spent establishing Bible-centered Christian churches” (Kienel 1998, 143).

James Kittelson also says,

“Luther the Educational Reformer,” is by no means just one more slice of the reformer’s career. It is an issue that lies at the very heart of understanding Luther. . . . Certainly, he was a great theologian, a pastor, and a biblical scholar, but from the beginning of his career to its end, he was also an educational reformer, who not only spoke his mind but also acted on his convictions. (Kittelson 1985, 96)

Like Charles Eavey says, “Everywhere Protestantism went—Christian schools were founded” (Eavey 1964, 156), the reformers were interested in establishing Christian schools. Luther also strongly advocated Christian schools and believed that through developing them, the evangelical church would be established. Luther asserted,

When schools prosper, the Church remains righteous and her doctrine pure. . . .
Young pupils and students are the seed and source of the Church. If we were dead,
whence would come our successors, if not from the schools? For the sake of the
Church we must have and maintain Christian schools. (Painter 1889, 9)

Among a number of his writings, *The Letter to Mayors and Aldermen of all the Cities of Germany in Behalf of Christian Schools* and *Sermon on the Duty of Sending Children to School* contains clearly Luther's ideas on education and they are considered as Protestant manifestos on education (Anthony and Benson 2003, 207; Reed and Prevost 1993, 193). Most of all, Luther emphasized the central place of the Bible in Christian schools.

According to Kienel, "Luther's educational philosophy can be summed up in one word—Bible-centered" (Kienel 1998, 168). In this regard, he translated both the Old Testament and New Testament into German to help people to read Scriptures personally, and used the German translation of the Bible in his schools. Luther required his students to learn Greek and Hebrew because he believed that "the preservation of truth in religion depended significantly on the ability to interpret the original biblical languages" (Reed and Prevost 1993, 193). Luther also advocated the universal compulsory education supported by the state for both sexes. He preferred the public education and argued that "church-based schools were an abysmal failure at their task of educating children" (Anthony and Benson 2003, 207). Reed and Prevost summarize Luther's work of educational reform:

Luther influenced Christian education by leading Protestantism, translating the Bible into German, stressing the educational role of the home and state, calling attention to the educational needs of common people, preparing catechisms, and writing hymns for congregational worship. (Reed and Prevost 1993, 194)

John Calvin

John Calvin was “the foremost leader of the second generation of the evangelical Protestant reformers” (Kienel 1998, 212). He is known for the theology centered on the sovereignty of God, the total depravity of man, and an insistence of predestination (Gangel and Benson 1983, 145). Like other great reformers, Calvin’s influence on education is not to be overlooked by historians and educators. Gerald Gutek says,

As a Protestant reformer, Calvin believed not only that it was necessary to purge the corruptions of Catholicism from Christian practice, but also that young members of the new church had to be instilled with correct doctrine. Like other reformers, such as Luther, Calvin turned to the catechistic method to impress the correct version of Christianity on the minds of the young. He condensed the religious principles of the *Institutues* and the confession into an abbreviated version in a catechism that could be studied by children in school. (Gutek 1983, 93)

Calvin had strict standards for teachers in his schools because he believed that teachers are accountable for the student’s learning. He also advocated strict corporal punishment, which he considered as a means to motivate the student to learn (Anthony and Benson 2003, 210). Like Luther, Calvin believed that the state had an obligation to support financially the compulsory universal education of its children (Reed and Prevost 1993, 198). More importantly, Calvin did not separate school from the church, believing that they were mutually dependent, and he did not distinguish education into sacred and secular categories. Robert White well describes this:

Calvin found the division into secular/sacred alien to his mind; no facet of schoolwork was excluded from the influence of the Scriptures and the Christian lifeview. . . . In the school the Word of God was the foundation of all learning and also of education. The Scriptures carry the authority of God, because they were inspired and revealed by Him. For this reason they then also have authority for the sphere of teaching and education. The Lord uses the enlightened—the teachers—to introduce the unenlightened to the mysteries of the Scriptures. (White 1969, 19)

Calvin's concepts of education spread to larger population centers than did those of Luther. "They went with John Knox to Scotland, were spread all over France by the Huguenots, were enforced in the Netherlands by the Prince of Orange (later known as William the Silent) and were carried to the new world by the Puritans" (Gangel and Benson 1983, 146).

Counter-Reformation and Christian School Education

The Council of Trent was held in 1545 to discuss the Protestant Reformation movement in the Catholic Church and to win back the lost territories, but "the result of the council was a reform movement within the church" (Gangel and Benson 1983, 149). In this regard, Michael Anthony defines this Catholic or Counter-Reformation as a movement within the Catholic Church between 1545 and 1563 "to bring about renewed doctrinal purity and refocus their missionary efforts" (Anthony and Benson 2003, 223). James Reed and Ronnie Prevost describe three interlocking movements, in which this Catholic renewal centered. "The Council of Trent provided the doctrinal stimulation and evaluation; the Inquisition added ecclesiastical muscle and force; and the Jesuits or Society of Jesus excelled as the teaching and missionary arm of the Catholic Reformation" (Reed and Prevost 1993, 202).

Paul Kienel views Protestantism's Christian school education as the foremost issue of the Catholic Reformation. He asserts that the mission of the Jesuit was "to overcome the embarrassment created by the successful Protestant schools through extirpating Protestants and establishing their own Jesuit high schools throughout Europe and non-European countries" (Kienel 1998, 300). Charles Eavey appreciates the educational efforts of the Jesuits and says, "Catholic and Protestant historians agree in

saying that it was the educational work of the Jesuit Order that checked the advance of Protestantism and saved much of Europe for Catholicism” (Eavey 1964, 153).

Anthony states, “The hallmark of Jesuit education was the integration of faith and learning” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 219). The student in the Jesuit education system was instructed to gain a wealth of sacred and secular knowledge and was encouraged to think logically to be able to persuade others and defend what they believed. In this regard, Reed and Prevost describe the Jesuit classroom as “an intellectual battlefield” (Reed and Prevost 1993, 206). Many historians and educators are interested in the approach of development and supervision of the Jesuit teachers and agree that it contributed to the success of the Jesuit education system (Anthony and Benson 2003, 220; also see Reed and Prevost 1993, 206). “Teachers in the Jesuit schools had to study sixteen to nineteen years before they could become instructors” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 150). Through such a strict approach of preparation and dedication of teachers, the Jesuit teachers “had a reputation for excellence in scholarship, methodical and systematic classroom delivery, the ability to use contemporary instructional methodologies, and a caring and nurturing attitude toward their students. They were model teachers in every respect” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 220).

The Pietist Schools

In 1618, the Thirty Years War began with its central questions, “Who owns the land?” and “Which religion will prevail?” after the great Reformation of 1517 (Kienel 1998, 305). During the war, Lutheranism had been politicized and lost its early evangelical point of view. Kenneth Gangel describes the decline of the Lutheran Church at that time:

Controversy raged among Protestant church leaders, and many of the clergy were ruled by secular civil authorities. Religious education centered on intellectual development and orthodox doctrine rather than personal purity and holy living. The clergy themselves were poor examples of Biblical teaching. Church services tended toward a formal rigidity which repudiated the dynamic vitality of the New Testament. (Gangel 1975, 190)

Frederick Eby defines Pietism as the “reaction against all this cold, deadening, rancorous system” (Eby 1934, 324). Lars Qualben emphasizes practical tendencies of Pietism as describing it:

Pietism is the name given to a great religious awakening within the Protestant churches of the 17th and the 18th centuries in behalf of practical religion. . . . This movement, combining the mystical and the practical tendencies within the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, came as a reaction against the inordinate stress of orthodoxy on pure doctrine and formalism. (Qualben 1942, 363)

Ernst Helmreich also focuses on the practical side of Pietism and explains its practical education as comparing pietism and rationalism, which appeared together in central Europe between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. He asserts that pietism and rationalism differed sharply on the issue of religion, but “one point the two movements had in common . . . was their emphasis on the practical in education, although their concepts as to what was practical were at variance. Both welcomed with somewhat different emphasis more instruction in the vernacular, and in such subjects as arithmetic, history, geography, and nature study” (Helmreich 1959, 23).

John Amos Comenius was one of “the foremost Pietist leaders in Protestant education” (Kienel 1998, 311) and was also called “The First Modern Educator” and “The Prophet of Modern Education” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 153). Along with numerous contributions of Comenius to the modern education system, such as development of sequential and systematic curriculum, establishing school textbooks and emphasizing natural development of the child in education, Christian educators

appreciate his Bible-centered Christian school education. Frederick Mayer calls him “a ‘God-intoxicated thinker’, for to him God was the beginning and the end of education” (Mayer 1960, 215). In his book *The Great Didactic*, “the most remarkable treasury of pedagogical wisdom ever written” (Eby 1934, 200), Comenius rejected the use of pagan classics and said, “If we wish our schools to be truly Christians schools, the crowd of Pagan writers must be removed from them” (Keatinge 1896, 418). The supreme purpose of his education was “piety.” He asserted, “Our schools, therefore, will then at length be Christian schools when they make us as like to Christ as is possible. How wretched is the teaching that does not lead to virtue and to piety?” (Keating 1896, 226).

Christian School Education in Colonial America

In 1534, King Henry VIII protested the long tradition of a Roman pope’s authority over England and became the Supreme Head of the Church of England (Kienel 1998, 332-33). Later, Elizabeth I, who was the daughter of Henry, added the Act of Uniformity, “making the Church of England the only legal church” (Kienel 1998, 339), to the Act of Supremacy, which had been passed in 1534. Paul Kienel asserts that this climate of conformity or “uniformity” eventually led to the exodus of the Separatists and the Puritans to America (Kienel 1998, 339). Fleeing from oppression and persecution in England, the Puritans and the Separatists focused on educating their children biblically in order to perpetuate their knowledge and value system. They were influenced by Calvinistic doctrine—“Man’s total depravity as a result of the Fall, unconditional election, limited atonement, Christ’s death only for believers, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints” (Ulich 1968, 146-47)—and their system of education in colonial America was based upon “educational Calvinism”—teaching doctrine through

the use of catechisms, stress on the authority of Scripture, and use of severe discipline in teaching children inherently evil and fallen (Reed and Prevost 1993, 275; Gangel and Benson 1983, 230).

The American colonial Christian schools attempted to improve their spiritual and academic quality as a reaction to the corrupted educational situation in England. John Winthrop, who was “a prime mover of the larger Puritan migration,” and “twelve times governor of the Bay Colony by annual election” (Kienel 2005, 44), described the situation in England at that time as follows: “The fountains of learning and religion are so corrupted [in England] most children, even the best wits . . . are perverted, corrupted and utterly overthrown by the multitude of evil examples.” Winthrop further said, in contrast, that the colonial schools were “for zealous purification of the church and common wealth” (Cremin 1970, 16).

There was no debate between secular versus religious education during the colonial period of American history because Christianity permeated the educational system of this period. Ellwood Cubberley observes this and says,

The first schools in America were clearly the fruits of the Protestant Revolt in Europe. The reformers everywhere had insisted upon the necessity of the Gospels as a means to personal salvation. This meant . . . that each child, girls as well as boys, should be taught to read so that they might become acquainted with the commandments of God and learn what was demanded of them. (Cubberley 1919, 13)

Kenneth Gangel and Warren Benson describe this Christian education system in the period of colonial America as following:

From the very start of the colonies, education in America was thoroughly Christian. Elementary schools were centers of reading and writing instruction so that children could read the Scriptures. Secondary education dealt with practical learning and classical studies to prepare the young student for college and the ministry. The aim of the colleges in the colonies could best be summed up in Harvard’s motto, “For

Christ and the Church,” as they sought to train young men for Christian ministry and in the knowledge of God through Bible study and prayer. (Gangel and Benson 1983, 252)

In 1647, the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed the famous Massachusetts School Act, known as the “Old Deluder Satan law,” which “served as the pivotal point in the establishment of public education in America” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 233). This act required every town with at least fifty families to establish an elementary school, and Christian training was emphasized in those schools. The main purpose of this law was to ensure that children would be educated to such a degree that they would be able to read in order to have knowledge of the Bible (Cohen, 1974, 46-47). David Smith asserts that other American colonies followed Massachusetts’s example and developed a similar law regarding education (Smith 1988, 28). Connecticut passed similar legislation in 1650, New York in 1665, and Plymouth in 1671, “requiring that children and servants be taught to read English, that they be instructed in the capital laws, that they be catechized weekly, and that they be brought up in husbandry or some trade profitable to themselves and to the commonwealth” (Cremin 1970, 125). In 1683, the new colony of Pennsylvania also followed suit and asked all parents and guardians to instruct children “in reading and writing, so that they may be able to read the Scriptures and to write by the time they attain to twelve years of age; and that then they be taught some useful trade or skill, that the poor may work to live, and the rich, if they become poor, may not want; of which every country court shall take care” (George, McCamant, and Nead 1879, 142).

Common School Crusade

From the end of the eighteenth century, the Christian saturation of education in the early colonial period began to give way to a rise in secularism developed by the growing influence of materialism, humanism, the rationalism of Descartes, the empiricism of Locke, and the scientism in America (Anthony and Benson 2003, 326-27). Gangel and Benson consider the Constitutional First Amendment as the groundwork for secular education (Gangel and Benson 1983, 255). It gave constitutional protection for religious beliefs and mandated a legal separation of church and state (Hunt and Caper 1997, 85). In giving the authority of the state over education, this legislation caused a de-emphasis of Christian teaching in schools. Gangel and Benson further argue that the secularism in America in this time period “shifted the focus of education to a nonbiblical perspective in the teaching of history, science, and the arts” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 256). This shift eventually caused “the present legislation prohibiting any religious education, Bible reading, and prayer in public schools” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 256).

Horace Mann

The 1830s and 1840s in America are considered a time of significant social upheaval. This time period is described as a time of the unrest situation with sectarian strife, the regional and political conflict, massive immigration, industrial revolution, and urbanization (Ravitch 1974, 34). David Smith points out that in this time of tremendous change, Americans began to doubt the value of the existing school systems and “this led to what has been called the ‘Common School Crusade’” (Smith 1988, 28-29).

On April 20, 1837, the Massachusetts legislature developed a state board of education and members of this board had power to appoint their own state secretary of

education. This event intensified the cleavage of church and state. This board appointed Horace Mann as their first secretary of the board, “a position comparable to a present-day state superintendent of public schools” (Kienel 2005, 167).

Horace Mann, who is known as the father of America’s public school system, became a significant figure in the so-called “Common School Crusade” (Hunt 2005, xii). Believing in the natural perfectibility of man, Mann believed that children were perfectible through a process of education in the public school, not through faith in Jesus Christ. Charles Glenn, Jr. summarizes Mann’s beliefs as saying, “Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities and nine-tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete; the long catalog of human ills would be abridged” (Glenn 1988, 80). According to John Blanchard, Horace Mann advocated education for every child, supported by the state, and financed by tax. He considered Calvinism as sectarian, and he attempted to introduce non-sectarian religion into the public schools. He argued that society should leave “the teaching of faith and values to the home and church and the teaching of facts to the schools” (Blanchard 1971, 88-89). Frederick Mayer introduces five ideals that Mann highly valued as delivering his educational philosophy.

1. Education was to be available to both the rich and the poor.
2. Education was to be free for those who attended.
3. Education is best overseen and administered by the state.
4. Education requires competently trained teachers.
5. Education should be available for both men and women. (Mayer 1960, 373)

John Dewey

John Dewey, “a foundation stone of modern public education” (Edlin 1999, 43), is another significant figure who advanced secular humanism in the American public school systems. Warren Benson points out an interesting fact—in 1859, Horace Mann

died in Massachusetts and John Dewey was born in Vermont, and he asserts, “Dewey would later take up Mann’s charge as an advocate of public education” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 330). Many educators, secular and Christian, agree that John Dewey was “America’s foremost philosopher and education thinker” (Kienel 2005, 269). Paul Woodring asserts, “If an institution is but the length and shadow of a man, few men have cast a larger shadow than John Dewey; the shadow is the American public school system” (Woodring 1953, 27).

In believing that truth is arrived at pragmatically—whether it works, Dewey “had little patience with people who majored in absolutes and abstract ideas” (Anthony and Benson 2003, 330). He considered natural knowledge as the total of everything, so there was no place for God or supernaturalism in his educational ideas. Moreover, Dewey believed that children can be made perfectible not through faith in God, but through faith in man. His ideas on Christianity were demonstrated when he signed the 1933 Humanist Manifesto as the first president of the American Humanist Association. The Manifesto, which regards humanism as a religion, reads, “While there is much that we do not know, humans are responsible for what we are or will become. No deity will save us; we must save ourselves” (Kurtz and Wilson 1973, manifestos.html). It continues to say, “Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful” (Kurtz and Wilson 1973, manifestos.html). Dewey’s opposition to Christianity is repeated over and over in his other writings. Dewey argued,

Faith in the prayer-hearing God is an unproved and outmoded faith. There is no God and there is no soul. Hence there are no needs for the props of the traditional religion. With dogma and creed excluded, then immutable truth is also dead and buried. There is no room for fixed, natural law or moral absolutes. (Nash 1990, 91)

John Dewey is called the father of “progressive education” (Kienel 2005, 264). In appreciating the great influence of Dewey’s educational views, Kenneth Gangel says that his progressive education and his man-centered belief impacted public schools across America and divested Christian beliefs from their heart (Gangel 1988, 105). Dewey insisted that, in the ideal school, “The child becomes the sun about which the appliances of education revolve; he is the center about which they are organized” (Dewey 1956, 34). In addition to child-centered education, Dewey’s educational insights can be described with education through intrinsic motivation, education through activity, education as reconstruction of experience, and social-centered education (Roper 1975, 315). The Progressive Education Association developed its own educational principles in the public school domain by reflecting Dewey’s progressive educational thoughts:

1. Children should be free to develop naturally.
2. Interest, arising from direct experience, is the best stimulus for learning.
3. The teacher should be a researcher into educational processes and a guide to learning.
4. There should be close cooperation between the school and the home.
5. The progressive school should be a laboratory for educational reform and experimentation. (Guttek 1983, 61)

Christian School Movement

The movement to remove sectarian instruction—teaching the doctrines of one sect or one church—in public schools made giant strides in the Early National Period—“the seventy-eight years between America’s War of Independence from England (1775-1783) and its Civil War (1861-1865)” (Kienel 2005, 185). Frederick Eby and Charles Arrowood describe this:

State after state secularized its schools; many, if they had not entered the Union with such provisions in their constitutions, adopted amendments which forbade sectarian instruction in schools. By the time of the Civil War, popular education had become

the fixed policy of the northern states, and had made a beginning in the South. (Eby and Arrowood 1940, 721)

The removal of sectarian instruction in public schools, however, did not mean total removal of the Protestant faith since the nineteenth century was “the Protestant century” as Mark Noll refers (Noll 1992, 163). Brown agrees with Noll when he says, “So long as population regions were relatively homogeneous in matters of religious faith, nothing could be more natural than that the public school should be used to transmit unto the children the faith of the fathers” (Brown 1912, 2).

This “common doctrine” policy was not accepted in the public schools of New York, though. On August 10, 1840, New York’s Bishop John Hughes, leading a number of Catholic petitioners, challenged the Protestant characteristics of America’s public schools (Bourne 1870, 192). Hughes expressed his opposition to the use of the King James Bible, Protestant hymn-songs and prayers, and derogatory references to the Catholic Church in the public schools (Dunn 1958, 271-72). While the immediate outcome was a victory for the Catholic churches of New York, this petition ultimately made the public schools secularized, which Bishop Hughes did not anticipate. On April 9, 1842, the state legislature signed the Maclay Bill—“eliminating any vestige of Christian doctrine from public schools” (Kienel 2005, 206). William Dunn makes the following observation:

Without intending it, Bishop Hughes by his campaign, opened the way for elimination of religious instruction of any sort in New York’s public schools. The result, unforeseen, and apparently unwanted, was a further decline of the amount of religious training given the American children who go to public schools. (Dunn 1958, 257)

After the Civil War ended in 1865, with unparalleled national prosperity, the people saw the necessity of the education of children from poor families growing, and the

public school education at all levels being accepted throughout the states. T. Harry Williams, Richard Current, and Frank Freidel deliver a well-developed description of the growth of public schools at that time:

Popular devotion to education became a national religion and assumed the proportions of a national faith. Before the war the idea or the principle of public, tax-supported schools had won general acceptance throughout the country, but little had been done to implement the principle. Laws had been passed authorizing the creating of schools, but the money to establish them had seldom been appropriated. The great growth of the public school system came in the years after 1865. (Williams, Current, and Freidel 1966, 102)

The first high schools for boys and girls, funded publicly, were established in Boston in 1821 and 1826 (Kienel 2005, 220), and “about 1910, the first junior high schools were established in California” (Cressman and Harold 1966, 30). Historians argue that these state-sponsored public high schools did not include religious instruction from its beginning. Clarence Benson asserts, “It is well to note that the high school was purely a nonreligious movement and its students have never received the Bible instruction” (Benson 1943, 147).

As the secular humanism in public schools was getting pervasive, a number of conservative Protestants attempted to regain religious control of their children’s education. James Caper and Jack Layman describe their efforts in three ways. Many of the Protestants have sought to include Christian beliefs into the public schools. They, for example, tried to teach about creationism and the Ten Commandments to help students to see history through the influence of Christianity, and to open voluntary opportunities of religious activities. Others have protested the use of academic materials which delivered and implied secularism, and tried to help their children to be exempt from exposure of such materials. Still others have surrendered their commitment to public schools and

looked for developing private schools to deliver an education consistent with their Christian worldview (Caper and Layman 1995, 8-9).

Common Schools to Christian Schools

During 1950 to 1980, Christian schools grew substantially and were influenced by diverse forces such as religious fundamentalism, right-wing politics, and the rejecting of the Supreme Court desegregation order by white racists. In particular, Paul Kienel views a series of Supreme Court decisions in the 1950s and 1960s, which ruled against racial segregation and required religious exercises, as a powerful stimulus for the Christian school movement (Kienel 2005, 309). In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled in the famous *Brown* decision that it was unconstitutional for schools to restrict Negroes from attending school with whites (Smith 1988, 30). The court also ruled in 1955 in *Brown vs. Board of Education II* that public schools, which were racially segregated, were unconstitutional. Racial segregation still remained in many parts of society in the United States in spite of these series of Supreme Court decisions, so federal troops and marshals were required to enforce the racial integration of the schools and universities (Reed and Prevost 1993, 371).

The Supreme Court ruled in other significant cases in the Christian school movement. In 1962, the court ruled in *Engel vs. Vital* that prayer required by the New York regents violated the Constitution because non-believers in the public schools might feel offended by it (Dockery and Thornbury 2002, 288). The court, ruling as *Abingdon School District vs. Schempp* and *Murray vs. Curlett*, found public school-sponsored prayer and devotional Bible reading to be unconstitutional (Reed and Prevost 1993, 371). James Reed and Ronnie Prevost assert that these court decisions gave an opportunity for

the persons who supported racial segregation to move their children's education to Christian schools and say.

These rulings enabled persons who opposed racial integration to claim for themselves a moral and spiritual "high ground"; they justified their racist "Christian" schools through a rhetoric of concern for the religious education of their children, the quality of education in general, and the removal of religion from the public schools. (Reed and Prevost 1993, 371)

Growing of Christian Schools

After World War II, numerous evangelical believers recognized that the public schools in America "were no longer extensions of the Protestant community" (Kienel 2005, 309), and this gave momentum for the current Christian school movement.

Christian schools have had phenomenal growth over the past decades. "This development of the Christian school movement has been described as 'an explosion' of unprecedented size" (Daniel, Wade, and Gresham 1987, 190). Like Kenneth Gangel and Warren Benson say, "It is virtually impossible to keep up with the statistics as the Christian school movement continues to explode on the educational landscape" (Gangel and Benson 1993, 355). On this phenomenal "explosion" of the Christian schools, Robert McBirnie finds the reasonable reasons in the troubles of the public school:

The proof that secular education is in trouble is supported by the many voices of alarm now being heard from nearly every discipline of learning. Standards of education are slipping; factual evidence of rising crime in American secondary schools is irrefutable; a marked decline of confidence in the efficacy of secular education is evident; increasing frustration and uncertainty is widespread; and the rise of a vibrant, fast-growing Protestant school movement is the final verdict that an important segment of America is withdrawing from the secular educational system. (McBirnie 1978, 196-97)

Henry Buchanan and Bob Brown observed this growth of Christian schools about four decades ago:

The most exciting development in education today is the rise of the Protestant church school. A rarity three decades ago, Protestant church schools are now being organized at the rate of 225 per year. If the enthusiasm does not wane, they will soon take a place of equal importance alongside the public and parochial schools. (Buchanan and Brown 1967, 3)

Donald Erickson, in defining Fundamentalist schools as schools associated with the right wing of Protestant Fundamentalism—with independent Baptist or charismatic groups of ‘born-again’ Christians” (Erikson 1986, 89), addresses that there were no more than 250 or 300 Fundamentalist schools in 1961-1962. Erickson, then, presents the explosive growth of Fundamentalist schools from 1976 to 1984 by using the data reported by the Association of Christian Schools International in 1984.

Table 3. The growth of Fundamentalist schools from 1976 to 1984

School Year	Number of Schools	Total Enrollment
1976-77	500	63,131
1977-78	611	74,460
1978-79	1051	185,687
1979-80	1294	220,001
1980-81	1482	289,001
1981-82	1728	320,950
1982-83	1933	337,550
1983-84	2148	364,070

(Erickson 1986, 90)

According to Thomas Hunt and James Caper, “as of 1992, enrollments in these new Christian schools represent approximately 20 percent of the total private school population and 2-3 percent of the national school population” (Hunt and Caper 1997, 96).

It has been difficult to assess the growth of Christian schools because some schools that belong to a separatist persuasion refuse to affiliate with any of the national

associations of Christian schools and to report enrollment data to the state. Nevertheless, considering the membership figures of the two largest Christian school associations, it can be possible to have the most concrete evidence of growth (Caper and Layman 1995, 10-11). The Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) was formed by merging the National Christian School Education Association, the Ohio Association of Christian Schools, and the Western Association of Christian Schools. Soon after this new association formed several other Christian school associations also joined ACSI, such as the Southeast Association of Christian Schools, the Association of Teachers of Christian Schools (Midwest), the Great Plains Association of Christian Schools, and the Texas Association of Christian Schools (Association of Christian School International [2005], acsi.org). ACSI “claimed a membership in 1967 of 102 schools (K-12) with an enrollment of 14,659. By 1973, the figures were 308 and 39,360, respectively; in 1983, ACSI figures were approximately 1,900 and 270,000; in 1989, 2,347 and 340,626; and 1994, 3,001 and 509,925” (Caper and Layman 1995, 11). Currently ACSI serves over 5,900 member schools in approximately 106 countries with an enrollment of nearly 1.4 million students (The Association of Christian Schools International 2011, Default.aspx).

In 1972, the American Association of Christian Schools (AACCS) was founded in Miami, Florida with 80 schools with an enrollment of 16,000 students. The Association claimed in 1983 more than 1,100 schools enrolling 160,000 students, and reported in 1991 that it served 1,200 schools and 187,000 students (Caper and Layman 1995, 11). According to the website of the Association, AACCS now serves over 100,000 students and teachers in member schools throughout the United States (The American Association of Christian Schools 2011, about-us).

Identity of Christian School Education

The identity of Christian schools cannot be considered without a proper understanding of Christian education with its foundational philosophy. Werner Graendorf defines Christian education as

a Bible-based, Holy Spirit-empowered (Christ-centered) teaching-learning process. It seeks individuals at all levels of growth through contemporary teaching means toward knowing and experiencing God's purpose and plan through Christ in every aspect of living. It also equips them for effective ministry, with the overall focus on Christ the Master Educator's example and his command to make mature disciples. (Graendorf 1981, 16)

Roy Zuck's definition contains similar elements to that of Graendorf. According to Zuck, "Christian education is the Christ-centered, Bible-based, pulpit related process of communicating God's written Word through the power of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of leading others to Christ and building them up in Christ" (Zuck 1971, 9). Pazmiño's book, *Foundational Issues of Christian Education*, develops a more inclusive definition of Christian education by combining "the descriptive dimensions of Cremin's suggestions with the normative dimensions fundamental to the Christian faith" (Pazmiño 1997, 87).

He says,

Christian education is the deliberate, systematic, and sustained divine and human effort to share or appropriate the knowledge, values, attitudes, skills, sensitivities, and behaviors that comprise or are consistent with the Christian faith. It fosters the change, renewal, and reformation of persons, groups, and structures by the power of the Holy Spirit to conform to the revealed will of God as expressed in the Scripture and preeminently in the person of Jesus Christ, as well as any outcomes of the effort. (Pazmiño 1997, 87)

Furthermore, even though it is not a definition of Christian education, the Christian-educational objective that Dennis Williams developed gives insight into how Christian education should be understood:

The educational objective is to reveal to the learner God's eternal plan for mankind through His Word, and especially through the revelation of Jesus Christ and His redeeming work; to lead the learner to accept the provision of salvation offered by God, and to enter a life of discipleship that will lead to spiritual growth and nurture in order that the learner will function within the body of Christ, the Church, as it fulfills its purpose of being a worshipping fellowship engaged in evangelism, education and ministry. (Williams 1992, 20)

Glen Schultz also provides Christian-educational goals in his book, *Kingdom Education*, and his three-step objective shares other Christian educators' understanding of Christian education: "A life-long, Bible-based, Christ-centered process of *leading a child to Christ, building a child up in Christ, and equipping a child to serve Christ*" (Schultz 1998, 25).

Why Christian Schools?

According to Kenneth Gangel, "The purpose of Christian school education is to expose students to the real world as revealed through the eyes of God and to instill solid defenses against conformity to the unreal world of the secular community" (Gangel 1988, 98). The Association of Christian Schools International considers its vision as follows:

Young men and women, products of Christian schooling, will mature to loving God with all their heart, mind, and soul (Matthew 23:37); growing in wisdom and stature (Luke 2:52); living in the world as salt and light (Matthew 5:13-14); and giving sacrificially of themselves and their resources reflecting the essence and love of the Christ who lives and dwells within them (Romans 12:1). (acsi.org 2005, Default.aspx)

In Richard Edlin's, *The Cause of Christian Education*, he contends that Christian schools should have clear and biblical positions, giving continuing attention to their vision for each school to be what it should be and professes its desire to be.

Christian teachers have the unique opportunity of leading their students in a discovery of the world and its peoples that allows the class to comprehend the wonderful way God made and sustains His world. Students in Christian schools also learn about the way mankind has exercised stewardship of God's world. They

also discover the glorious potential that each of them has for fulfilled living if they base their decisions and actions upon a heart commitment to Jesus Christ and His way of doing things. They learn some unsavory truths about what mankind is really like. In the Christian school, though, this will be seen in the light of God's wonderful love that empowers them with the challenge of conveying a true and lasting message of hope to their own generation. (Edlin 1999, 15)

Christian schools were growing and like Paul Kienel says, "Perhaps the most visible thing the Holy Spirit is doing in the body of Christ today is the rapid proliferation of Christian schools" (Kienel 1978, 1). There have been, however, constant debates with regard to the problem of their right to exist. In this regard, Edlin uses the metaphor of the "hothouse" to insist on the necessity of Christian school education. Against the concern of the people that Christian schools encapsulate students "in an escapist 'hothouse' atmosphere" (Edlin 1999, 36), Edlin explains that the plants, which are nurtured in the hothouse while they are young, become more strong to stand against the ferocity of the elements when they are removed from the hothouse. Likewise, the job of schools "is to assist growing, developing youngsters and give them direction and help as they learn about the world and prepare for their tasks in it" (Edlin 1999, 36). At this point, Edlin argues that "*all schools, as nurturing institutions, are hothouses*" and continues to say,

Christian schools proclaim in all their curricula and in life that this is God's world, that it can only be properly understood or learned about in all its wonder in relationship to him and in the light of His Word, and that youngsters can only properly be prepared to take their place in this world in response to God's revelation and the call that He makes upon the lives of every one of them. (Edlin 1999, 36)

Wayne Grudem, in his article "Biblical Reasons for Sending Children to a Christian School," articulates six biblical statements supporting Christian school education.

1. All of a child's education should be Bible-centered and God-centered. The training and instruction from secular education would "exasperate" children (Eph 6:4).

2. Education should be positive and truthful. Secular training may *callous* Christian children so they view sin as more “normal.” It may *harden* them so they care more about the things of the world and less about God. It may *desensitize* them so they are more comfortable living in the midst of repeated sin against their Lord. But it will not *strengthen* them as Christian men and women: “Train a child in the way he *should* go.
3. Peer influence should be positive and Christ-like. Bible says, “Do not be misled: ‘Bad company corrupts good character’” (1 Cor 15:33), and “He who walks with the wise grows wise, but a companion of fools suffers harm” (Prov 13:20).
4. Every teacher’s pattern of life should be worthy of imitation. Christian parents should choose Christian schools for their children because children tend to imitate a teacher they like and the teacher will impact on attitudes toward all aspects of life including their studies.
5. Only God-centered education gives true wisdom. The secular educational process has strayed from the truth because “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” (Prov 9:10) and “in [Christ] are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col 2:3).
6. Christian schooling is the best hope for transforming society. School is where students learn “*how to work and relate to others and influence the world*” and with the meek acceptance of secular instruction, for twelve years their Christian witness grows accustomed to being mute, and it remains *uneducated*, never growing beyond the ‘Sunday school’ level. (Grudem 1984, n.p.)

Chris Templar also participates in this debate and has listed arguments that have been raised for justifying the Christian schools’ existence:

1. God’s revelation is the basis for all truth (Luke 11:52; Prov 1:7).
2. God gave parents the responsibility to control the education of their children (Deut 6:7; Eph 6:4; Gen 18:17-19).
3. God gave religious leaders a responsibility for teaching children (Deut 31:9-13).
4. Christian education must be education for the whole person (Prov 22:6).
5. God’s education is always in contrast to man’s education (Col 2:8).
6. Biblical education requires a submission of the intellect and will to the lordship of Christ (1 Cor 1:18-31; 2 Cor 10:5).
7. Every part of the educational process is related to God, and, therefore, education cannot be divided into “secular” and “religious.” It can take place only in an atmosphere where this relationship can be implemented.
8. The person to be educated is a unified personality. He is one as God is one. Therefore, his education cannot be compartmentalized into “secular” and “religious.”
9. The goal of all education, in church or school, is to help man more fully achieve the purpose of his life, that is, to know and serve God. Only the Christian school can eradicate the false dualism of “sacred” and “secular” and bring the two together, thus presenting a unified Christian world view.

10. Higher academic standards are possible because of devoted teachers, limited enrollment, and increased efficiency due to the wise stewardship of limited resources.
11. The small percentage of time children spend at home and church reinforces the needs for the Christian school.
12. For the Christian, the highest incentive in learning and conduct is to glorify God. This incentive can be stressed in Christian schools in a way that is not possible for a Christian teacher in a public school. Thus, the standards of the Christian home are reinforced and emphasized. (Daniel, Wade, and Gresham 1987, 290-91)

The Myth of Religious Neutrality in Education

In his article published in 1977, William H. Willimon, Duke University professor of Christian ministry, called Christian schools separatist, racist, and inimical to Christian evangelism, and maintains that “Christians had no business in founding Christian schools” (Willimon 1993, 30). His assertion is based on the fact that Christian schools “were considered by many Christians to be unnecessary because public education was basically neutral and articulated a uniform ethic to all students, an ethic that espoused common values which usually resembled Biblical principles” (Edlin 1999, 42). Willimon changed his position on public schools and in his 1993 article, “I was Wrong About Christian Schools,” he states that “public schools are not and never have been as ‘neutral’ as they have claimed to be” (Willimon 1993, 32). Such belief on religious neutrality in public school is still “the cornerstone contention of Christians who place their children in public schools” (Edlin 1999, 42).

It is notable that, while some Christians want to believe that education is neutral, a number of secular scholars comment that this is not true. Elliot Eisner holds, “To be in school is to acquire a worldview” (Eisner 1992, 305). Robert Sollod, Cleveland State University professor, presents the same idea in a more practical way:

Much has been written about the loss of ethics, a sense of decency, moderation and fair play in American society. I would submit that much of this loss is a result of the increasing ignorance, in circles of presumably educated people, of religious and spiritual world-views. It is difficult to imagine, for example, how ethical issues can be intelligently approached and discussed or how wise ethical decisions can be made without either knowledge or reference to those religious and spiritual principles that underlies our legal system or moral codes. (Sollod 1992, 60)

Edlin considers the neutrality concept in education as “the flawed perspective behind the modern-day clamor for the separation of church and state” (Edlin 1999, 27), and he proclaims, “Education is not religiously neutral. It never has been, and it never will be. Education is always the expression of the beliefs about life and living that are held by those who determine the educational process. The myth of religious neutrality in education is dead” (Edlin 1999, 45). Dennis Mills agrees with Edlin when he contends that “education cannot be expressed in a vacuum” (Mills 1997, [faith-learning.html](#)). Mills further asserts, “All schools are religious schools!” (Mills 1997, [faith-learning.html](#)). According to him, religion is defined as “one’s deepest convictions about God, about man, about one’s self, about the world, and about the future” (Mills 1997, [faith-learning.html](#)) and such beliefs is expressed in education.

Ronald Nash views the myth of religious neutrality not only in education, but in human beings themselves when he writes, “Human beings are never neutral with regard to God. Either we worship God as Creator and Lord, or we turn away from Him” (Nash 1990, 29). Edlin delivers the same idea as does Nash and addresses scriptural foundations for such a belief. In Acts 17, Paul, who is distressed about seeing idols in the city of Athens, declares—in the Areopagus meeting with regard to the God of heaven and earth—that He “does not live in temples built by hands” (v. 24) and “gives all men life and breath and everything else” (v. 25). The same Lord set the times and places for

people “so that men would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him” (v. 27). Edlin argues that “this is one of the most momentous claims of the Bible” (Edlin 1999, 28). Paul contends in this passage that all people are not only created by God, but are created as God-seekers. In other words, people are all religious if being religious means seeking after the Lord.

Paul’s claim in Romans 1:25 confirms that there is no neutrality and that all of life is religious. “They [the people] exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator.” Edlin suggests that the choice does not concern worshiping and serving, but the object of the worship; the creature or the Creator. While pointing out that this biblical passage does a good job of describing the modern-day humanist heresy—worshiping the creature rather than the Creator, Edlin maintains that “the Bible reminds us that all of life is religious, and that, sadly, Satan has diverted humankind’s God-ordained worship instinct” (Edlin 1999, 28).

Biblical Educational Philosophy

According to Albert Greene’s book, *Reclaiming the Future of Christian Education*, the problem in today’s Christian schools is a lack of scriptural foundation. The schools often assume that “they understand how to start and maintain a Christian school. They seldom realize how many of their ideas on the subject are derived from modern society and not from the Bible” (Greene 1998, 65). Then, he continually says that “the foundation of a Christian schooling project should be a Christian philosophy” (Greene 1998, 66). Robert Pazmiño shares his idea of educational philosophy, when he remarks that “education is the fruit of its philosophic roots” (Pazmiño 1997, 81). Gordon Clark takes the point a little further, when he writes, “If someone wishes to unify

education, it is not enough to say that a philosophical base is necessary. To accomplish such a result, it is essential to provide the philosophy” (Clark 1988, 21). He then adds that, for Christians, “There is only one philosophy that can really unify education and life. That philosophy is the philosophy of Christian theism” (Clark 1988, 21). Christian educators generally found themselves agreeing that Christian-educational philosophy will be the systematic scheme of thought, based upon which Christian educational programs and practices will be articulated.

Definition of the Christian Education Philosophy

The term “philosophy” is literally defined as “the love of wisdom.” Christians understand that it is God Who gives wisdom (Prov 2:6), and the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom (Prov 1:7). Furthermore, the Bible says, “All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” are hidden in Christ. Keeping this in mind, Edlin observes, “We don’t need to start with human philosophies or human wisdom to know what education is about, but we can, and must, start with the Word of God and, as the Holy Spirit interprets it to us, allow the Lord to show us the type of education to which we should expose our children” (Edlin 1999, 30).

By studying philosophy as an academic discipline, individuals usually seek to discern what is the truth, the real, and the valuable. Christian philosophy, however, cannot be considered without the reality and truth of God because, as Pazmiño rightly states, “God is the source of all truth and reality” (Pazmiño 1997, 82). With this basic understanding, Norman DeJong offers a well-developed definition of a philosophy of Christian education as “an attempt to arrange systematically some thoughts on education

as given their meaning by the biblical teachings that constitute the orthodox Christian faith” (DeJong 1974, 16).

Basic Elements of Christian Philosophy

Against Christian scholars who are satisfied with the Roman Catholic philosophy of neo-scholasticism, Greene advocates an integral Christian philosophy that “goes by the name of the Cosmomic philosophy or the Philosophy of Law” (Greene 1998, 75). It is integral because it is against the inescapable dualism of Christian philosophy based on neo-scholasticism, which tries to explain ordinary matters by human reason and to understand spiritual issues with faith. Greene mentions the urgency for developing an integral Christian philosophy:

If we fail to seek an integral Christian philosophy, we will condemn ourselves to operating out of an unrecognized, but no less dangerous, dualism. We will seek answers in theology where we can find them, but in other areas we will be subject to secular, non-Christian presuppositions. By doing this, we will ensure our failure to bear witness to the total lordship of Christ, which is our privilege and our duty as Christians. Thus there are powerful arguments for the pursuit of a Christian philosophy. (Greene 1998, 78)

The integral Christian philosophy proposed by Greene follows three basic elements—or categories—of philosophical studies, with which today’s prominent Christian educators, including George Knight and Robert Pazmiño, develop. They are metaphysics, “the study of questions concerning the nature of reality”; epistemology, “the study of the nature of truth and knowledge and how these are attained”; and axiology, “the study of questions of value” (Knight 1998, 8-9).

James Cunningham—in the book coauthored with Anthony Fortosis, *Education in Christian Schools*—ensures that the search for these three basic categories of philosophic studies will end when one meets and accepts Jesus Christ because He is

the Way, “the ultimate metaphysical reality”; the Truth, “the personification of epistemological purity”; and the Life, “the embodiment of a sinless axiological moral model” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 25).

Metaphysics

Cunningham furnishes a well-developed definition of metaphysics. “The word *Metaphysics* comes from two Greek words *meta* (with or after) and *physics* (natural things). It is the branch of philosophy that tries to discover the nature of ultimate reality” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 29). According to George Knight, the biblical metaphysical framework clearly presents the existence of the Creator-God, His perfect creation, the creation of human beings in God’s image, the invention of sin, the limitation of human beings, salvation through Jesus Christ, and return of Christ to restore our world (Knight 1998, 166).

Creation. Christians agree with Michael Peterson when he declares that there are two broad categories of reality: “God, the Creator and the world, His creation” (Peterson 1986, 80). The sovereign, living, triune God—Who is eternal, infinite, and self-sufficient—created “the heavens and the earth” out of nothing (Gen 1:1, 2), and everything that He made looked good in His sight. Peterson finds three implications in the creation doctrine. First, it implies that the world, which the Prime Existence created, is real. Second, the world is intelligible because God, Who is supremely creative, made it. Third, the Genesis creation narrative explains that the God-made world is good (Peterson 1986, 82).

The scriptural creation doctrine describes God, the Creator, as the central reality of anything meaningful and the source of all other reality. The world is the transcendent and personal God's creation and it should be viewed in its relationship with the Creator's existence and purposes. Edlin considers that the main function of schools is teaching students about the world and their places and tasks in it. With a biblical understanding of the creation doctrine, he addresses a strong statement to Christian educators:

The Scriptures have shown that such learning about the world must be built upon the evident base that this is God's world which He has made, redeemed, and sustains—a study which should reflect God the Creator within the context of the actual study, and which should lead to the praise and worship of the God of all the earth. Anything else is disobedient education, is non-Christian, and is educating students to serve a god substitute, usually man, since man is seen as the center of things, the determiner of truth, in our existing public education system today. (Edlin 1999, 33)

Greene understands the creation concept with two sides: “the origin of the universe” (Greene 1998, 91) and the “ongoing process of creation” (Greene 1998, 92). God, who created the world, also holds it by His Word of power. “The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word” (Heb 1:3; Col 1:17). Edlin rightly points out that there is order in this world because of the Lord's constant upholding work. He further holds that “that is why we can talk of laws and principles in geography or physics or economics or whatever” (Edlin 1999, 31).

Anthropology. Genesis records the origin of human beings. As Francis Schaeffer states, “Man is not impersonal matter or energy shaped into its present form by impersonal chance” (Schaeffer 1982, 18). Additionally, man and woman are created

beings, who are dependent on the Prime Source. Therefore, human beings, like other creatures, are finite, fallible, and contingent. Yet, “God created man in his own image” (Gen 1:27). The Lord’s image in human beings distinguishes them from other created beings. Human beings are not only “like the beasts that perish” (Ps 49:12) but also “a little lower than the heavenly beings” (Ps 8:5). Mike Mason summarizes this Scriptural anthropology: “Man reflects God’s likeness in expression, purpose and personality. He is given the privilege in Christ of communing with God. This incarnate image of God is hallowed, since God has graced it with His own indwelling. Made a little lower than the angels, he is God’s noblest creation” (Mason 1985, 40). Cunningham and Fortosis comprehend this biblical view of human beings as a distinctive perspective of Christian schools. According to them, “The Christian view of man says that we need to learn how to have right relationships with God and man. God’s character is the law of the universe. Therefore, *we must* know who God is in order to understand His universe. This high view of man—that every man has worth because he is made in the image of God—is a distinctive of a Christian perspective on education” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 63).

Even though all human beings are created in the image of God, they are sinful and apart from God since the Fall as recorded in the third chapter of Genesis. Man’s ultimate destiny has become “death” (Rom 5:12), and any kind of human effort cannot reach the Lord’s glory (Rom 3:23). God, however, had His own plan in His mind. He sent His one and only Son, Jesus Christ, into the world, allowed Him die, and raised Him from death to restore his image in human beings and to reconcile them to Himself (John 3:16). The only way to come to God and to restore the broken relationship with Him in the name of Jesus Christ is by faith in Christ. In Paul’s letter to the Ephesians, he plainly

writes, “For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith – and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God – not by works, so that no one can boast” (Eph 2:8, 9). Cunningham and Fortosis argue that the understanding of humanity’s sinful nature leads Christian educators to “see a need for the salvation of their students as well as their spiritual enlightenment in academic events,” and to recognize the twofold purpose of their teaching: “to teach the content of mathematics or the content of chemistry or whatever the subject matter may be, and to bear witness to the students of their need for Jesus Christ as the personal Lord and personal Saviour in their own lives, so they understand the God who ‘made the math’” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 49).

Epistemology

With its original Greek words, “epi (upon) and histani (stand), plus logy (the study of),” Cunningham explains the term “epistemology” as the “part of philosophy that deals with the origin, nature and limits of knowledge” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 65).

Knowledge. God is not only He Who is, but He Who knows as well.

According to Peterson, God is the ultimate source of all knowledge and all intelligence. His knowledge is “total, perfect and impeccable” (Peterson 1986, 83). Created in the Lord’s image, human beings are also able to think, judge, and know—even though they are fallen by sin—but their knowledge has become “partial, defective and fallible” (Peterson 1986, 83). In this regard, Peterson emphasizes how vital it is for people to grasp reliable knowledge by employing their reason.

Against human-centered views of life and the world, Cunningham and Fortosis comment that “the believer’s epistemology is revelation-centered” and delivers three revelation methods that are widely accepted: General Revelation-Creation, Special Revelation-Bible, and Incarnate Revelation-Jesus of Nazareth (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 70-71). God created the world and is still working in it. Thus, knowledge of the Lord is available through the created order. The psalmist claims, “The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands” (Ps 19:1, 2). In addition, the Apostle Paul says, “For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities – his eternal power and divine nature – have been clearly seen being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse” (Rom 1:20).

Millard Erickson explains general revelation’s universality and describes it as “accessible to all persons at all times” (Erickson 2001, 178). Both believers and nonbelievers, know the Lord’s truth if they do not suppress it. It cannot substitute, though, for the special revelation, which “involves God’s particular communications” through inspired and inerrant writings (Erickson 2001, 178). Humans’ understanding of the Lord grows within their personal relationship with Him, and salvation is solely derived from believing in His work of grace (Erickson 2001, 198-99). In this regard, Cunningham warns Christian educators, “Don’t ever let anyone tell you that the people closest to nature are closest to God” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 73). Yet, he encourages them to enjoy seeing God in creation with their students. Cunningham continues, “The closer one gets to nature and the knowledge of how the human body and mind and spirit function, with a Biblical knowledge of God, the greater one’s

understanding and excitement about God and His general revelation” (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 73).

Special revelation’s primary purpose is restoring human beings’ lost relationship with God, while general revelation helps them gain “general” knowledge of the Lord. George Knight expresses this point when he says, “The purpose of scripture is to make people ‘wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus’ and to provide doctrine, reproof, correction, and ‘instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect’ (2 Tim 3:15-17 AV)” (Knight 1998, 169). God reveals Himself and His will more completely, in an appropriate way, to human beings’ understanding through special revelation. Accordingly, if people hold to the Bible as the complete, sufficient, clear, authoritative, and adequate rule of faith, they will comprehend its message of salvation and deliverance from sin, which it offers them in Jesus Christ.

Peterson contends that, if God is the ground of knowledge as its ultimate source, Jesus Christ—the Son of God—is its center (Peterson 1986, 84). Human beings can attain knowledge because each individual has a Teacher within himself or herself. “Christ is the Teacher who illumines the human mind to comprehend and understand reality” (Dockery and Thornbury 2002, 77). His revelation is central knowledge of God because Jesus had been with Him. “No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father’s side, has made him known” (John 1:18) (Erickson 2001, 782). Additionally, Jesus defines Himself as “the word of God,” “the wisdom of God,” and “the one in whom all of the knowledge of God rests” (Peterson 1986, 84). More importantly, He is the truth (John 14:6) and He is God (John 1:1). Consequently, Jesus

Christ is the highest of all God's revelations, the spiritual truth (Heb 1:1-3), and "the very heart of reality" (Peterson 1986, 84).

Axiology

Moreover, axiology is from the Greek word: "axios (worthy) and logy (the study of nature, types, criteria and status of human values)" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 87). Its two subdivisions are "ethics and aesthetics, or values and beauty" (Greene 1998, 127).

Ethics. From a Scriptural perspective on the world, ethics is transcendent and is based on the major character of God, Who is love. George Knight considers the great commandments—which Jesus Christ gave His disciples in the Gospel of Matthew—to be the basis for Christian ethics, and believes "the entire law is summed up in" them (Gal 5:14) (Knight 1998, 175-77). "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.' This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself'" (Matt 22:37-39).

Greene asserts that values from a biblical perspective are absolute and "run through every part of our life and experience" (Greene 1998, 129). He adds, "Our task is to discover in the light of the Bible, what is the will of God for us in each area and to live it out for His pleasure" (Greene 1998, 131). Cunningham and Fortosis agree with him: "We are created for God's good purpose to reflect Him, to serve Him, to enjoy Him. God is our highest good. Without Him we can do nothing. His plans and purposes for us are always good" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 107). To sum it all up, as Peterson claims, the Lord is the absolute standard by which all human actions are measured. Cunningham

admonishes Christian educators to turn to God's absolute standard as recognizing an ongoing challenge in this value-free world. According to him,

As Christians we tend to reduce our standards down to the lowest common public denominator. However, if we have our morals attached to Biblical standards, the Biblical standards are consistent. When do we stop bowing our knee to Baal and maintain a genuine Biblical morality, even though it means losing people from our particular group because they think we are being perhaps too strict? How far down can the world go with its morals if we follow just a little bit behind, always comparing ourselves to the world? To be "in the world" but not "of the world" is the ongoing challenge facing the Christian School Movement. (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 106-07)

Aesthetics. In the beginning, God created the whole universe, and He appreciated it as "good" (Gen 1:1, 31). In other words, the Lord not only created the whole world, but He created it of beauty, so individuals can find aesthetic values in His world God is a really creative Creator due to the fact that He formed the whole universe out of nothing. Made to be good in His image, human beings are simultaneously creatures and creators who can seek and appreciate beauty and can create beauty as well (Knight 1998, 180-81). Human beings and the whole universe, however, have been deprived by sin since the Fall. Albert Greene maintains that "sin has blinded us to the nearness of God in the creation" (Greene 1998, 134). He continues, "Our daily experiences, in unrecognized slavery to the Enlightenment idea that facts are neutral or meaningless, have lost almost all sense of God's self-revelation in the ordinary experiences of ordinary life. What the aesthetic aspect of experience can do is awaken us to God's nearness and so deepen our awe, love, praise, and service to Him" (Greene 1998, 134).

Greene further states his position on Christian aesthetics with regard to Christian schools. He finds two meanings of the Christian understanding of aesthetics for

the Christian schooling system. First of all, Greene holds that Christian schools “need to develop a much more aesthetic approach to the school studies so that they lead students to an increased awe and love for God” (Greene 1998, 137). Second, he specifies the problem of neglecting music and art as part of the curriculum in today’s Christian schools as well as in the public schools: “Without neglecting the aesthetic side of all the subjects, music and art should have a much more important place in the curriculum than our money-conscious ways often afford them” (Greene 1998, 138).

Biblical Principles of Christian School Education

Many Christian educators have tried to define Christian education. Their definitions have slightly different emphases, but there certainly are common elements because they are all based on the Word of God and His insight. Like Gangel and Benson say, “The one constant in the field of education is that of change, and the Scriptures constitute the one educational handbook that will not change or go out of style. Its principles are eternal, whereas books in educational psychology and even foundations of education are abruptly and carelessly discarded” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 65). Based on what they understand Christian education to be through biblical insight, various Christian educators have developed biblical principles of Christian education – which guide educational endeavors and practices in Christian schools.

Richard Edlin insists that in order not to make Christian education as “a conglomeration of contemporary and temporary educational novelties” (Edlin 1999, 15), Christian educators should take seriously the Word of God as its foundation. For the vision of Christian school education, he argues that the Word of God must be the core of the school’s curriculum. Edlin continually says, “All facets of the life of the school

inside and outside of the classroom must reflect the fact that this is God's world which can only properly be understood in relationship to Him, whose character is visible in His world and who calls people to live in that world in faithful response to His commands" (Edlin 1999, 38). Edlin, then, addresses three biblical passages, which are foundational to an understanding of Christian education, and he uses them as biblical principles for his personal challenge and to encourage his teachers and students. The first one is "Trust in the Lord with all your heart and lean not on your own understanding; in all your ways acknowledge him, and he will make your paths straight" (Prov 3:5-6). Edlin comments that this calls for Christian educators and students to seek God's way of thinking in everything and he insists that "if all of our educational methodologies have this foundation, then we will have a basis for knowing the direction in which we should go in our classrooms" (Edlin 1999, 16). The second foundational direction from God for Christian schools, according to Edlin, is that "I gain understanding from your precepts; therefore I hate every wrong path. Your word is a lamp to my feet and a light for my path" (Ps 119:104-105). Christian schools, Edlin says, should help students to gain the precepts and directions of the Bible and to apply these to examine the world and tasks in it in order to find direction and purpose in life. The third passage that Edlin uses as a foundation for the Christian school is that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; all who follow his precepts have good understanding. To him belongs eternal praise" (Ps 110:10; also Prov 9:10 and Job 28:28) (Edlin 1999, 16). Based on this passage, Edlin argues that "a reverent awe of [God] and His way is the key to wisdom and a good education" (Edlin 1999, 16) and the educational patterns in Christian schools should be divinely guided.

When dealing with the philosophy of Christian school education, David L. Hocking articulates thirteen basic principles upon which the Christian school education rests. Hocking asserts that most of all, “the Christian philosophy of education is based on the authority, authenticity, and reliability of the Bible as the complete and final revelation of God concerning all matters of faith, truth, and practice” (Hocking 1978, 12). In arguing that if Jesus Christ, who is the source of wisdom and knowledge, is not the center of everything that is done in Christian school classrooms, “the entire Christian philosophy of education crumbles” (Hocking 1978, 14), Hocking’s second principle is “The Christian philosophy of education is based on the centrality and authority of Jesus Christ in all that is believed, said, or done” (Hocking 1978, 14). The third principle, according to Hocking, is that “the Christian philosophy of education is based on clearly defined goals and objectives that are found in the Bible” (Hocking 1978, 15). As for the goals and objectives that Christian education must follow, Hocking lists “the glory of God,” “the salvation of non-believers,” “the maturity of believers in doctrine and practice,” and “the training of believers for Christian service and ministry” (Hocking 1978, 15-18). Hocking’s fourth principle is “The Christian philosophy of education is based on the conviction that knowledge of the Bible and of Jesus Christ is essential to the development and growth of the individual in matters physical, mental, social, and spiritual” (Hocking 1978, 18), and he asserts that “the Christian viewpoint must consider all truth as God’s truth; to a Christian there is no difference between the secular and the sacred, for all things are sacred” (Hocking 1978, 18). The fifth principle that Hocking emphasizes is the importance of personal faith in Jesus Christ and commitment to Him of teachers and workers in Christian schools. He says, “The Christian philosophy of

education is based on a personal commitment to Jesus Christ on the part of all who are involved in the educational process. The next principle is that “the Christian philosophy of education is based on the ministry of the Holy Spirit” (Hocking 1978, 22), who is the true author of the Bible, who teaches the people what is in it, and equips teachers and workers in the Christian educational process with spiritual gifts. The seventh principle is that “the Christian philosophy of education is based on a proper relationship between the family, the church, and the educational process” (Hocking 1978, 23). In order to follow this principle, Hocking asserts that balance is essential and the educational process should be controlled by the family, which is “the basic unit of Christian education” and the church, which is “simply an extension of the educational process of the home, providing a supportive basis of encouragement to the family in its basic responsibility” (Hocking 1978, 23). Principle number eight is that “the Christian philosophy of education is based on the establishment of proper priorities in an individual’s life” (Hocking 1978, 24). Proper priorities according to Hocking are as follows: (1) Commitment to Christ Himself; (2) commitment to the family; 3) commitment to other believers; (4) commitment to non-believers; (5) commitment to a job (Hocking 1978, 24-25). Hocking, then, addresses the principles related to understanding of history, the origin of man, and moral standards. The ninth principle is that “the Christian philosophy of education is based on the sovereignty of God in all the affairs of men and throughout all history” (Hocking 1978, 25). The tenth principle is that “The Christian philosophy of education is based on the creation of man in the image of God apart from any so-called evolutionary process” (Hocking 1978, 25). The eleventh principle is that “the Christian philosophy of education is based on the moral principles of the Bible” (Hocking 1978, 25). Noting that

many Christian educators ignore the factors related to spiritual growth when they are considering the development of the child, Hocking writes the twelfth principle: “The Christian philosophy of education is based on meeting the needs of people in their chronological, physical and mental development, as well as in their spiritual growth as believers” (Hocking 1978, 26). Lastly, Hocking expresses his emphasis on the excellence of the teacher in a Christian educational process and says, “The Christian philosophy of education is based on Christian teachers who understand these basic principles of Christian education, who are personally committed to them, and who demonstrate effectiveness in their ability to communicate them” (Hocking 1978, 26-27).

James Braley, in *How to Start a Christian School*, which is an ACSI handbook of helpful information to make an effective plan and get a Christian school started in an international setting, lists five basic principles for Christian schools. The first principle to keep in mind, according to Braley, is that “Jesus is the central figure of the Christian school” (Braley 1998, 6), and every person who provides a Christian education should strive to carry out the basic principles of Scripture. The second principle is that “God has given to parents the responsibility of educating children” (Braley 1998, 6). In order to follow this principle, Braley asserts that Christian schools must work with the family as a team as providing as much information as possible for parents and having meetings with parents regularly. As the third principle, Braley addresses that “the school must nurture students” (Braley 1998, 6). Referring to Matthew 18:1-6, he challenges educators in Christian schools to “nurture children and not cause them to stumble” (Braley 1998, 6). The next principle Braley lists is that “every child is an honored, gifted child” (Braley 1998, 6). Braley encourages Christian school directors and teachers to see each child

from God's point of view and to help the child find and develop his/her own God-given gifts as keeping this principle in mind. Lastly, Braley suggests, "Live out biblical teaching" (Braley 1998, 7), and gives practical examples, such as developing "projects that help students minister to each other and to those around them in their community, country, and the world" (Braley 1998, 7).

Glen Schultz also set forth biblical principles of education in his book, *Kingdom Education: God's Plan for Education Future Generation*. "Biblical Principles for Achieving Kingdom Education." According to him, kingdom education is defined as "the life-long, Bible-based, Christ-centered process of leading a child to Christ, building a child up in Christ, and equipping a child to serve Christ" (Schultz 1998, 25). In addition, Schultz believes that "God's Word provides every Christian with principles needed to put kingdom education into practice" (Schultz, 2002, 20). He, then, develops ten basic biblical principles that should guide the next generation's total education. The following is a summary of his biblical principles of kingdom education.

1. The education of children and youth is the primary responsibility of parents (Deut 6:4-9; 11:18-21; Ps 78:1-7; Ps 127:3; Prov 22:6; Mal 2:13-16; Eph 6:4). Children are God's homework assignment to parents; therefore Christian parents must make sure that they are assuming total responsibility for the education of their children.
2. The education of children and youth is a 24 hour-a-day, 7 days-per-week process that continues from birth till maturity (Deut 6:7; 11:19; Prov 22:6). Parents must teach their children diligently. The only time we should not be diligently teaching our children the things of God is when they are asleep.
3. The education of children and youth must have as its primary goals the salvation of and discipleship of the next generation (Ps 78:6-7; Matt 28:19-20). Christians must develop a single-minded focus for the purpose behind the education of their children. This purpose is to see their children become mature followers of Christ.
4. The education of children and youth must be based on God's Word as absolute truth (Matt 24:35; Ps 119). God's word is eternal and, therefore, is man's only source of truth. This means that everything that man studies must be scrutinized through the lens of scripture. This is the only way we can find true knowledge that will lead us to wisdom.

5. The education of children and youth must hold Christ as preeminent in all of life (Col 2:3, 6-10). Christ is to be preeminent in everything—period. Even the education of our children and youth must be centered on Christ.
6. The education of children and youth must not hinder the spiritual and moral development of the next generation (Matt 18:6; 19:13-14; Mark 10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17). Sometimes we think of offending children only in means of physical abuse. We forget that anything that hinders their moral and spiritual development is the epitome of child abuse.
7. The education of children and youth, if and when delegated to others by parents, must be done with utmost care to ensure that all teachers follow these principles (Exod 18:21; I Sam 1:27-28; 3:1-10). Consider who you are allowing to help you in educating your children. Make a list of every person and/or institution, organization, etc. who is teaching your children about any aspect of life. Then ask the question: Does each one “fear God, love truth and hate covetousness” (Exod 18:21)?
8. The education of children and youth results in the formation of a belief system or worldview that will be patterned after the belief systems or worldviews of the person’s teachers (Luke 6:40). Everyone who teaches others influences them in three ways. They influence them by their content, what they say; by their communication, how they say it; and by their conduct, how they live. No one can teach out of a philosophical vacuum. Their beliefs and values will come out and these will help shape the belief and values of those whom they teach.
9. The education of children and youth must lead to true wisdom by connecting all knowledge to a biblical worldview frame of reference (Prov 4:5, 7; 3:19; 9:10; Ps 104:24; 136:5; Jer 10:12; Rom 11:33; Luke 11:52; Col 2:3; 1 Cor 8:1; 13:8; Rom 1:28).
10. The education of children and youth must have a view of the future that includes the eternal perspective (Cor 3:1-2; Matt 6:19-20; 2 Tim 4:6-8; Acts 20:24; Heb 11:13; Col 3:23-24). (Schultz 2002, 21-30)

The Excellence Movement and Christian Schools

The U.S. Department of Education’s National Commission on Excellence in Education published in 1983 the results of an eighteen-month study by members of this commission, which is titled *A Nation at Risk*. The report claims that the state of American education is found at risk. The findings of this report illustrate that “some 23 million American adults are functionally illiterate by the simplest tests of everyday reading, writing, and comprehension”; “About 13 percent of all 17-year-olds in the United States can be considered functionally illiterate,” and, “Compared to other nations,

American students spend much less time on school work” (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983, risk.html). Recognizing such severe problems in American education, the commission cautions,

The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people. . . . If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983, risk.html)

This commission advances several recommendations to remedy such a national crisis, like adding five new basics to the curriculum of America’s schools; increasing the amount of time students spend engaged in learning; and establishing higher and measurable academic-performance standards. In dealing with the “Excellence in Education” issues, the commission members asserted the following:

Our goal must be to develop the talents of all to their fullest. Attaining that goal requires that we expect and assist all students to work to the limits of their capabilities. We should expect schools to have genuinely high standards rather than minimum ones, and parents support and encourage their children to make the most of their talents and abilities. (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983, risk.html)

Twelve million copies of the report have blanketed the country and captured the American people’s attention regarding education. This document is often cited as the origin of current reform efforts—the excellence movement (Furst 1995, 83).

Allan Bloom published his best-selling book *The Closing of the American Mind* in 1987. It stimulated the debate pertaining to the educational crisis more than ever. He contends, “The crisis of liberal education is a reflection of a crisis at the peaks of learning, an incoherence and incompatibility among the first principles with which we interpret the world, an intellectual crisis of the greatest magnitude, which constitutes the

crisis of our civilization” (Bloom 1987, 346). In diagnosing the educational problem, Bloom explains that—for more than fifty years—all education has dedicated itself to inculcating the only virtue, relativism, and students today believe that this kind of relativism is linked to tolerance and an open mind. He argues that such alleged openness actually closes the American mind—instead of opening it—because it makes students believe that “out there in the rest of the world is a drab diversity that teaches only that values are relative, whereas here we can create all the life-styles we want. Our openness means we do not need others” (Bloom 1987, 34). Bloom proceeds to write, “Thus what is advertised as a great opening is a great closing. No longer is there a hope that there are great wise men in other places and times who can reveal the truth about life” (Bloom 1987, 34).

Although his book alarmed the people who controlled education at that time and received more attention than ever by developing the argument about the problem of modern education, which has caused the closing of the American mind, many of Bloom’s critics identify its inadequacies, too. John Robbins compares Bloom to a doctor who “diagnoses the disease but never prescribes a cure,” and who “prescribes a treatment that will exacerbate, not meliorate, the disease” (Clark 1988, x). Ronald Nash makes the same point: “People concerned about the serious decline in American education at every level can thank Bloom and his book for helping to raise the level of consciousness, to some degree at least. But it does appear that those interested in solutions for that problem will have to look elsewhere” (Nash 1990, 28).

According to Nash’s book, *The Closing of the American Heart*, the educational dilemma represents not only a closing of the American mind, but a closing of the

American heart—which he defines as “the center of a person’s being,” and “the religious and moral center of our being that plays a role in determining our ultimate commitments”(Nash 1990, 14). The author goes on to note,

Like Allan Bloom, I want my readers to understand that there has been a closing of the American mind; I also want them to understand why. But it is important to go beyond what Bloom and others have said and realize that something else, something equally fundamental, has also occurred, namely, a closing of the American heart. No real progress toward improving American education can occur until all concerned realize that an education that ignores moral and religious values cannot qualify as a quality education. (Nash 1990, 30)

Integration of Faith and Learning

The integration of faith and learning is an issue that most Christian educators focus on when they discuss Christian education. William Ringenberg claims that “few themes have received greater emphasis in Christian colleges [that are making an] overt effort . . . to stimulate their faculty members better to achieve it” (Ringenberg 1984, 16). Although he concentrates on higher education, it is also true for every level of Christian education that the integration of faith and learning is a favorable topic.

Mark Eckel contends that Christian schools have hope when they integrate God’s Word with all disciplines. He explains, “Academies that exist for the right reasons will not simply baptize pagan beliefs with a Bible verse and then teach like everyone else. Christian schools will wed heavenly authority with earthly operation to properly explain reality. Biblical principles should permeate everything because everything is based on biblical principles” (Eckel 2003, 4-5). He continues, “Biblical principles unify all truth because all truth is biblical” (Eckel 2003, 34). Arthur Holmes observes that a Christian college should distinctively provide an education that “cultivates the creative and active integration of faith and learning, of faith and culture” (Holmes 1987, 6). Charles Colson

and Nancy Pearcey assert that beyond devotionals coupled with instruction out of secular textbooks, Christian education should consist “of teaching everything, from science and mathematics to literature and the arts, within the framework of an integrated biblical worldview” (Colson and Pearcey 1999, 338). They continue, “It means teaching students to relate every academic discipline to God’s truth and his self revelation in Scripture, while detecting and critiquing nonbiblical worldview assumptions” (Colson and Pearcey 1999, 338). George Knight makes the same point by borrowing a famous phrase, “All truth is God’s truth,” which is the title of Arthur Holmes’ book published in 1977 (Knight 1998, 171). Knight remarks, “As such, the distinction between secular and sacred truth is a false dichotomy” (Knight 1998, 171). Frank Gaebelien develops the connections between this concept and Christian education, and says,

Now Christian education, if it is faithful to its deepest commitment, must renounce once and for all the false separation between secular and sacred truth. It must see that truth in science and history, in mathematics, art, literature, and music belongs just as much to God as truth in religion. While it recognizes the primacy of the spiritual truth revealed in the Bible and incarnate in Christ, it acknowledges that all truth, wherever it is found, is of God. For Christian education there can be no discontinuity in truth, but every aspect of truth must find its unity in the God of all truth. (Gaebelien 1962, 13)

George Akers also agrees with the concept, “All truth is God’s truth,” and says, “God’s truth is *one*—harmonized, unified, coherent within itself, it overarches all of life, embracing all that man has known or can ever know” (Akers 1977, 8). Akers asserts that a person can get any truth of knowledge only in God, “who is the Author and Sustainer of all things and the active Redeemer of the world, of man and of his disordered society,” and defines Christian education as “the process of discovering God in every phase of study. Every subject is considered a disclosure of Him in some manner, with the teachers and students being partners in this common search” (Akers 1977, 8). Pazmiño

participates in this popular issue as well and contends, “God imparts wisdom and people are dependent upon this grace for any claim to wisdom. Therefore, wisdom that is apart from or inconsistent with the truths of God’s revelation must be suspect and questioned. Education at its best must be God-centered, seeing God as the source. Educators are called to integrate all areas of knowledge with God’s revelation” (Pazmiño 1997, 37).

With the same understanding, Pauline Johnson puts it this way:

Rene Dubos, bacteriologist, claims that “despite the immense diversity of creation, we all accept that there exists in nature a profound underlying unity.” The unity of which the scientist is aware is also known to the artist who seeks the principles upon which relationships are established. This unity underlies the whole and is the framework for musical harmony, architecture, and all the other arts. It results from an orderly cosmos whose origin goes back to the God whose divine intelligence and creativity are manifested throughout the universe and through the creativity of man. (Johnson 1972, 72)

The secular and sacred split, however, is pervasive in current society. Even Christian educators and pastors themselves often do not recognize the way they have absorbed it. Nancy Pearcey delivers an example and says,

A school superintendent once told me that most educators define ‘a Christian teacher’ strictly in terms of personal behavior: thinking like setting a good example and showing concern for students. Almost none define it in terms of conveying a biblical worldview on the subjects they teach, whether literature, science, social studies, or the arts. In other words, they are concerned about being a Christian *in* their work, but they don’t think in terms of having a biblical framework *on* the work itself. (Pearcey 2004, 37)

Gordon Spykman addresses the difficulty of the dichotomy between the secular and sacred in another way. “If we depend on chapel and daily devotionals to integrate faith and the teaching-learning process, we will be guilty of contributing to the secularization of the classroom” (Spykman 1977, 2). Frank Spina recognizes the same problem: “A Christian school is Christian if, and only if, Christian content is central to the whole undertaking. Every subject of study is to be seen from the perspective of Christianity”

(Spina 1993, 43). Christian Overman and Don Johnson, starting their revolutionary work related to the biblical-worldview integration of Christian schoolteachers – *Making the Connections* – express the problem in this manner: “If Christian young people go through twelve years of elementary and secondary school failing to see the connections between biblical truth and math, science, history or literature, they will certainly have difficulty seeing how God’s word relates to business, law, government, and pop culture” (Overman and Johnson 2003, 3).

The Bible in Christian Schools

Based on scriptural passages, such as “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom (Job 28:28), Christians mostly will agree that wisdom and knowledge are from God, but they might claim that they “will not find wisdom in the Bible for the study of athletics, reading, home economics, or the computer, for example” (Edlin 1999, 33). The story of Daniel and his friends, however, clearly says, “God gave them the knowledge and skill in all learning” (Dan 1:17). Edlin—keeping this in mind—delineates that although the Bible is not primarily an educational textbook,

The light of the Bible . . . will still point to a proper understanding of a child, recreation and work, evil, the imagination, curriculum design and content, and discipline so as to enable even matters like these to be addressed in a God-honoring way. The proper way to consider these—and all issues—is to weigh them up under the scrutinizing light of Scripture and a Christian world view that is firmly built upon a solid foundation of Biblical presuppositions. (Edlin 1999, 58)

Stuart Fowler demonstrates the same understanding of the Scripture, which “leads our whole life in every area and every dimension” (Fowler 1980, 133). He declares that “educational directions in the Christian school are not chosen on the basis of faith in reason, or in practical experience, or in human personality but by the leading of the faith

that is directed by the saving Word of God given in the Scripture” (Fowler 1980, 135).

Ronald Chadwick defines the Bible’s place in Christian schools: “God, as He has shown Himself to us in His divine revelation, the Bible, must be at the very center or core of our curriculum. Everything that is taught or done must be brought into rightful and meaningful relationship with God and His Word” (Chadwick 1990, 179).

The Use of the Bible in Christian Schools

Donovan Graham introduces two inadequate uses of the Bible dealing with the issue of the function of the Bible in Christian school classrooms. Some Christians select certain biblical texts and passages to teach particular ideas. For example, Don Howard tries to explain why the political right is good and the left is evil by referring the passages of the “right” hand of God and the “left-handed” judge Ehud, whom Howard considers evil (Judg 3:15) (Graham 2003, 14). Graham also objects to teachers who believe that the Bible addresses only spiritual issues, so it is irrelevant to use the Bible for the academic inquiry. Against this inadequate approach of the use of the Bible in Christian schools, Graham asserts that “the Bible should be used to build a *framework* for informing and directing our inquiries into any subject” (Graham 2003, 14). Graham, then, supports his arguments by adopting Sidney Greidanus’ ideas from the article, “The Use of the Bible in Christian Scholarship.” Greidanus insists that since God reveals Himself in the Word as well as in His creation, there is no conflict in truth that is revealed from the Bible and from the academic study. He also asserts that like the Psalmist confesses that God’s Word is a lamp to his feet (Ps 119:105), “the Bible must serve as light for any particular academic discipline or field of inquiry” (Greidanus 1982, 139). Against the use of the Bible by selecting certain passages for specific situations, Greidanus suggests

that “to move beyond specific situations and examples to transcendent principles, one must interpret each text in the context of the entire Bible” (Greidanus 1982, 141). Lastly, Greidanus addresses that when interpreting poetic and metaphorical expressions of the Bible, it is important to search for the intention of the author to gain principles rather than simply specific literal examples. He says, “Identifying the purpose of the author, in the context of the purpose of the Bible, is essential if we are to extract principles that we can use in academic inquiry” (Greidanus 1982, 143).

Richard Edlin, who refuses child-centered or content-centered perspectives in Christian education, argues that “the Scriptures alone are properly championed as the source of truth and as the measuring standard for policy and curriculum” (Edlin 1999, 55). He presents three Bible functions for Christian schools in an affirmative way. According to him, first is the *devotional* function. School-board meetings and every educational endeavor of the teachers must commence with prayers recognizing Christ’s the lordship and seeking His wisdom and guidance. As Jesus taught his apostles, “Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness” (Matt 6:33). If all the teachers and administrators initially seek God’s kingdom, He will provide them with wisdom in dealing with everyday matters. Edlin recommends as well that, in Christian schools, “time should be set aside at a formal assembly or in the classroom at the beginning of the teaching day to consider and to worship the God whose creation the school’s activities seek to carry out and to commit all of the learning activities to Him” (Edlin 1999, 60).

Edlin contends that the Scriptures have a *foundational* function, too. Every guiding principle for school policy on any matter—such as school curriculum, assessment, or discipline—should be found in God’s Word, so that Christian school students

recognize that “the Bible is the foundation which provides the key to proper learning in every subject in the curriculum and in every area of school administration” (Edlin 1999, 62). Moreover, Edlin expresses his belief in the necessity for specific Bible study in this regard. He maintains that “it [the Bible class] should not be seen as an ‘easy’ option but as a vital graduation requirement” (Edlin 1999, 64).

Lastly, Edlin proclaims that Scriptures should have a *permeative* function in Christian schools. The fundamental principles that have been examined as part of the foundational function of the Bible in the Christian school now should “flow over into all other aspects of the curriculum in a *permeative* manner” (Edlin 1999, 64). Edlin asserts that “the permeative function of the Bible is inescapable as its principles are presented to the student to guide her in her studies” (Edlin 1999, 65). Like the psalmist confesses that God’s Word “is a lamp to [his] feet and a light for [his] path” (Ps 119:105), the Bible should be the light and lamp through which the various subjects are interpreted. Scriptures’ permeative function should not be understood as utilizing the Bible for each subject’s text or as finding every Scripture verse to be related to the day-to-day teaching lesson. “The Bible is not frosting on an otherwise unaltered humanist cake. It needs to be the leaven in the educational loaf, shaping the entire curriculum from its base up as it permeates through the whole school program” (Edlin 1999, 66).

Definition of the Integration of Faith and Learning

After World War II, Protestant fundamentalism gave birth to evangelicalism, and – since about 1950—seminaries and evangelical liberal arts colleges have begun to grow (Badley 1994, 16). Both kinds of institutions have worked carefully to seek a dual desire, “to embrace their conservative theological convictions while fostering a

relationship with academia, to view all the fields of knowledge as proper for study” (Badley 1994, 16). This desire has been verbalized as the “integration of faith and learning,” and the phrase largely appears in the broader literature on Christian education. Today, Christian educators, who work not only for higher education but also for every level of education, mostly agree that it is the integration of faith and learning that distinguishes the Christian school from other educational institutions. “Integration of faith and learning” has been used as a slogan that many Christian schools seek to accomplish. According to Ken Badley, the problem is that the majority of Christian educators and writers who use this term do not specify or restrict what they mean when they borrow it (Badley 1994, 16).

Integration, Faith, and Learning

Badley indicates that there is a widespread lack of clarification and clarity of the “integration of faith and learning” phrase in literature on Christian education and educational integration. Badley explains its ambiguity with the diverse implications and meanings of the term “integration,” and he identifies “five main paradigms, or logical models, of integration in the literature” (Badley 1994, 24). His five paradigms are “*fusion integration, incorporation integration, correlation integration, dialogical integration, and perspectival integration*” (Badley 1994, 24). Badley describes fusion as occurring when “two (or more) elements flow together, or mesh, becoming one new entity” (Badley 1994, 24). In this case, the original elements may – or may not – lose their identity. Incorporation integration, which can be considered as a subset of fusion, “seems to imply that one element disappears into, dissolves in, or infiltrates the other” (Badley 1994, 24). Badley understands correlation integration as “a pedagogical or

strategic activity” – rather than as “structural/formal relationships” – because “in correlation integration, someone, usually a teacher, shows the relationships between two subjects by noting points of intersection or common interest,” instead of blending or combining elements (Badley 1994, 24-25). Dialogical integration, according to Badley, is “a sufficiently high and continuous degree of correlation that we can properly claim a conversation had begun between two areas” (Badley 1994, 25). Lastly, in perspectival integration, “the entire educational enterprise is viewed from a specific perspective” (Badley 1994, 25). In other words, in this last integration, a worldview provides an educational coherence “in the sense that disparate and even conflicting elements cohere as they fit into a larger framework of thought and practice” (Badley 1994, 25).

Badley advocates the last meaning of integration, perspectival integration. He believes that “the Christian worldview makes a special contribution of faith and learning because it contributes the overall framework, or perspective, in which learning takes place” (Badley 1994, 28). For this integration, Badley holds that the role of Christian schools – colleges for him – is encouraging students to develop and articulate their Christian perspective and to relate the perspective to all the academic disciplines.

Kenneth Gangel defines the term “integration” as “the forming or blending into a whole of everything that is part of a Christian student’s life and learning” (Gangel 1983, viii), but he hesitates to use that word while recognizing that it is widely used and not easily avoided. Gangel prefers to utilize the term “harmony,” with the same meaning: “to merge, blend, correlate; to connect, associate, and apply” (Gangel 1983, ix).

The “integration of faith and learning” phrase can be comprehended differently not only because of the term “integration,” but due to the words “faith” and “learning,”

too. Realizing this, Badley mentions, “One can immediately see at least four possible combinations” because faith can mean “life of faith” or “body of doctrine,” and learning can mean “process of learning” or “body of knowledge” (Badley 1994, 28).

Mel Wilhoit examines the terms “faith” and “learning” and delivers their definitions as well. “Faith is the area of personal communion with God – it values traits such as trust and love rather than precision of thought or emotional detachment,” and “learning is represented by cautious generalizations of philosophy or the carefully controlled inductive truths of empirical science” (Wilhoit 1987, 78). He adds,

Put in another way, learning represents those things we can verify by the scientific method (such as water being made of two parts hydrogen and one part oxygen), while faith relates to those things we cannot test or rationalize (such as the concept that God is all powerful). Ultimately then, the difference between faith and learning is a question of *origins* – with faith representing the sphere of understanding as revealed by God in His Word, and learning representing the sphere of understanding as discovered and recorded by man. (Wilhoit 1987, 78)

With such “qualitatively different spheres of comprehension,” Wilhoit contends, teachers or educators in Christian schools “are to prepare as a single satisfying concoction and to serve to [their] hungry students” (Wilhoit 1987, 78).

What Biblical Integration Is Not

Some Christian writers define the “integration of faith and learning” phrase by establishing a contrast: what it is, and what it is not. Harold Heie and David Wolfe distinguish integration from pseudointegration—apparent integration. According to them, the line of demarcation between genuine integration and nonintegration is “integral sharing” or “integral commonality” (Heie and Wolfe 1987, 5). They believe that “all integration is based on the notion of integral commonality, or the sharing of concepts and concerns by the areas to be placed within a single vision. To speak of the integration of

faith and learning, of religion and science, of Christianity and the arts, of revelation and philosophy, is to postulate some common ground between the members of the pairs mentioned” (Heie and Wolfe 1987, 11). They define genuine integration and pseudointegration with the demarcation. “Genuine integration occurs when an assumption or concern can be shown to be internally shared by (integral to) both the Judaeo-Christian vision and an academic discipline” (Heie and Wolfe 1987, 5). Pseudointegration lacks an integral relation to the disciplines.

Mark Eckel, in his book *The Whole Truth* also describes what biblical integration is by articulating what biblical integration is not. First, he argues that biblical integration is not illustration. Eckel states, “Simply finding similar word connections [should not be] considered to be biblical integration” (Eckel 2003, 67). In addition, he claims that biblical integration is not only teaching or instructing in good character because “the Christian school cannot be distinctive in its instruction of all subjects if what is meant by biblical integration is only character quality precepts” (Eckel 2003, 68). Integration of faith and learning should not be understood just as spiritualization, either. Eckel specifies the problem of many Christian schools or instructors who teach Bible verses or stories separated from academic subjects. Although they teach the Bible and emphasize its lessons, “they are merely segments of Christian truth dropped in and around curricula” (Eckel 2003, 69). Furthermore, he asserts that integration of faith and learning is not transmission. At this point, Eckel warns Christian schools: “There is nothing wrong with a desire for a high level of competency, rigor, and discipline in studies. But if Christian academies are only interested in beating other schools at their own game, then the battle has already been lost” (Eckel 2003, 69). According to him,

finding correlating elements, such as scriptural citations about numbers for teaching math, should not be understood as integration of faith and learning because “correlation runs into problems because connections to a concept cannot explain the essence, role, or operation of a person, place, or thing” (Eckel 2003, 70). Eckel indicates the importance of application, but he notes that biblical integration is not application because “obviously the problem remains one of detachment if biblical truth applies to life only in certain circumstances, at certain points in the school calendar” (Eckel 2003, 70). Finally, Eckel observes that sharing the personal testimony of Jesus or modeling the Christian life is not enough to tell that it is biblical integration. He points out that “the life-changing message of Jesus’ death, burial, and resurrection must saturate every corner of a person, transforming the mind, engaging God’s world, and bringing every thought captive to Christ” (Eckel 2003, 71).

William Hasker argues that a recognition of what the integration of faith and learning is not may help one to understanding of what it is. First, Hasker asserts that the biblical integration is not “the cultivation of personal Christian living on the part of the faculty member” (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp). According to him, even though the spiritual influence of the teacher upon students is important, faith-learning integration is a scholarly task and Christian faculty members have a specific responsibility to be engaged in the work of teaching and scholarship. He continues to say, if (as often happens) they fail to perform this task it will not be done at all (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp). Second, Hasker contends that “using academic disciplines as a source of illustrations for spiritual truths” is not the integration of faith and learning (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp). He explains this use by presenting an example: “Two and two is always four, and God is

always the same; you can depend on Him” (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp). Even though it is true what is being said in this example, Hasker clearly says, “this example does not involve an ‘integral relationship’ between the Christian faith and the discipline of mathematics; it is not an example of faith-learning integration” (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp). Third, Hasker addresses, “Faith-learning integration is not a public relations program designed to convince constituents of Christian character of an institution” (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp). Heavy use of the rhetoric of the biblical integration does not guarantee the significant visible achievement because the integration of faith and learning is hard scholarly work, which requires much time and effort. “But if the commitment to faith-learning integration is dominated by the desire to ‘prove something’ about the institution, the effort is likely to be distorted or undermined” (Hasker 2001, rc_detail.asp).

Integration of Faith and Learning

One of the earliest evangelical users of the idea of the integration of faith and learning is Frank Gaebelin. In his book *The Pattern of God’s Truth: Problems of Integration in Christian Education*, he defines biblical integration as “the bringing together of parts into the whole” (Gaebelin 1954, 7). Later in the book, he delivers a more extended definition of the integration of faith and learning. “It is the living union of its subject matter, administration, and even of its personnel, with the eternal and infinite pattern of God’s truth” (Gaebelin 1954, 9).

As another earlier user of integration language and one of the Christian thinkers in liberal arts colleges, Arthur Holmes published effective handbooks on integration, such as *The Idea of a Christian College* and *All Truth Is God’s Truth*.

Concerning Christian higher education, he claims that the Christian college is distinctive by not combining “good education with a protective atmosphere,” but the Christian faith touches “the entire range of life and learning to which a liberal education exposes students” (Holmes 1987, 45). For him, “Christian perspectives are all-redeeming and all-transforming,” and he understands biblical integration as “the positive contribution of the Christian faith to all the arts and sciences” (Holmes 1987, 45-46).

Kenneth Gangel delivers his understanding in his article, “Integrating Faith and Learning.” According to him, the integration of faith and learning refers to “the teaching of all subjects as a part of the total truth of God, thereby enabling the student to see the unity of natural and special revelation” (Gangel 1994, 396). Gangel, more practically, suggests six principles for achieving integration of faith and learning in a Christian classroom.

1. The essential principle is a commitment to the authority of the Bible. In order to accept the inerrant authority of the Bible at the center of contemporary education, the integration demands a recognition of the contemporaneity of the Bible and the Holy Spirit.
2. Christian educators must recognize the authoritative Scripture is related to the student’s life here and now and for this, the role of Holy Spirit, who will guide into all truth, is crucial.
3. The biblical integration is a clear understanding of the nature, source, discovery, and dissemination of truth. All truth is God’s truth and wherever truth is found, if it is genuine truth, it is ultimately traceable back to the God of the Bible.
4. The integration has to do with designing a curriculum which is totally constructed on the centrality of special revelation. Such curriculum produces a student who is able, at the end of his educational pattern, to demonstrate commensurate levels of wisdom, witness, holiness, and churchmanship as representative ideals.
5. The fifth principle for the integration of faith and learning demands the development of Christian world and life view. Christian teachers are demanded to internalize God’s truth into students, not just to develop cognitive knowledge.
6. Bibliocentric education should extend to all areas of student life. The Christian school which strives to achieve the integration of faith and learning should demonstrate how that philosophical posture is implemented in the lives of students at all times and in all places. (Gangel 1994, 397-99)

Mark Eckel's understanding of biblical integration is not very different from these earlier Christian thinkers' definition of the topic. His main concern in comprehending scriptural integration is the permeation of biblical principles in everything: all subjects, discussions, books, or ideas. He claims that "biblical integration brings to light the truth (or error) of any subject by interpreting it through Scripture" (Eckel 2003, 64). Eckel considers biblical integration to be the synonym for "*Wholeness, Synthesis, Completion*" (Eckel 2003, 73). He understands the integration term, as "bringing everything together as one" (Eckel 2003, 194). In this regard, Eckel prefers "synthesis" because it is "the best English word to communicate the concept," but – to avoid any confusion – he uses the widespread biblical integration or faith and learning phrase (Eckel 2003, 194). At the end of the nineteenth century, James Orr addressed a similar idea:

No duty is more imperative on the Christian teacher than that of showing that instead of Christianity being simply one theory among the rest, it is really the higher truth which is the synthesis and completion of all the others; that view which, rejecting the error, takes up the vitalizing [*sic*] elements in all other systems and religions, and unites them into a living organism, with Christ as head. (Orr 1897, 10-11)

James Cunningham and Anthony Fortosis define the integration of faith and learning by supplying the original meaning of the integration term. It is derived from the Latin *integraie*, which means "to make whole" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 79). They recommend that it should be defined "as purity and honesty united with values that support belief and actions consistent with God's absolute standards" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 79). Moreover, they also deliver five principles of integration: (1) Integration brings the parts together to form a whole unit. (2) Integration is incarnational.

(3) Integration is positive and contemporary. (4) Integration is a witness against negative actions, words and attitudes. (5) Integration must not be exhaustive to be effective (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 79-85).

Even though he does not mention integration of faith and learning terminology, George Knight shares the same idea with other Christian writers who use the phrase. While pointing out postmodern society's problem that "subject-area scholars have lost the ability to communicate with each other because they have lost the significance of their subject matter in relation to the whole of the truth" (Knight 1998, 211), he contends that Christian educators should not ignore the fact that Christianity is the unifying force, and they need to apply what they know. Knight expresses his understanding about the importance of biblical integration by observing, "All truth in the Christian curriculum, whether it deals with nature, humanity, society, or the arts, must be seen in proper relationship to Jesus Christ as Creator and Redeemer" because "all truth is God's truth" (Knight 1998, 212).

Albert Greene, Jr., in the introduction of the book, *The Cause of Christian Education* by Richard Edlin, shares a very similar idea with Knight when he criticizes the secular school, which "can teach facts, but not values," so it "lost its foundation" (Edlin 1999, 12). Greene believes that here is the most important contribution of the Christian schools and says,

The Christian school can restore meaning or value to the school subjects and so inculcate in its students a love for God and neighbor. The reality is that all facts, being created by the living God, are laden with meaning. They bear witness to their Creator (Romans 1:20, Psalm 19, Job 42:5-6, etc). The school subjects, thus, are revelatory of God and a channel for our communion with and service to God. (Edlin 1999, 12)

In 2002, David Dockery published a book titled *Shaping a Christian Worldview* to “articulate a Christian worldview for the twenty-first century, with all of its accompanying challenges and changes, and to show how such Christian thinking is applicable across the educational curriculum” (Dockery and Thornbury 2002, 3). In the book, he does not literally address the biblical integration or integration of faith and learning phrase, but implies the same idea while emphasizing that the Christian worldview should be the framework for intellectual wrestling with every academic discipline. According to Dockery,

Christian worldview provides the framework for Christian scholarship in any and every field. This worldview, which grows out of the exhortation to take every thought captive to Christ, begins with the affirmation of God as Creator and Redeemer, for the dominating principle of Christian scholarship is not merely soteriological but cosmological as well. We thus recognize the sovereignty of the triune God over the whole cosmos, in all spheres and kingdoms, visible and invisible. (Dockery and Thornbury 2002, 12)

Creation, Fall, and Redemption

Mark Eckels summarizes his understanding of biblical integration in three words – creation, fall, and redemption. “Creation had intentional ideals set within itself by God (Prov 8:12-36). Sin fragmented human thought, life, universal connections, and the lot. The Christian’s duty of redemption laid out by Jesus recaptures the fragments of truth, excises the error, synthesizing, and recreating God’s unique objective for His word” (Eckel 2003, 64). Arthur Holmes articulated this approach before Eckel by using the term “reintegration,” instead of the integration of faith and learning. He prefers reintegration “because the problem is not that we deal with two unrelated things and somehow or other have to force a shotgun wedding. Rather, we need to reintegrate a union that was broken apart in the course of history” (Holmes 1999, 161).

Heeding Paul's warning in Colossians, Holmes clarifies his idea of reintegration of faith and learning. The apostle states, "In [Christ] are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col 2:3), and then goes on to say, "See to it that no one takes you captive through hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ" (Col 2:8). Holmes explains that, in these passages, Paul contrasts two worldviews—one from the human tradition and the other from Jesus' wisdom and knowledge: "Paul is after a reintegration of faith and learning that will restore to the Creator that which is rightfully his, redeemed thinking that properly honors Jesus Christ" (Holmes 1999, 167).

Practical Problem Concerning the Integration of Faith and Learning

Most Christian educators today are aware of the integration of faith and learning. It is a favorite topic during discussions of the Christian school's distinctiveness. Eckel spells it out: "Biblical integration is the bedrock upon which the distinction between Christian and non-Christian schools must be built" (Eckel 2003, vii). The problem is that in spite of the abundant literature that addresses the issue of integrating faith and learning, it usually only mentions philosophical viewpoints. Accordingly, a number of Christian writers on biblical integration contend, "The integration of faith and learning is an unknown quantity to many Christian teachers" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 80); or, numerous Christian teachers do not know the way to implement it. Knight articulates the difficulty this way—"The problem for Christian educators has not been to find the pattern of knowledge in relation to its center; their problem has been to apply what they know" (Knight 1998, 211).

Over four decades ago, Frank Gaebelein presented a significant reason for this recognized problem—the “secular, naturalistic, man-centered, not God-centered” climate in American education—and it still seems to be applied to today’s Christian school education (Gaebelein 1954, 39). According to him, a fair percentage of the faculties in Christian school systems “have had their higher education in the teachers’ colleges or secular liberal arts colleges or universities” (Gaebelein 1954, 39). The educational philosophy of such educational institutions is of the earth and “all too few Christian students in secular colleges . . . escape heavy inroads of secularism in their thinking” (Gaebelein 1954, 39). He also asserts that the teachers from Christian institutions are not very different from those who are from secular school systems in this regard because even in Christian colleges, “there has been all too little correlation between Christianity and so-called secular subjects” (Gaebelein 1954, 39). Gaebelein also asserts that the textbooks from a secular view point keep Christian teachers free from the secularism. He says, “The vast majority of textbooks are written from a point of view that fails to relate all truth to God, and we can see that to some degree even our Christian teachers reflect the secularism of our age” (Gaebelein 1954, 40). Cunningham and Fortosis deliver the similar reasons why teachers in Christian school systems have a hard time integrating their faith into students’ every level of learning experience. They list three reasons:

1. Many teachers and administrators, even in Christian schools, are the products of secular influences, through public schools, secular colleges, and the media. We tend to teach the way we were taught.
2. Many Christian parents and church workers are not able, or do not know how, to integrate the Bible and General Revelation.
3. Many textbooks are secular in philosophy, and many Christian textbooks tend to correlate biblical truth with secular knowledge rather than integrate. Teachers and students often accept textbook data as “truth” in its entirety. (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 80)

Ruth Haycock agrees with Cunningham and Fortosis when she contends that teachers in Christian schools often bring secular perspectives on their subjects, which “is, in many cases, the only thing they know” (Haycock 1993, iv). She continues to argue that those teachers have often had all their training either in secular institutions or in Christian colleges where their professors were the products of humanistic educational institutions. The teachers, accordingly, easily think, “After all, social studies is social studies, isn’t it, regardless of where you teach it, so why expect a different social studies in a Christian school?” (Haycock 1993, iv). Haycock points out that the teachers of nearly every other curricular area also have the same attitude.

Summary and Proposed Study

This chapter presents a brief review of literature that is related to the subject of the integration of faith and learning in Christian schools. It covers the analysis of the relevant history of Christian schools in the United States to understand their nature of in America, and the analysis of the literature concerning Christian-educational philosophy and about the matter of its integration with academic subjects in Christian schools.

The literature examined illustrates that current Christian educators and Christian thinkers have tried to develop authentic Christian-educational institutions based on the scriptural philosophy of education throughout United States history. It suggests that biblical educational philosophy should be integrated into every academic subject that instructors teach in Christian-school systems. The abundant literature that addresses the issue of integrating faith and learning usually mentions philosophical perspectives on this matter and its importance. At this point, it is necessary to heed Korniejczuk’s argument: “Describing the integration of faith and learning in terms of lofty platitudes offers little

help with the task of implementation. In clear and operational terms, what does integration of faith and learning look like in the classroom and school? How is it done?” (Korniejczuk 1994, 4). One of the best ways to answer these questions is examining Christian schoolteachers’ attitudes pertaining to the integration of faith and learning within their daily routines of teaching academic disciplines and communicating with students.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

It has been said that Christian schools are unique because they integrate faith and learning. Biblical integration is espoused as the hallmark quality of Christian education. Christian educators have published books for several decades with the goal of developing a distinctive Christian educational philosophy. The authors searched for ways to integrate this Christian educational philosophy into academic subjects. Moreover, a Christian school's mission statement usually includes a statement regarding the integration of biblical philosophy and educational principles into every level of students' learning experience. Recently, there have been increasing concerns on the way that biblical philosophy can be integrated into practical, everyday, classroom teaching to make Christian schools separate from public and other private schools. A review of the precedent literature in these fields of study reveals that many Christian educators – especially those working with Christian schools – have focused on this issue and many research projects have been conducted related to this topic.

This study was developed to focus on the same concerns and was designed to examine ACSI elementary school teachers' integration of faith and learning in their daily classroom teaching. Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk's model of implementation of the integration of faith and learning and her survey questionnaire were employed to measure the degree of Christian school teachers' implementation of the integration. The study

also depicted the factors, which influence teachers' integration. This chapter outlines the research design and its process.

Research Question Synopsis

The purpose of the study was to examine the self reported proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in accomplishing the task of integrating faith and learning across the academic curriculum, and to analyze the factors which influence teachers when they implement the integration of faith and learning.

Five research questions were investigated to fulfill this study's purpose.

1. How proficient are elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in integrating faith and learning?
2. Which academic subject do elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools feel is the most difficult to integrate faith and learning?
3. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning between elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools who attended Christian schools and those who did not?
4. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning between elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools who attended seminars or training events on the implementation of faith and learning and those who did not?
5. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning by elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools according to demographic factors?

Design Overview

Although the phrase "integration of faith and learning" has frequently occurred in Christian education literature for at least three decades, precedent literature indicates its widespread lack of clarity. Some teachers may not understand how to perform biblical integration while others may wonder how well they are doing with integration. Keeping

this in mind, this study was designed to examine selected teachers' degree of proficiency in implementing the integration of faith and learning; to evaluate the teacher's education and school-provided teacher training for this issue and to examine if there is any difference in their implementation of the integration of faith and learning according to the teachers' educational experience of attending Christian schools; and to analyze other factors that influence teachers when they implement integration of faith and learning. Christian elementary school teachers' proficiency level of implementation was identified based upon the model of teacher implementation developed by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk. The difference in the implementation of integration of faith and learning by elementary school teachers was examined along with teachers' educational background of attending Christian schools, teachers' experience of participating in seminars or training for biblical integration, and other demographic factors. This research also assessed which academic subject the school teachers felt was the most difficult to implement biblical integration. Data analyses were conducted using a *t*-test to determine whether the difference was statistically significant or not.

Descriptive Quantitative Research

This research concerning the integration of faith and learning implemented by Christian elementary school teachers is descriptive in its genre because it was designed to examine “a situation *as it is* [and it] does not involve changing or modifying the situation under investigation, nor is it intended to determine cause-and-effect relationships” (Leedy and Ormrod 2005, 179). According to Daniel Hittlemand and Alan Simon, the descriptive research can use quantitative or qualitative methods to answer the question, “What exists?” (Hittleman and Simon 1992, 105). This study is more quantitative

because this research mainly utilized the questionnaire developed by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk.

As a result, this study can be categorized as descriptive quantitative research. Leedy and Ormrod explain that “this type of research involves either identifying the characteristics of an observed phenomenon or exploring possible correlations among two or more phenomena” (Leedy and Ormrod 2005, 179). This study identified characteristics related to teachers’ implementation of biblical integration in Christian elementary schools. It also explored the difference in the implementation of integration of faith and learning according to demographic attributes, such as teachers’ gender, age, religion and teaching experience as well as their educational background of attending Christian schools and their experience of participating in biblical integration seminars.

Population

The research population of this study consisted of teachers in the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI)-affiliated elementary schools, with first through fifth or sixth grades, which belong to the Southeast and Mid-America regional offices of ACSI—schools in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The directory of member schools of the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI), which is available on the ACSI website, www.acsi.org, provides the list of the information of member schools. According to the directory, there were 359 elementary schools in the Southeast region and 290 schools in the Mid-America region in 2011. All the teachers in these 649 schools were considered as the research population of this study.

The population of this study included only classroom teachers who teach core curriculum for the elementary schools. Elementary school teachers were selected because they teach all the core curriculum classes. The teacher reported the degree of proficiency for implementing biblical integration depending on academic subjects, such as language, mathematics, social studies, and science. ACSI schools were selected because of their concentration on a thoroughly scriptural philosophy of Christian-school education, and due to their goal of implementing the philosophy into every academic subject.

Sample

There are 6,164 ACSI accredited schools in approximately 106 countries and 3,705 schools in the United States according to the ACSI directory of school membership. ACSI-affiliated elementary schools located in the Southeast and Mid-America regions were chosen for this study. According to the ACSI directory of member schools, which is available on the ACSI website, www.acsi.org, there are 649 schools in the United States matching the criteria. The exact number of classroom teachers in these 649 schools was difficult to measure with precision because most schools did not want to offer teachers' information nor let the researcher contact teachers directly. Instead, their administrators became mediators between the researcher and teachers. It was assumed that each school has at least 3 or 4 classroom teachers and the possible number of teachers was approximately 2,000 in the Southeast and Mid-America ACSI regions.

In order to increase the number of respondents, all the administrators of the 649 schools were contacted and they, then, asked their teachers to participate in my study. 220 teachers filled out the survey completely and they were included as the final sample

of this study. A 95% confidence level, a sample of 220 out of 2,000 yielded a confidence interval of ± 6.23 , which was deemed an acceptable level.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to elementary schoolteachers instead of including teachers in Christian elementary to secondary schools to help with data collection and analysis. It also was delimited to ACSI-affiliated schools because their educational philosophy is thoroughly biblical, and teachers in the schools are expected to integrate scriptural philosophy into their teaching activities. In addition, this study was delimited to elementary teachers who worked in ACSI-affiliated elementary schools and who belonged to the Southeast and Mid-America regional offices for sampling convenience. The elementary school teachers chosen for this research were those in the schools of the ACSI member school directory from the stated regions, rather than ones in all ACSI schools in the population, due to convenience.

Limitations of Generalization

The results of this research did not necessarily generalize for teachers teaching in Christian higher education—middle and high schools, colleges, and universities and in the home schooling system. The study's research findings did not necessarily generalize for teachers working in non-ACSI Christian schools. This study had a limitation as well when it came to generalizing only to teachers working in ACSI schools of the regional offices in the Southeast and Mid-America regions. The research findings are further limited in the degree of generalization that could be made to others who are not

classroom teachers or those teaching subjects such as music, art and health. The findings did not generalize to administrative-staff members and counselors who did not teach.

The findings of this study did not necessarily generalize to all classroom teachers teaching core academic disciplines in ACSI elementary schools of the Southeast and Mid-America regional offices. Generalization could be limited because teachers who did not return surveys could represent a different viewpoint from teachers who returned the surveys (Leedy and Ormrod 2001, 222).

Instrumentation

Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk's questionnaire on the integration of faith and learning was appropriate for one of the purposes of this study, to assess the proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in achieving the task of integrating faith and learning. Her questionnaire consisted of two parts—part 1 includes questions on the integration of faith and learning and part 2 contains demographic questions. Because the audience and the research questions for this study were different from Korniejczuk's it was necessary to revise the questionnaire. The audience of Korniejczuk's research was high school teachers while this study was to assess elementary school teachers' proficiency level in integrating faith and learning. In this regard, the question number 20 of Korniejczuk's questionnaire was not applied to the audience of this study. It says, "It is very difficult or impossible to integrate my faith with the subject I teach." The elementary school teacher usually teaches all subjects taught in the elementary school. This study, therefore, deleted this question and added one that asked teachers about the most difficult subject to integrate their faith.

The survey instrument of this study included four large sections (Appendix 1). The first part of the instrument asked questions to examine selected teachers' level of implementation of the integration of faith and learning. This section was mostly identical with Korniejczuk's questionnaire with minor revisions, including omitting question number 20. In part 2, elementary school teachers were asked demographic questions such as gender, age, length of time teaching in a Christian school, and personal faith information.

Part 3 was developed to evaluate the teacher's education including school-provided teacher training for biblical integration. It asked questions about teachers' educational background including their experience of training or seminars on the integration of faith and learning. The selected teachers reported their training experience. For instance, they were asked if they had participated in any training for the integration of faith and learning. This section of the instrument asked selected teachers if they took any complementary degree or classes on theology or religion as well.

Part 4 asked teachers which subjects were the most difficult to integrate biblical principles. Elementary school teachers usually teach all core subjects—religion, language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, and so on. In order to find out which academic subject the teachers felt the most difficult to integrate their Christian faith, this research added this part to the survey instrument developed by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk. In this part, the elementary school teachers were asked to evaluate their own proficiency in the integration of their Christian faith into all the subjects they teach. By using a Likert scale, they marked themselves as 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent), which indicated the proficiency level of the integration of their faith into religion, science,

language arts, mathematics, and other subjects. In this section, the teachers were also asked a question on the amount of time spent on the integration of faith and learning when preparing lessons.

Validity of Survey Instrument

In order to increase the content validity of her survey instrument, Korniejczuk submitted the instrument to several authorities on the integration of faith and learning throughout the stages of development. She also used a pilot test and an expert panel to test the questionnaire's internal consistency. After developing the instrument, she validated it by using triangulation of sources and triangulation of methods. As "a procedure for cross-validating information" (Hittleman and Simon 1992, 196), she "looked for complete teacher data from all the sources available: questionnaires, teacher interviews, student interviews, and course plans" (Kornidjczuk 1994, 73). Reliability figures from this procedure created a 0.84 alpha level with $p < 0.0001$, which was deemed a good agreement between questionnaire and the interview/document review in assigning teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning.

Identifying Proficiency Level

The first research question of this study was created to examine the proficiency of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in integrating faith and learning. In order to answer this question, the first part of Korniejczuk's survey instrument was utilized. This part is subdivided into two sections. The first section includes "statements relating to knowledge, interest, management concerns, and difficulty of the subject" (Korniejczuk 1994, 64). The second section contains questionnaire statements to

examine teachers' deliberate implementation of the integration of faith and learning.

Some of the questionnaire statements in the second section describe teachers' changes of techniques for the integration of faith and learning, some reveal teachers' effort to involve students in the integration, and some describe teachers' collegiate collaboration in the integration (Korniejczuk 1994, 64-65). Korniejczuk categorized those questionnaire statements by content to conduct content analysis and Table 4 summarizes the categorization.

Table 4. Categorization of questionnaire statements

General statements				
Perception of knowledge	Interest/ implementing	Management concerns	Preparation to implement	Difficulties/ subject
1	6	2	9	20
3	7	4	4	
13	10	5		
	16	8		
	18	11		
	19	12		
		15		
		17		
General statements				
Change of Techniques	Student Involvement	Collegiate Collaboration		
21	22	23		
24	26	25		
27	28	30		
31	29			

(Korniejczuk 1994, 66)

This study generally used this categorization of questionnaire statements except the category of “Difficulties/subject.” The elementary school teacher, who was the target audience of this study, usually teaches all subjects taught in the elementary school and this study, therefore, deleted this questionnaire statement and added one about the most difficult subject into which teachers integrate their faith.

The questionnaire statements of Korniejczuk’s survey instrument were developed to ask teachers to mark their knowledge, interest, concerns, and deliberate implementation of the integration of faith and learning on a Likert scale of 1, the lowest, to 7, the highest. Teachers can mark N in case the statement does not apply to their current situation (Korniejczuk 1994, 70). Korniejczuk provided criteria for analysis of the questionnaire statements and this study followed her criteria to assess teachers’ implementation level of the integration of faith and learning.

Criteria for Scoring Teacher’s Perceptions by Category of Statements

Korniejczuk determined teachers’ perception regarding different categories through following criteria.

1. A score below an average of 1.5 was determined as No.
2. A score between an average of 1.5 and 3.5 was determined as Low.
3. A score between an average of 3.5 and 5.5 was determined as Medium or Moderate.
4. A score above an average of 5.5 was determined as High. (Korniejczuk 1994, 71)

Criteria for Scoring Level of Implementation

Korniejczuk developed the criteria for assigning teachers’ levels of implementation of the integration of faith and learning based on the respondents’ scores

on questionnaire statements in her dissertation published in 1994. This researcher found that some of the teachers' responses could not be accessed with these criteria and asked her for the revision. Korniejczuk reviewed the teachers' responses, which did not fit into her original criteria, and developed amplified criteria. This study followed these revised criteria and Table 5 presents them.

Procedures

The necessary permissions were procured before starting data collection. Permission to conduct research on human subjects was granted from the ethics committee at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary based upon application submitted with an abstract of the research, a copy of the researcher's vita, a copy of the research instrument, and a risk assessment for human research. The researcher approached and secured permission from the ACSI Southeast and Mid-America regional directors under the condition that the findings of this study would be provided to the regional offices to help their teachers to undertake the integration of faith and learning in better way. They not only gave permission but also wrote endorsement letters, which encouraged school administrators and teachers to participate in this research (Appendix 2). Raquel Bovet de Korniejczuk was also contacted to obtain permission to utilize her survey instrument. She willingly assisted in assigning teachers' implementation levels based on her criteria as well.

Pilot Study

Before the survey was posted online, the survey instrument was administered to a pilot group, which consisted of 18 elementary school teachers in Christian Academy

Table 5. Criteria for assigning implementation levels

Criteria				
Level	Deliberate Implementation	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation
0	Predominance of “no” or “na” answers	Any	Low	Any
	Predominance of “low” answers	Low	Low	Low
1	Predominance of “no” or “na” answers	Low Moderate High Low	Moderate or High Moderate or High Moderate or High Moderate or High	No or Low No or Low Nor or Low Moderate or High
2	Predominance of “no” or “na” answers	Moderate or High	Moderate or High	<u>Moderate</u> or High
3	Predominance of “Low” answers	<u>Low</u> Moderate or High Moderate or High <u>Moderate</u>	<u>Moderate or High</u> <u>Low</u> or Moderate Moderate or High <u>High</u>	<u>Moderate or High</u> Moderate or High Moderate or High <u>Low</u>
	Predominance of “Moderate” answers	<u>Low</u> Moderate Moderate or High <u>High</u>	<u>Moderate</u> <u>Low</u> or Moderate Moderate or High <u>Low</u>	<u>High</u> Moderate or <u>High</u> Low <u>Moderate or High</u>
4	Predominance of “Moderate” answers	High Moderate High	Moderate High High	Moderate or High Moderate or High Moderate or <u>High</u>
	<u>At least High in Change</u>	<u>Moderate or High</u>	<u>Moderate or High</u>	<u>Moderate or High</u>
5	“High” at least in Student involvement and no less than “Moderate” in change	High <u>Moderate</u> or High Moderate	High Moderate High	Moderate or <u>High</u> High High
6	“High” at least in two areas including “Collegial collaboration”	High	<u>Moderate or High</u>	High

(Korniejczuk 2011)

* _____ indicates additions

of Louisville, KY. The teachers were asked to fill out the survey questionnaire and to answer the additional questions concerning the clarity of content, time spent to complete survey, and participants' general comments on the survey. The feedback from the pilot group helped to validate the instrument and to revise the questionnaire statements to make them more clearly understood.

Final Population Assessment

Data gathering commenced when all approvals for research were granted. The ACSI Mid-America regional director was contacted and he provided the most current database of ACSI-affiliated school's administrators' email addresses. For gaining administrators' contact information of the Southeast region, the researcher used ACSI directory of school membership available on the ACSI website. Since most elementary schools were reluctant to offer their teachers' email addresses, the researcher contacted the administrators instead and asked them to encourage their teachers' participation.

Sampling

Prior to data gathering, the researcher checked on the size of the sample again to see if there had been changes to the population. According to the ACSI directory of member schools, there were 649 Christian elementary schools in the Southeast and Mid-America regions. It was estimated that there were approximately 2,000 teachers in the schools of the regional offices and all of these teachers were considered as the sample of this study.

Survey Distribution

The survey was administered through an online delivery system, www.surveymonkey.com. After the list of email addresses of selected administrators in ACSI-affiliated elementary school were obtained, an invitation letter sent via email to ask for their school's participation. The letter included basic information about the researcher, the purpose of the study, and the nature of teacher participation required (Appendix 3). The abstract of the prospectus of this research and the endorsement letter from the regional director were attached. In the email, two options were presented to the selected administrators—they could provide their school teachers' email addresses or they could copy and paste the message this researcher sent and send it to their teachers. Only a couple of schools gave their teachers' email addresses and most of school administrators worked as mediators between this researcher and their teachers for the study.

Survey Follow-up

By mailing the follow-up letter, the percentage of respondents increase and bias in the research due to low response rates is reduced (Leedy and Ormrod 2001, 222). About a week after the invitation letter had been sent, a follow-up letter was delivered via email to the selected Christian elementary school administrators and teachers (Appendix 4). The survey was posted for about 4 months and the administrators and teachers received three reminder letters at regular intervals.

Returns

Originally 262 responses were collected from the survey. By checking whether respondents gave the answers sincerely on the majority of the survey questions or not, 42 surveys were deleted. The number of respondents utilized in this study was, therefore, 220 (N=220).

Encoding Data

After collecting responses was completed, a summary of the results was downloaded from the website that this study utilized for the online survey. The website encoded raw data into spreadsheet tables for statistical analysis and descriptive evaluation. Data from the survey questionnaires was encoded into data tables, but some of the categories remained flexible to account for responses to open questions. Replies to open-ended question concerning teachers' time spent for integration of faith and learning were categorized by the amount of minutes they spend per week. Replies to the question related to the teachers' educational background were categorized based on the existence of their experience of training for integration of faith and learning, or theological education.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Christian schools have striven to find their reason for existence and their identity as Christian schools. Christian educators are concerned that Christian schools have taught a “baptized paganism” rather than a distinctive Christianity like David Claerbaut points out, “In many cases, Christians have trained and disciplined themselves—perhaps out of a desire to communicate with relevance in the larger society—to think secularly about secular (nonspiritual) matters” (Claerbaut 2004, 22). With the intention to make Christian schools as Christian, school leaders and teachers are now focusing on the concept of the integration of faith and learning. A number of books address the importance of the integration of faith and learning in all levels of Christian school education and many Christian educators approach this concept philosophically and theologically. Recently some Christian leaders recognized the lack of a practical approach to biblical integration and they have made an effort to give more practical suggestions to teachers in Christian schools (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987; Knight 1998; Burton and Nwosu, 2002; Wilhoit 1987). Even with this effort Christian school teachers continue to have difficulty in implementing biblical integration in their classrooms.

This study was an attempt to examine a more practical side of the integration of faith and learning in Christian schools. Its purpose was to examine the self reported

proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in achieving the task of integrating faith and learning across the academic curriculum, and to analyze the factors that influence teachers when they implement the integration of faith and learning.

The analysis of findings is presented in three sections. The first section, Compilation Protocol, addresses the data collection procedures and statistical methods utilized in the data analysis. The second section describes the data based on statistical analysis. The demographic characteristics of the research sample are depicted and teachers' implementation levels of the integration of faith and learning are defined. This section also deals with the differences in teachers' implementation level according to various factors and finds the factors which influence the teachers' integration. The section for the evaluation of the research design methods is followed focusing on possibilities for improving the internal consistency of the integration of faith and learning survey instrument and the efficiency of the process of the survey.

Compilation Protocol

The research findings were analyzed in order to define ACSI Christian elementary school teachers' implementation levels of the integration of faith and learning and to discover relationships which may exist between teachers' implementation levels and different factors related to their teaching. This study's survey included a research questionnaire, which consisted of four sections that was posted on a website as an online survey called "Survey Monkey" (www.surveymonkey.com). The selected elementary school teachers were invited to visit the website to complete the survey.

When collected responses were completed, raw data from the surveys were converted into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet tables and were downloaded from the online survey website. The data from the survey instruments which were not fully completed were eliminated from the results. Originally 262 responses were collected from the survey and 42 were deleted. The number of respondents utilized in this study was, therefore, 220 (N=220). In calculating the implementation level of the integration of faith and learning of Christian elementary school teachers, the reverse scored items were marked and the scores were coded reversely. In order to perform statistical analyses of the encoded data from research participants, the computer program SPSS was utilized because of the strength of this statistical package for data analysis and presentation.

The analysis began to calculate teachers' implementation levels of the integration of faith and learning. In order to find out the most difficult academic subject to integrate biblical principles, the responses were summarized by calculating the mean and standard deviation. Running *t*-tests determined whether there were differences in teachers' implementation level according to various factors—educational background, teaching experience, and other demographic factors. Finally, a multiple linear regression was run to assess the influence of the factors on teachers' implementation levels.

Findings and Displays

The research data describes how proficient Christian elementary school teachers were in achieving the task of integrating faith and learning and shows the factors that influence teachers when they implement the task. This section consists of characteristics of the sample, the teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning, and the difference in the teachers' proficiency level of implementation

according to academic subjects, in regard to their educational background and demographic data. The results of a multiple linear regression were followed to deliver the factors that impact on the teachers' implementation level.

Characteristics of the Sample

The population of this study was ACSI affiliated Christian elementary school teachers in the Southeast and Mid-America regions. According to the ACSI directory of member schools, there are 359 elementary schools in the Southeast regions and 290 elementary schools in the Mid-America regions. All the classroom teachers in those 649 schools were selected as part of the research sample and 220 teachers participated in this study (N=220).

Of the sample population, 184 teachers (83.6%) were female and 36 teachers (16.4%) were male. The age of the teachers ranged from 23 to 71 years old with a mean of 47.85. The largest number of respondents was between 40 and 49 years old (29.1%). All responding teachers indicated they were Christians. Table 6 shows the results of gender and age of respondents.

Table 6. Gender and age of teachers

Variables		Frequency	Percentage	
Gender	Male	36	16.4	
	Female	184	83.6	
Age	39 or younger	53	24.1	Mean: 47.85 SD: 11.83 Min: 23 Max: 71
	40-49	64	29.1	
	50-59	59	26.8	
	60 or older	44	20.0	

The span of time teaching in Christian schools varies from 1 to 42 years with a mean of 12.67. Nearly half of the teachers participating in this study reported that they had been teaching in Christian schools for less than 5 years. Experienced teachers who had been teaching for more than 20 years were 23.4%. Results are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Teaching experience in Christian school

Variable		Frequency	Percentage	
Years Taught	Less than 5 years	53	24.3	Mean: 12.67 SD: 10.00 Min: 1 Max: 42
	5-9 years	48	22.0	
	10-14 years	43	19.7	
	15-20 years	23	10.6	
	More than 20 years	51	23.4	

Regarding teachers' religious and educational background, 55.5% had attended Christian schools. The majority of the participants (83.2%) in the study have taken classes in Bible, theology, or religion but only 20% had any complementary degree on theology or religion. A high percentage of the teachers (76.4%) participated in in-service training, seminars or lectures on how to integrate biblical principles into the subjects they teach. See Table 8 for these results.

Table 9 shows that over 35% of the respondents spent 1 to 2 hours per week on the integration of faith and learning when they prepared their lessons. One teacher answered that he prepared for the integration of faith and learning all the time, 168 hours per week. On the contrary, 13 respondents (8.2%) stated 0 hour per week for this

question. Preparation time for the integration of faith and learning, accordingly, ranged from 0 to 168 hours with a median of 1 hour.

Table 8. Educational background of teachers

Variables		Frequency	Percentage
Attending Christian School	Yes	122	55.5
	No	98	44.5
Taking classes in Bible, theology or religion	Yes	183	83.2
	No	37	16.8
Taking complementary degree on theology or religion	Yes	44	20.0
	No	176	80.0
Participating in training	Yes	168	76.4
	No	52	23.6

Table 9. Preparation time for the integration of faith and learning

Variables		Frequency	Percentage	
Preparation Time	Less than 30 minutes.	37	23.4	Mean: 2.68hr. Median: 1hr. SD: 13.70hr. Min: 0hr. Max: 168hr.
	30mins.-less than 1 hour	23	14.6	
	1 hour-less than 2 hours	58	36.7	
	2 hours and more	40	25.3	

***Teachers' Implementation Level of the
Integration of Faith and Learning***

One of the main purposes of this study was to assess teachers' proficiency level in implementing the integration of faith and learning and the questionnaire in the first part of the survey instrument was designed to determine selected teachers' level of implementation of the integration of faith and learning. The questionnaire statements were categorized by content and the average of scores on questionnaire statements in each category was used for assigning teachers' implementation level (see Appendix 6). The categorization of questionnaire statements included knowledge, interest, preparation, and deliberate implementation. Also included were change of techniques, student involvement, and collegiate collaboration. Table 10 notes that the respondents generally recorded high scores on knowledge and preparation with a mean of over 5.5 out of a possible 7 on the Likert response scale. They, however, scored under 4.0 on the questionnaire related to change of teaching techniques and collegiate collaboration for biblical integration.

Table 10. Teachers' proficiency in implementation of faith and learning

	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation	Change of techniques	Student involvement	Collegiate collaboration
Mean	5.7871	5.2961	5.7705	3.9349	4.1063	3.9146
SD*	1.13532	1.15091	1.38593	1.43100	1.25455	1.56193
Min	2.33	1.60	1.00	1.00	1.20	1.00
Max	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00

*SD= Standard Deviation

The survey instrument of this study categorized about 75% of the participants as exhibiting characteristics of level 3 (41.4%) or 4 (33.2%). According to the summary of the distribution of the teachers by levels of implementation depicted in the table 11, no respondent was assigned to level 0.

Table 11. Distribution of teachers by implementation levels (N=220)

Level	Frequency	Percentage
0	-	-
1	8	3.6
2	18	8.2
3	91	41.4
4	73	33.2
5	9	4.1
6	21	9.5
Totals	220	100

***Teachers' Management Concerns
and Implementation Level***

Eight questionnaire statements in this survey were related to different management concerns. There were statements to examine teachers' concerns about time available to do their task (statements 2 and 5), about decision making and leadership (statements 4 and 8), about the changing when implementing the integration (statements 11 and 12), about energy required to accomplish the biblical integration (statement 17), and about tension with their teaching activities (statement 5) (Korniejczuk 1994, 126, 127). The responses to those statements were not accessed to assign teachers'

implementation level of the integration of faith and learning but they reported significant statistical findings.

Table 12 reports that the respondents generally did not have strong management concerns. They were most worried about the opinion of their supervisors or leaders on their implementation and wanted to know the final decision maker in their school (mean of 3.80). They, however, were not very concerned about the tension between the biblical integration and their other teaching activities (mean of 1.76).

Table 12. Teachers management concerns

	Mean	SD*	Min	Max
Available time	2.69	1.29	1	7
Leadership	3.80	1.91	1	7
Changing	3.05	1.55	1	7
Required energy	3.62	2.12	1	7
Tension	1.76	1.414	1	7

*SD= Standard Deviation

Correlation results depicted in Table 13 noted that teachers' management concerns were negatively correlated with their biblical integration implementation level. In particular, the teachers who were ranked in a higher level presented less anxiety about their ability to change ($r=-.304$), did not care much about the tension between the biblical integration and their other teaching activities ($r=-.205$) and had less concerns about time needed to do their task ($-.201$). There were, however, no statistically significant correlations between the teachers' implementation level and leadership and between the level and required energy.

Table 13. Correlations between teachers' management concerns and implementation level

	Available time	Leadership	Changing	Required Energy	Tension	Level
Available time	1					
Leadership	.049	1				
Changing	.482***	.311***	1			
Required Energy	.210**	.362***	.467***	1		
Tension	.711***	.013	.382***	.147*	1	
Level	-.201**	.077	-.304***	-.025	-.205**	1

* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

The Most Difficult Academic Subject in integrating Faith and Learning

Part 4 of the survey instrument was developed to find out which academic subject the teachers felt was the most difficult to integrate their Christian faith. In order to find out the most difficult subject to fulfill biblical integration, the teachers were asked to evaluate their own proficiency in the integration of their Christian faith into all the subjects they teach, such as religion, science, language arts, mathematics, social studies, fine arts, music, and health. By using a Likert scale, they marked their proficiency as 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent).

Table 14 presents a summary of teachers' responses on proficiency of integrating biblical principles into each academic subject. The teachers felt that the most difficult subject to integrate their faith was mathematics (3.68) or arts (3.96). They, however, reported they could easily integrate biblical principles when they had dealt with the subject of religion (6.27). They also evaluated highly their proficiency of the integration of faith and learning when teaching science (5.54). For this particular study

the choices in ascending order were religion (6.27), science (5.54), social studies (5.17), health (4.98), language arts (4.45), arts (3.98), and mathematics (3.68).

Table 14. Proficiency of integrating faith into academic subject

Academic Subject	Mean	SD*
Religion	6.27	1.12
Language arts	4.45	1.58
Mathematics	3.68	1.68
Science	5.54	1.44
Social studies	5.17	1.49
Arts	3.96	1.72
Health	4.98	1.67

*SD= Standard Deviation

This order was similarly depicted when the responses were listed by the implementation level of the integration of faith and learning. The teachers of every level reported religion as the easiest subject to integrate their faith. Mathematics or arts was chosen as the most difficult subject to integrate. The respondents assigned to implementation level 5 also evaluated religion as the least difficult subject to integrate biblical principles but felt somewhat easy to integrate their faith with the subject of arts. See Table 15 for these results.

***The Difference in Teachers' implementation Level
according to Educational Background***

Part 3 of the survey instrument of this study asked the teachers' educational background. It discovered if they had any training or seminars related to the integration of faith and learning and if they took any degrees or classes on theology or religion.

Table 15. Difference in proficiency of integrating faith into academic subject according to implementation level

level		Religion	Language arts	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Arts	Health
1	Mean	5.50	2.67	2.00	3.50	2.50	2.50	3.50
	SD*	.707	.577	1.414	2.121	.707	.577	2.121
2	Mean	6.54	3.07	2.46	4.62	4.33	3.18	4.38
	SD*	.877	1.592	1.266	1.758	1.435	1.834	1.609
3	Mean	5.88	4.25	3.69	5.41	4.97	3.52	4.61
	SD*	1.310	1.501	1.611	1.379	1.525	1.446	1.676
4	Mean	6.57	4.80	3.77	6.00	5.65	4.53	5.63
	SD*	.772	1.366	1.616	1.103	1.140	1.723	1.347
5	Mean	6.50	4.38	4.17	4.40	5.43	4.86	4.29
	SD*	1.414	1.598	2.229	2.074	1.512	1.864	2.870
6	Mean	6.71	5.85	4.54	6.17	5.40	4.83	5.29
	SD*	.825	1.463	1.854	1.337	1.765	2.038	1.383

*SD= Standard Deviation

Additionally, it examined if there were any difference in the teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning according to their educational background. It observed whether those educational experiences influenced the teachers' proficiency of the integration.

The respondents' educational background and their learning experience related to the integration of faith and learning has already been summarized. This section provides the results of a *t*-test to examine the difference in the implementation level of the integration of faith and learning according to educational background. As Table 16 delivers, the implementation levels of teachers who took class(es) in theology, Bible, or religion were higher (mean of 3.66) than teachers who had not (mean of 2.97). The mean score of implementation level of teachers who attended in-service training of seminars on

biblical integration was also higher (mean of 3.69) than teachers who did not (mean of 3.07). The results of the *t*-test reported that there was a significant difference in teachers' implementation level according to their experience of taking class(es) in theology or religion and participating in in-service training or seminar on the biblical integration with *t* scores of 3.444 and 3.490 and $p < .01$.

Table 16. Difference in implementation level according to educational background

		Mean	SD	<i>t</i> value
Attending Christian school	Yes	3.48	1.05	-0.901
	No	3.62	1.23	
Taking class in theology	Yes	3.66	1.10	3.444**
	No	2.97	1.11	
Taking degree on theology	Yes	3.59	0.92	0.344
	No	3.53	1.18	
Participating in training	Yes	3.69	1.11	3.490**
	No	3.07	1.09	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

To provide a clearer pictures of teachers' proficiency in the integration of faith and learning, it seemed necessary to take a *t*-test on each of the sub-categories—knowledge, interest, preparation, change of techniques, student involvement and collegiate collaboration—which were used as criteria to access teachers' implementation level. The findings recorded in Table 17 shows there is no significant difference in proficiency of the biblical integration whether the teachers attended Christian schools or not.

Table 17. Difference according to Educational Background:
Attending Christian School (*t*-test)

Attending Christian school	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation	Change of techniques	Student involvement	Collegiate collaboration
Yes	5.78(1.17)	5.28(1.10)	5.82(1.29)	3.83(1.37)	4.07(1.26)	3.75(1.54)
No	5.79(1.08)	5.30(1.20)	5.69(1.49)	4.05(1.49)	4.14(1.24)	4.11(1.56)
<i>t</i> value	-0.103	-0.125	0.685	-1.062	-0.376	-1.607

p*<.05, *p*<.01, ****p*<.001.

The teachers who had taken class(es) in Bible, theology or religion have higher mean scores on knowledge, preparation and student involvement and the results of the *t*-test show there is a significant difference (2.209 for knowledge, 2.431 for preparation, and 2.024 for student involvement). The teachers who had gained a degree on theology or religion, however, reported no significant difference in the implementation of faith and learning from those who did not have a degree. See Table 18 and 19 for these findings.

Table 18. Difference according to educational background:
Taking class in theology (*t*-test)

Taking class in theology	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation	Change of techniques	Student involvement	Collegiate collaboration
Yes	5.86(1.11)	5.22(1.17)	5.89(1.26)	3.98(1.42)	4.18(1.26)	3.99(1.55)
No	5.41(1.15)	5.62(0.98)	5.14(1.78)	3.63(1.42)	3.67(1.10)	3.47(1.52)
<i>t</i> value	2.209*	-1.924	2.431*	1.223	2.024*	1.670

p*<.05, *p*<.01, ****p*<.001.

Table 19. Difference according to educational background:
Taking degree on theology (*t*-test)

Taking degree on theology	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation	Change of techniques	Student involvement	Collegiate collaboration
Yes	5.93(1.07)	5.23(1.08)	5.88(1.23)	3.97(1.32)	4.13(1.19)	4.17(1.48)
No	5.74(1.14)	5.31(1.16)	5.74(1.42)	3.92(1.46)	4.09(1.27)	3.84(1.57)
<i>t</i> value	0.995	-0.423	0.619	0.204	0.173	1.180

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

When implementing the biblical integration, there was a significant difference between the teachers who participated in in-service training, seminars or lectures on how to integrate biblical principles and those who did not. Teachers who attended training scored higher on preparation ($M=6.02$) than teachers who did not ($M=4.95$). This difference was also depicted in the scores on knowledge, change of techniques, students involvement, and collegiate collaboration when the *t* values exceeded 2.10 (Gall, Gall, and Borg 1999, 160, 161). It is concluded that the difference was statistically significant (3.226 for knowledge, 3.013 for change of techniques, 2.781 for student involvement, and 3.843 for collegiate collaboration). It is noted that on interest, there was no significant difference according to teachers' training experience. Table 20 shows these results.

***The Difference in Teachers' Implementation Level
according to Demographic Data***

The last research question of this study was developed to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in teachers' proficiency of integrating faith and learning according to various demographic factors. This section presents the difference in teachers' implementation level according to gender, age, length of time teaching in a

Christian school, and preparation time for the integration of faith and learning.

Table 20. Difference according to educational background:
Participating in training (*t*-test)

Participating in training	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation	Change of techniques	Student involvement	Collegiate collaboration
Yes	5.92(1.09)	5.23(1.22)	6.02(1.20)	4.08(1.37)	4.23(1.25)	4.12(1.54)
No	5.35(1.17)	5.48(0.87)	4.95(1.61)	3.34(1.49)	3.62(1.12)	3.11(1.35)
<i>t</i> value	3.226**	-1.641	4.413***	3.013**	2.781**	3.843***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

There is no significant difference in the teachers' implementation level of biblical integration according to their gender as noted in Table 21. Table 22, however, reports that male teachers generally recorded a higher score than female teachers on every area related to the integration—knowledge, interest, preparation, change of techniques, student involvement, and collegiate collaboration. In particular, the difference between male and female in knowledge, preparation, and collegiate collaboration was statistically significant (2.139 of knowledge, 2.906 of preparation, and 2.200 for collegiate collaboration).

Table 21. Difference in implementation level according to gender

		Mean	SD	<i>t</i> value
Gender	Male	3.69	0.98	0.860
	Female	3.51	1.16	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 22. Difference according to gender (t-test)

	Knowledge	Interest	Preparation	Change of techniques	Student involvement	Collegiate collaboration
Male	6.08(0.86)	5.35(1.17)	6.22(0.91)	4.06(1.29)	4.23(1.24)	4.44(1.34)
Female	5.72(1.17)	5.28(1.14)	5.68(1.44)	3.90(1.46)	4.07(1.25)	3.80(1.58)
<i>t</i> value	2.139*	0.347	2.906**	0.598	0.650	2.200*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Correlation results noted in Table 23 indicate that the teachers who spent more time in preparing how to integrate their faith into the lessons were assigned to a somewhat higher level than others with a correlation coefficient of .161. Teachers' age and teachers' teaching experience, however, do not relate to teachers' implementation level. The table 13 delivers a notable finding even though it is not about correlation between level and demographic factors. Teachers' years taught is correlated significantly with their preparation time for the integration with a correlation coefficient of .206 and $p < .01$.

Table 23. Correlations between demographic factors and implementation level

	Age	Teaching experience	Preparation time	Level
Age	1			
Teaching experience	.617**	1		
Preparation time	.103	.206**	1	
level	.080	.066	.161*	1

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

***Influential Factors on Teachers' Implementation Level
of the Integration of Faith and Learning***

A multiple linear regression was run to find out which factors influenced teachers' implementation level of the biblical integration. The variables included gender, age, teaching experience, preparation time, attending Christian school, taking classes in theology, taking a degree in theology, and participating in training. The discrete categorical variables were transformed into a dummy variable. The independent variables of this model accounted for 12.4% of the variation in the dependent variable, the level of implementation of faith and learning and the model could be used to predict the influential factors on teachers' implementation level with $F=2.607$ ($Sig=0.011$). The VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) scores were under 4 and there was no problem with the collinearity among independent variables in a regression calculation (Miles and Shevlin 2001, 130).

The findings from the test depicted in Table 24 indicated whether teachers who took class(es) on theology, religion, or Bible had the strongest influence on teachers' proficiency of the integration of faith and learning, $Beta=.232$, $Sig=.007$. Participation in in-service training, or seminars on the biblical integration was one of the significant facts which influenced on the level, $Beta=.186$, $Sig=.24$, and teachers' preparation time for integrating their faith into their daily teaching was significant factor to increase their implementation level, $Beta=.167$, $Sig=.45$. Teachers' teaching experience or learning experience in a Christian school did not work as an influential factor. Other demographic factors, such as teachers' gender and age also could not count as factors which had influence on teachers' integration implementation.

Table 24. Multiple linear regression: Influential factors

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(constant)	3.000	.553		5.422	.000	
Gender	.064	.250	.021	.256	.798	1.123
Age	-.005	.010	-.047	-.447	.656	1.883
Teaching experience	.001	.013	.007	.065	.948	1.830
Preparation time	.193	.095	.167	2.020	.045	1.149
Attending Christian school	-.363	.209	-.156	-1.733	.085	1.376
Taking class in theology	.712	.261	.232	2.722	.007	1.230
Taking degree on theology	-.032	.239	-.011	-.135	.893	1.170
Participating in training	.494	.217	.186	2.276	.024	1.132
R	.351					
R square	.124					
F	2.607 (Sig.=0.011)					

* Dependent Variable: level

** Dummy variable: Reference group= women, no attending Christian school, no taking class in Theology, no taking degree on Theology, no participating in training

Evaluation of the Research Design

The purpose of this study has been to examine the integration of faith and learning implemented by ACSI elementary school teachers and to analyze the factors that influence teachers' proficiency of the integration. The design for this study was quantitative in nature and utilized a survey instrument created by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk to develop stages of teachers' deliberate integration of faith and learning. In order to collect data for statistical analysis related to the purpose and research questions,

the survey was administered to Christian elementary school teachers in ACSI Southeast and Mid-America regions using an online survey tool, Survey Monkey.com.

As a quantitative study, this research was able to include a larger sample number by using only the questionnaire rather than using qualitative methods such as observation or interview. The administrators of 649 schools in the Southeast and Mid-America regions of ACSI were contacted as mediator who invited their teachers to this study. This, however, may be seen as a weakness of the study in that the survey questionnaire can only examine teachers' implementation of the biblical integration with limited depth. The way of self-reporting would reduce the reliability of responses because the participants could try to put themselves in the best possible light. The comparison between answers given in the survey and the information from other sources, such as classroom observation or interview with teachers, could help to evaluate and depict teachers' actual performance in daily classroom teaching.

The online Survey Monkey data collection tool was very beneficial in several ways. The tool was very straightforward in posting the survey. It was a quick and easy way for teachers in different areas and in busy schedules to participate in the study. It also provided participants' responses on an Excel spreadsheet and this helped to save time and energy in analyzing the results. With the online survey's anonymity, however, respondents tended to offer their perspectives insincerely and they left some questionnaire statements a blank. Out of 262 collected responses, 42 responses were dropped because of their incompleteness. A rewarding system, such as presenting a gift to a respondent who filled out the survey completely, might help to make up for this weakness.

The size of the sample of 220 responses was adequate for statistical analysis for research questions 1 and 2—assigning teachers’ implementation levels and examining the most difficult academic subject to integrate their faith. The sample, however, was not large enough or diverse enough to allow for analyzing difference in each assigned level according to variables such as educational background and demographic factors. For example, because there was no one assigned to level 0, it was impossible to examine the difference among teachers in this level according to various factors. The sample size of level 1 also had a limitation to represent the characteristics of the teachers in the level. In a replication of this study, it seems necessary to administrate the survey to teachers in elementary schools of additional ACSI regions in order to increase the size of the sample.

The final suggestions for improvement of the research design are about the instrument questionnaire and its questions. The survey instrument of this study was originally developed by Korniejczuk and adjusted for the sample of Christian elementary school teachers. Mark Eckel, who also utilized this survey instrument for his dissertation, *A comparison of Faith-Learning Integration between Graduates from Christian and Secular Universities in the Christian School Classroom*, suggested that additional questions such as “church attendance or the kind of church attended (e.g., denomination)” might impact the study of the integration of faith and learning implemented by Christian school teachers (Eckel 2009, 132). In addition to this, the number of years as a Christian could be a factor which influenced on teachers’ biblical integration. A study on the difference according to the kind of Christian schools teachers attended, such as level of school—elementary school, high school, or university or schools’ denominations could deliver additional results.

Revision of questionnaire statements seems also necessary. In order to examine the level of teachers' perception of knowledge on the integration of faith and learning and the amount of their preparation time to integrate, the survey allocated only 2 or 3 statements. Since the original survey was for Seventh Day Adventist high schools, adding more questionnaire statements considering the uniqueness of ACSI Christian elementary school could make the survey instruments more efficient.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study focused the practical problem on the integration of faith and learning, which “becomes a symbol” in Christian school education (Gangel 1994, 396). The concept of integration of faith and learning is still an unknown quantity to many Christian teachers, and numerous Christian teachers do not know how to achieve it in their daily teaching. Recognizing this problem, the study tried to delineate how proficiently teachers integrate their faith into their daily teaching and it also examined if there are any factors, which could enhance teachers’ biblical integration.

This chapter draws conclusions about the teachers’ implementation levels of the integration of faith and learning and the difference in teachers’ implementation level according to various factors. Following a review of the research purpose and the research questions, this chapter delivers the findings of each research question, analyzes implications of these findings, and proposes applications for the practice of teachers’ implementation of faith and learning in their daily teaching. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the study was to examine the self reported proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in achieving the task of integrating

faith and learning across the academic curriculum, and to analyze the factors that influence teachers when they implement the integration of faith and learning.

Research Questions

The following five research questions were used to guide this study:

1. How proficient are elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in integrating faith and learning?
2. Which academic subject do elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools feel is the most difficult to integrate faith and learning?
3. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning between elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools who attended Christian schools and those who did not?
4. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning between elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools who attended seminars or training events on the implementation of faith and learning and those who did not?
5. What, if any, is the difference in the implementation of the integration of faith and learning by elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools according to demographic factors?

Analyzing research data identified two additional questions.

1. What, if any, is the relationship between the implementation of integration of faith and learning by elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools and teachers' management concerns?
2. What are the influential factors to the implementation of integration of faith and learning by elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools?

Research Implications

The implications drawn from the research findings may contribute to the understanding of teachers who teach in Christian schools and their implementation of the integration of faith and learning. The data may deliver implications for the teachers'

proficiency level to implement the integration. Implications may also come from management concerns in integrating faith and learning and in identifying the most difficult subject teachers considered when integrating their faith. Implications may also be developed from the factors of educational background and demographic information.

Teachers' Implementation Level of the Integration of Faith and Learning

The data relevant to research question 1 were analyzed to examine selected ACSI elementary school teachers' levels of implementing the integration of faith and learning. The part 1 of the research survey instrument was divided into two sub-sections and the second section was designed to be filled only by the teachers who consciously implemented the biblical integration in their academic activities. The questionnaire statements in the first section were to depict the degree of teachers' knowledge, interest, and preparation related to the integration of faith and learning. The second part included the statements to examine the degree of deliberate implementation of teachers. The statements were summarized into three groups—if they wanted to change their techniques for better biblical integration, if they were willing to involve students in their integration, and if they tried to collaborate with their colleagues.

The statistical findings reveal about 3/4 of the teachers are on a 3 or 4 level of the implementation of the integration of faith and learning. The mean scores for the categories of questionnaire statements denote that teachers understand the concept of the integration of faith and learning quite well and they are well-prepared for its implementation. They also show their interest in the biblical integration. They, however, demonstrate lower degree of deliberate implementation of the integration. This would

seem to be interpreted that even though teachers have knowledge of and interest in the biblical integration and prepare for it, they still need to improve the way they integrate their faith into their daily teaching and to consider attitudes of students and involve them in the process of the biblical integration. The collegial efforts such as having regular meeting to coordinate their efforts for the integration should be encouraged.

This interpretation is confirmed with the explanation for the levels 3 and 4 in Korniejczuk's Model of IFL (Integration of Faith and Learning) Implementation (Korniejczuk 1994, 138-39). According to Korniejczuk's study, the teachers on a level 3 integrate their faith into their teaching deliberately, but the integration is superficial—they use “spiritual content for secular purposes without meaning” (Korniejczuk 1994, 139). Their integration is also unplanned and irregular. The integration implemented by teachers on a level 4 is more stabilized. They deliver coherent implementation of the biblical integration, but they do not made changes in the ongoing use of the integration. They also consider their own opinion rather than students' responses when integrating faith and learning (Korniejczuk 1994, 139).

An interesting implication could be depicted when comparing the level distribution of this study to the one of Korniejczuk's study in 1994. While 40 % of teachers of Korniejczuk's were assigned on 0 through 2 level (Korniejczuk 1994, 77), the percentage of teachers on these levels in this study was only 11.8%. Korniejczuk's study denoted that 5.7% of teachers were on a level 0 and no teacher was assigned on a level 6, but in this study, there was no teacher who could be assigned on a level 0 and 9.5% of the teachers were on a level 6.

Two possible explanations might account for this difference. The raised teachers' level of the implementation of the biblical integration would seem to be explained with the limitation of the self-reporting method. Teachers could provide a self-deceiving view of their implementation behind a veil of anonymity. The influence of profound interest in the integration of faith and learning among Christian school educators and their studies on this issue during last over a decade, however, cannot seem to be overlooked.

Teachers' Management Concerns and Implementation Level

Eight out of 31 questionnaire statements in the survey of this study were developed to examine teachers' management concerns when integrating the faith and learning. The data imply that teachers generally do not have strong management concerns. In particular, teachers do not concern themselves about the tension between their responsibilities and their interest in the biblical integration and about available time to integrate their faith into their lesson. The level of concern about changing of the way of their teaching which is required by the integration is not high. Statistical indications also demonstrate that these management concerns are negatively correlated with teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning. That means the higher teachers' level is, the lower is their concern about tension, time, or change.

This research suggests that teachers' strongest concern is about leadership—they want to know what their supervisors think of their implementation of the integration and who makes the final decision regarding how well they do (Korniejczuk 1994, 127). The concern about leadership is not related to the teachers' implementation level.

Correlation results demonstrated that even though there was no statistical significance, the higher the teachers' level is, the stronger is the concern about leadership ($r=.077$).

The data related to teachers' management concerns about leadership might infer that the supervisor or administrator could influence teachers' implementation of the biblical integration. Precedent literatures support this assumption and states, "in order for a biblical worldview to be penetrated into every aspect of Christian school education, it is necessary that the needs of teachers and the demands or role expectations of the school should be compatible" (Kibuuka [2011], 12cc_130-120.pdf; see also Nwosu 1998; Masterson 1999). Mark Eckel also considers school leadership as the largest influence in teachers' faith-learning integration (Eckel 2009, 145).

The Most Difficult Academic Subject in Integrating Faith and Learning

Research question 2 sought to determine which academic subject teachers felt was the most difficult to integration their faith into. The findings imply that the most difficult academic subject to be integrated into the teachers' faith is mathematics. The subject of religion is considered to be the easiest discipline for the biblical integration and science, social studies, health, and language arts are deemed as easy subjects for it. Teachers, however, seem to feel it is difficult to integrate their faith into the subject of arts.

This implication coincides exactly with Frank Gaebelein's assertion. He in his book, *The Pattern of God's Truth*, asks a question, "What is the hardest subject to integrate with Christianity?" (Gaebelein 1954, 57). He, then, asserts that while it is easier

to integrate Christian faith into history, literature, and science, “almost to a man they shy away from mathematics” (Gaebelein 1954, 57).

The precedent literature addressed the integration of faith into each academic subject and several works have provided practical suggestions as emphasizing “what a biblical worldview means for teaching the subject” (Brummelen 2002, 202; also see Overman and Johnson 2003). The data, however, validates that it is still necessary for teachers to be aided in searching what a biblical worldview means, especially for the subjects of arts and mathematics in integrating their faith.

***The Difference in Teachers’ Implementation Level
according to Educational Background
and Influential Factors in
Educational Background***

The data pertinent to research question 3 and 4 sought to depict the differences in teachers’ implementation levels according to their educational background including training or seminars on the integration of faith and learning. The results of the *t*-test reveal that there was a statistically significant difference in teachers’ implementation level according to their learning experience in theology class(es) and in training on faith-learning integration. This implies that teachers who took class(es) in theology, Bible, or religion and who attended training on biblical integration are in a higher level than those who did not.

In particular, the data infer that teachers who took class(es) in theology have more knowledge of the biblical integration and are better prepared for it, and they are more interested in students’ opinion and reflection in the process of the integration. Teachers who participated in biblical integration training also demonstrate higher

proficiency level in knowledge, preparation, and student involvement. Furthermore, they may be more willing to change their teaching methods or techniques and cooperate with other teachers for better implementation of faith-learning integration.

Taking class(es) in theology and attending training on the biblical integration were also identified as influential factors on teachers' integration level through statistical analysis. According to the findings of a multiple linear regression, taking class(es) in theology is the strongest influential factor. The emphasis on the establishment of a theological foundation of Christian school education has been an ongoing theme in precedent literature. George Knight asserts, "What is needed by Christian institutions is a thorough and ongoing examination, evaluation, and correction of their educational practices in the light of their basic philosophic beliefs" (Knight 1998, 154). Mel Wilhoit also declares "the development of a biblical worldview based on scriptural presuppositions" is central to Christian education (Wilhoit 1987, 81). Wilhoit continues to argue that the biblical worldview should be "a filter or interpreter for all information which passes through it" and should be the essence of the integration of faith and learning (Wilhoit 1987, 81). The research data along with the contention of precedent literature suggests that in to improve the proficiency of biblical integration, it is necessary and helpful to provide teachers continuing education in theology and encourage them to develop an educational philosophy based on it.

The influence of the training or seminars on teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning was quite strong according to the regression test. Fortunately, the training or seminars the participants of this study attended seemed to provide a positive influence. The precedent literature points out the danger of

“unenlightened training,” which could influence negatively on the interest and implementation of the integration of faith and learning (Korniejczuk 1994, 160). Recent studies have emphasized the necessity of training, which provides practical instructional strategies and opportunities to practice and internalize the knowledge obtained (Nwosu 1998, 4; Kibuuka [2011], 12cc_130-120.pdf).

The statistical findings of this study reveal an interesting implication. The data demonstrated that even though taking classes in theology made a difference in teachers’ proficiency of the integration, there was no significant difference in teachers’ level between teachers who obtained a degree in theology and those who did not. The results of a multiple linear regression also implied that the degree in theology did not influence the teachers’ ability to integrate their faith into their daily teaching. There could be various possible explanations for this phenomenon, but it seems to be unnecessary as well as impossible to find the right reason. One thing that is certain and more important is that time and energy to get a degree in theology or religion without any connection with teaching might be unhelpful for teachers’ implementation of the biblical integration.

The statistical indications also reveal that the educational experience in Christian schools did not make a significant difference in teachers’ implementation level and did not influence it, although this is directly opposed to the results of Mark Eckel’s recent dissertation. After analyzing the difference between Christian and secular university graduates in their practice of faith-learning integration in their classroom (Eckel 2009, 13-14), Eckel concluded that Christian university graduates could communicate the concept of faith-learning integration better and they were better equipped to integrate their faith in the classroom (Eckel 2009, 138-41). This difference

could be explained in several ways. One possible explanation might be the different sample—Eckel included 6th through 12th ACSI teachers in the Mid-America region in his study (Eckel 2009, 105). No matter what the real reason is, a more hopeful implication for teachers could be delivered in this study's statistical indications because they cannot change their past educational background. The findings of this study might help teachers move on to improve their ability and proficiency of the integration of faith and learning by taking theological classes and by attending training on this issue rather than regret what they could not or did not do.

***The Difference in Teachers' Implementation Level
according to Demographic Data
and Influential Factors among
Demographic Data***

The last research question asked if there was any difference in teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning according to various demographic factors such as gender, age, teaching experience and preparation time. The data validated that male teachers were on a higher average level than female teachers but this was not statistically strong. The results of the *t*-test reveal that male teachers reported higher proficiency in knowledge, interest, preparation, change of techniques, student involvement, and collegiate collaboration and there was a statistically significant difference between male and female teachers in knowledge, preparation, and collegiate collaboration. Gender, however, was not identified as an influential factor on teachers' biblical integration based on the results of a multiple linear regression.

Considering statistically the difference between male and female teachers in collegiate collaboration for the biblical integration, the implication of this study looks

contrary to the assertion of precedent literature. Men are more likely to work by themselves while women are more likely to long for others' support (Religious Education Association, Princeton Research Center, and Gallup Organization 1985, xi). Carol Gilligan also argues, "Men feel secure alone at the top of a hierarchy, securely separate from the challenge of others. Women feel secure in the middle of a web of relationships" (Gilligan 1982, 42).

The only one influential factor among demographic variables was teachers' preparation time for the integration of faith into their daily lesson. Correlation results imply that the teachers who spend more time are on a higher implementation level and the data from the regression test reveal that their preparation time influenced their proficiency of the biblical integration. The data validate the need for teachers to secure enough time to think and prepare how to integrate their faith into the academic subjects, which they are teaching and this could be possible with supervisors' or administrators' assistance (Eckel 2009, 144).

Research Applications

The research findings of this study could be applied in various ways to Christian school teachers who are making an effort to integrate the biblical worldview into their daily teaching, school supervisors who are trying to find the way to encourage their teachers to undertake biblical integration, and Christian schools and universities and Christian school organizations who are trying to help teachers by providing classes, training, or seminars on the faith-learning integration.

Institutional Assessment

Christian schools manifest a biblical worldview in their objectives or mission purpose and expect their teachers to teach all subjects from a Christian perspective. They seek to find the way to help teachers to come up to their expectations. When they assess accurately the status of teachers, they could provide proper assistance to increase teachers' proficiency of the integration of faith into their teaching. In particular, the survey instrument of this study and the Model of IFL Implementation originally developed by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk would provide information on their teachers' level of integrating their faith into teaching all subjects and its characteristics and the schools could establish a program to aid teachers to live up to their expectations.

Supervisors' Support

This study presents the significant role of supervisor or administrator of Christian schools in teachers' implementation of the integration of faith and learning as dealing with teachers' management concerns about leadership. Hudson Kibuuka explains the role of the institution in the integration of faith and learning and says, "Supervision of all operations should be to foster orderliness and efficiency, as our Lord is orderly and efficient" (Kibuuka [2011], 12cc_130-120.pdf). Mark Eckel delivers a more practical way for administrators to demonstrate their support. They could provide training and resources on the biblical integration. Affective encouragement and feedback on the process are also effective ways to show teachers that they truly regard faith-learning integration as important (Eckel 2009, 145-46).

Theological Education

This study suggests that teachers' experience of theological education work positively on their implementation of the integration of faith and learning. The biblical and theological foundation serves as the basis for the biblical integration and teachers should establish a biblical philosophy, through which all the academic subjects should be interpreted and taught. Continuing education on theology should be provided to help teachers to develop the theological foundation for the integration of faith and learning including following details:

1. The reality of a personal God.
2. The origin of the universe and the whole reality as created by God.
3. The appearance of sin that caused change in nature and man.
4. The reality of an intercessory ministry of Jesus Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.
5. The acknowledgement that man has the image of God in an indivisible unit.
6. The search for wisdom found in God and His word (Luna 1996, 17cc_171-191.pdf).

Christian School Education

The results that there was no difference in the implementation level of the integration of faith and learning between graduates from Christian schools and secular schools might be explained with current problem in Christian school system. Like James Cunningham and Anthony Fortosis indicated, today's teachers are not products of Christian influences even though they graduated from Christian schools because a considerable number of their teachers and administrators received secular education in public schools and their textbook was "to correlate biblical truth with secular knowledge rather than integrate" (Cunningham and Fortosis 1987, 80).

In this regard, Christian school education should be recalibrated and a biblical worldview should be penetrated into every aspect of teaching and learning. Students

graduating from this authentic Christian school, then, may report strong influence of their educational background on their ability to integrate faith and learning.

Training on Integration of Faith and Learning

The findings of this study, that training is an influential factor on the teachers' implementation level of the biblical integration, may encourage Christian schools and Christians school organizations to sponsor or provide training for the integration of faith and learning. Currently, numerous seminars or training on this issue have been held but many of them showed "lack of depth" and failed to provide follow-up training (Nwosu 1998, 4). They did good job of explaining "the rationale, theory, and research that surround the innovation; [discussing] its advantages; and [giving] necessary information about what is being studied, including the goals, objectives, and key ideas" (Nwosu 1998, 10). There, however, have been few efforts to help teachers use the "knowledge so as to grow and develop (Kibuuka [2011], 12cc_130-120. pdf). It seems to be necessary to re-design the program and format of the training to provide biblical principles for each of the subjects with more practical instructional strategies to integrate those principles into teachers' classroom teaching.

Teachers' Organization for Integration of Faith and Learning

Teachers' cooperation with other teachers in studying and preparing for the integration of faith and learning is an important criteria to attain a higher level of implementation, but teachers in this study showed low proficiency in this criteria. Precedent studies suggest the need of teachers' collaborative group work in order to improve the skill of faith-learning integration in their teaching (Masterson 1999; Nwosu

1998). Theodore Plantinga asks Christian educators to regard themselves “as part of a Christian community of scholarship” (Plantinga 1980, 88) and encourage them to gather together with their colleagues to reinterpret and reconstruct “knowledge on a Christian basis, and to see how they can best help each other along” (Palntinga 1980, 88).

Further Research

Intentional limitations based on the design of this study can make some suggestions for further research. Other suggestions are also developed from the findings of this study. The following is the list for further research, which this researcher is interested in pursuing:

1. Replicate this study with ACSI Christian elementary school teachers in additional regions to increase the size of the sample.
2. Replicate this study with additional ACSI regions and conduct cross-case analyses using each separate region as a case.
3. Replicate this study with other populations, such as teachers in secondary Christian schools or in Christian colleges.
4. Conduct qualitative research on teachers’ implementation of the integration of faith and learning by using interviews with teachers, observations of classroom, and documentation such as lesson plans.
5. Research students in Christian schools and examine their perception of the integration of faith and learning in the classroom.
6. Conduct an experiential study on the influence of training experiences on teachers’ implementation of faith and learning by comparing before and after training experience.
7. Conduct an experiential study on the influence of theological class on teachers’ implementation of faith and learning by comparing before and after taking classes in theology.
8. Conduct additional studies to refine the survey instrument and create a valid and reliable scale for ACSI elementary school teachers’ perceptions of the integration of faith and learning.

Summary of Conclusions

The integration of faith and learning is not an unfamiliar phrase in Christian education today. Mel Wilhoit argues “for approximately three decades, the Christian college’s strongest philosophical argument has been the integration of faith and learning” (Wilhoit 1987, 77). In fact, the integration of faith and learning has been a common topic of discussion not only in Christian colleges but also in every level of Christian schools. The problem, however, is not a matter of knowledge of the concept, but a matter of its practical application in the daily classroom. Recognizing this problem, John Wesley Taylor asserts,

We are convinced that the integration of faith and learning must be vibrant and evident in the academic community. So what is missing? The crucial link is frequently the step from theory to practice, from belief to action, from perception to realization. How does a Christian teacher go about integrating faith in the teaching/learning experience? (Taylor [2011], 27cc_409-425.htm).

The main purpose of this study was to determine to what degree elementary school teachers were implementing biblical integration into their teaching. It also provided a practical picture of the integration of faith and learning implemented by ACSI elementary school teachers in their classrooms and provided practical suggestions to improve teachers’ proficiency of the integration. Average teachers in this study reached a high level of integration but they were still unwilling to change their teaching methods, to involve students’ opinion, or to work together with colleagues in their biblical integration. Classes in theology, training on the integration of faith and learning, and preparation time for the biblical integration were identified as the influential factors on the teachers’ implementation level. Based on the practical picture of ACSI elementary school teachers in conducting biblical integration, Christian schools may provide training and

administrative support to increase teachers' implementation level. Also by taking continuing education classes in theology and gathering together with colleagues, teachers may improve their ability to integrate the biblical worldview into their daily classroom teaching.

APPENDIX 1
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire
for Christian elementary school teachers
in the Mid-America regional office of ACSI

Introduction

Although the integration of faith and learning is a fine concept, questions arise about how teachers are to carry it out. Of course, every teacher unconsciously communicates faith through the day-to-day interaction with students. It appears, however, that very few teachers have in place a comprehensive program for integrating Christian faith into all their classes.

For this questionnaire, we define the integration of faith and learning as follows.

The integration of faith and learning refers to the process of consciously presenting the subject from a biblical perspective, highlighting the Christian values of its content.

The questionnaire consists of four parts:

- Part I: Your thoughts on the integration of faith and learning
- Part II: Demographic questions
- Part III: Your educational background related to the integration of faith and learning
- Part IV: A self evaluation on your implementation of the integration of faith and learning

Agreement to participate

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to determine your thoughts on integrating faith and learning in your classroom. This study is being conducted by You Jung Jang for purpose of dissertation research. In this research, please follow the directions and answer all the questions. Any information you provide will be held *strictly confidential*, and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses. *Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time.*

By your completion of this survey, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

PART I: Your thoughts about integration of faith and learning

Please respond to the items in terms of your present concerns, or how you feel about your involvement or potential involvement with integration faith and learning. Please circle one response for each question.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	not true		somewhat true			very true	
1. I don't know what the integration of faith and learning is.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am concerned about having enough time to organize myself each day.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I have limited knowledge on how to integrate biblical principles into my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I would like to know what my superiors think about my integration of faith and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I am concerned about conflict of interest between the integration of faith and learning and my other responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I would like to know how the integration of faith and learning affects students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I am not concerned about integrating faith and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I would like to know who makes the final decisions to implement the integration of faith and learning in my school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I have decided how to implement the integration of faith and learning for the coming year.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I would like to know what resources are available if I decide to adopt the integration of faith and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I am concerned about my ability to manage what the integration of faith and learning requires.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I would like to know how my teaching methods might change if I implement the integration of faith and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I would like to tell other departments or people about the benefits of the integration of faith and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I had planned to integrate faith and learning this year.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I am overwhelmed with other responsibilities so that I have little time for integrating faith and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I would like to know what the implementation of faith and learning will require of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. I would like to receive more information about time and energy commitments required to integrate faith and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. I would like to know what other schools are doing in this area. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. I would like to know how the implementation of the integration of faith and learning will improve what I am doing now. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

This year if you were able to consciously incorporate faith and learning in your academic activities (yearly plan, your course content and/or your classes) please select your preferences in the scale according to your situation for items 20-31; otherwise, go to the next part.

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20. This year I discovered some other approaches to the integration of faith and learning that might work better than previous years. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. I am concerned about students' attitudes when I integrate faith and learning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22. I feel sufficiently prepared to help other faculty members at my school integrate faith and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23. I am trying new ways to integrate faith and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. This year I met regularly with other faculty members to discuss the implementation of integration of faith and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25. I continuously evaluate the impact of faith and learning on my students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26. This year I have revised my instructional strategies in order to integrate faith and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. I am modifying my strategies to integrate faith and learning based on the life experiences of my students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28. This year I made efforts to inspire students to do their part in integrating faith and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29. This year I coordinated my efforts with other teachers to maximize the effect of the implementation of the integration of faith and learning at my school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 30. I have evaluated my methods to improve the integration of faith and learning in my classes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31. I have used feedback from students to change my implementation of faith and learning in my classes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

PART II: Demographic questions.

1. Year of birth:
2. Gender:
3. How long have you taught in a Christian school? ____ years
4. Are you Christian?
 ___Yes ___No

PART III. Your education background

1. Did you attend a Christian school (elementary school, high school, or university)?

Yes No

2. Have you taken classes in Bible, theology or religion?

Yes No

3. Did you take any complementary degree on theology or religion?

Yes No

4. Have you participated in in-service training, seminars or lectures on how to integrate biblical principles into the subjects you teach?

Yes No

PART IV. Implementation of integration of faith and learning

1. How much time do you spend on the integration of faith and learning when you prepare lessons?

___ hour(s) per week

2. Mark your proficiency level of integrating faith into each academic subject.

	Poor					Excellent	
Religion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Language arts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mathematics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Science	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Social studies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Arts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Health	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX 2

ENDORSEMENT LETTERS FROM REGIONAL DIRECTORS



SOUTHEAST REGION

"That in all things He might have preeminence" Colossians 1:18

November 10, 2008

Dear ACSI Elementary Christian School Teachers:

ACSI is constantly looking for ways to encourage our Christian schools to improve and enhance all that they are doing to fulfill the mission to which they have been called. Often times our colleagues in Christian higher education can help us as they conduct educational research to affirm that what we are doing in Christian schools is best practice and can be assessed as most productive.

I have been evaluating the work of You Jung Jang, a doctoral student at the School of Leadership and Church Ministry of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. His research deals with the integration of faith and learning implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. This research promises to help our Christian school movement strive to become the most effective in preparing our students to go out into their cultures to make an impact for Christ.

I trust that you will take some of your very valuable time to complete the online survey that will prove very helpful to the completion of this research project. As more and more educational research is completed that deals directly with Christian school education, there will be an ever increasing benefit to all of our Christian schools.

Thank you for your faithfulness in the ministry to which God has called you, and thank you for completing the online survey.

In His Service,

William R. Wilson
ACSI Southeast Regional Director

MAILING: PO Box 1537, Snellville, GA 30078-1537 • **SHIPPING:** 2386 Clower Street, Suite B100, Snellville, GA 30078

PHONE: 770-985-5840 • FAX: 770-985-5847 • EMAIL:
acsise@acsi.org • WEBSITE: <http://www.acsi.org>



MID-AMERICA REGION

Association of Christian Schools International Mid-America Region

Dear ACSI Elementary Christian School Teachers:

ACSI is constantly looking for ways to encourage our Christian schools to improve and enhance all that they are doing to fulfill the mission to which they have been called. Often times our colleagues in Christian higher education can help us as they conduct educational research to affirm that what we are doing in Christian schools is best practice and can be assessed as most productive.

I have been evaluating the work of You Jung Jang, a doctoral student at the School of Leadership and Church Ministry of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Her research deals with the integration of faith and learning implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. This research promises to help our Christian school movement strive to become the most effective in preparing our students to go out into their cultures to make an impact for Christ.

I trust that you will take some of your very valuable time to complete the online survey that will prove very helpful to the completion of this research project. As more and more educational research is completed that deals directly with Christian school education, there will be an ever increasing benefit to all of our Christian schools.

Thank you for your faithfulness in the ministry to which God has called you, and thank you for completing the online survey.

With Eternity In Mind,

Sam Barfell, Ed.D.
Regional Director

Mid-America Region

Association of Christian Schools International
4216 Maray Drive, Rockford, IL 61107
Phone: 815.222 Fax 815.226.0424

APPENDIX 3
INVITATION LETTER

Title: Please find the attachment of Sam Barfell, ACSI regional director

Greetings to all ACSI elementary Christian school administrators:

My name is You Jung Jang and I am in the dissertation process for the Ph.D. in the school of Church Ministry and Leadership (previously known as the School of Christian Education) at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. This brief e-mail is to request your school's participation in my research project on the integration of faith and learning implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. I would consider it a great service if you ask your school teachers to complete the online survey to help complete my research project. **Please see attached file and find ACSI mid-America regional director, Sam Barfell's cover letter and an abstract of my dissertation.**

There are **two ways** to help my research project.

- 1. You can send me your school teachers' email addresses. (If possible, please state each teacher's job title—such as room teacher, physics teacher, music teacher, and so on.) OR**
- 2. You can send your school teachers an e-mail, which includes the following message and Sam Barfell's cover letter. (You can create new message as copying and pasting the following message. Please DON'T forward my e-mail to your teachers. If you forward it, the link will be broken.)**

****You can also copy the link below and paste the code into the HTML of your school's webpage so that your school teachers can click the link and access my survey.**

`Click here to take survey`

My name is You Jung Jang and I am in the dissertation process for the Ph.D. in the school of Church Ministry and Leadership (previously known as the School of Christian Education) at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. This brief e-mail is to request your participation in my research project on the integration of faith and learning implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. I would consider it a great service if you spend your valuable time to complete the online survey to help complete my research project. Please see attached file and find ACSI mid-America regional director, Sam Barfell's cover letter.

This survey will take approximately seven to ten minutes to complete, and I will use your response to analyze elementary Christian school teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning. At the conclusion of the study the abstract of the dissertation will be sent to you.

To take the survey, click the link below.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L7Q83C2>

Thank you in advance for your participation.

If you have additional questions, please email, yjjang@yahoo.com

I am happy to share the result of this project with you at the conclusion of the study.
Thank you in advance for your participation and may God bless your ministries.

Sincerely,
His,
You Jung Jang

APPENDIX 4
FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

Title: To All ACSI Christian Elementary School Administrators

Greetings to all ACSI Christian Elementary School Administrators:

My name is You Jung Jang and I am in the dissertation process for my Ph.D. from the School of Church Ministry and Leadership (previously known as the School of Christian Education) at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Hopefully, most of you have already received my e-mail asking for your school's participation in my research project on the integration of faith and learning as it is implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. **I understand your busy schedule during this holiday season but I need your help definitely at this moment. Please help me to complete my project by taking a moment to copy and paste this email to your teachers!!! By filling out my questionnaire, your teachers may get special prizes, which will be offered to randomly selected replies.**

This e-mail is to ask you to remind your school's teachers to fill out the online survey to help complete this important research project. You can simply send the teachers an e-mail, which includes the following message and Sam Barfell's cover letter. (You can create a new message by copying and pasting the following message, but please DON'T forward my e-mail to your teachers. If you forward it, the link needed for the survey will be broken.)

E-mail to cut and paste:

Greetings to all ACSI Christian Elementary School Teachers!

This is You Jung Jang and I am in the dissertation process for my Ph.D. from the School of Church Ministry and Leadership (previously known as the School of Christian Education) at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. This is the second reminder to take a moment to fill out the questionnaire regarding the integration of faith and learning as it is implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. **Special prizes will be given to randomly selected replies. Please take your time to fill out my questionnaire by following very easy and simple steps.**

About two weeks ago you received an e-mail message asking you to assist me in analyzing elementary Christian school teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning. If you have filled out the survey, thank you!

If you have not had a chance to take the survey yet, I would appreciate your participation by clicking the link below and taking a few moments to complete the survey

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L7Q83C2>

Thank you in advance for your time and effort in completing the questionnaire. Your help is greatly appreciated.

If you have additional questions, please email, yjjang@yahoo.com

Thank you again for your participation.

May God bless your ministry!

His,
You Jung

Title: Special prizes available for ACSI-teachers completing a research survey

Greetings to all ACSI Christian Elementary School Administrators:

My name is You Jung Jang and I am in the dissertation process for my Ph.D. from the School of Church Ministry and Leadership. Most of you have already received my e-mail asking for your school's participation in my research project on the integration of faith and learning as it is implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. **I am sorry to keep bothering you but I still need your crucial help!! Please help me to complete my project by taking a moment to copy and paste this email to your teachers!!! By filling out my questionnaire, your teachers may get special prizes, which will be offered to randomly selected replies.**

You can simply send the teachers an e-mail, which includes the following message and Sam Barfell's cover letter. (You can create a new message by copying and pasting the following message, but please DON'T forward my e-mail to your teachers. If you forward it, the link needed for the survey will be broken.)

E-mail to cut and paste:

Title: A gift is waiting for ACSI Christian Elementary School Teachers

Greetings to all ACSI Christian Elementary School Teachers!

This is the third reminder to take a moment to fill out the questionnaire regarding the integration of faith and learning as it is implemented by Christian elementary school teachers. **Special prizes will be given to randomly selected replies. Please take your time to fill out my questionnaire by following these very easy and simple steps.**

About two month ago you received the first e-mail message asking you to assist me in analyzing elementary Christian school teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning. I still need more responses! If you have filled out the survey, thank you!

If you have not had a chance to take the survey yet, I would appreciate your participation by clicking the link below and taking a few moments to complete the survey at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L7Q83C2>

You could win a prize simply for taking a few minutes to complete this rather easy questionnaire!! Besides that, you will help me complete my dissertation work for my Ph.D. from the School of Church Ministry and Leadership (previously known as the School of Christian Education) at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Thank you in advance for your time and effort in completing the questionnaire. Your help is greatly appreciated.

His,
You Jung Jang

Thank you again for your participation.
May God bless your ministry!

His,
You Jung Jang

REFERENCE LIST

- Akers, George H. 1977. The measure of a school. *Journal of Adventist Education* 40 (2): 7-9, 43-45.
- Akers, George H., and Robert D. Moon. 1980. Integrating learning, faith, and practice in Christian education—Part 1. *The Journal of Adventist Education* 42 (4): 17-32.
- Alan, Kurt, ed. 1967. *Martin Luther's ninety-five theses*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House.
- Anthony, Michael J., ed. 2001. *The evangelical dictionary of Christian education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Anthony, Michael J., and Warren S. Benson. 2003. *Exploring the history & philosophy of Christian education: Principles for the 21st century*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- Badley, Ken. 1994. The faith/learning integration movement. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 3 (1): 13-33.
- Benson, Clarence H. 1943. *A popular history of Christian education*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Bigge, Morris L. 1971. *Learning theories for teachers*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Blanchard, John. 1971. Can we live with public education? *Moody Monthly* (October): 88-89.
- Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The closing of the American mind*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Blumenfeld, Samuel L. 1981. *Is public education necessary?* Old Greenwich, CT: The Devin-Adair Co.
- Bourne, William Oland. 1870. *History of the public school society of the city of New York*. New York, NY: Wm. Wood and Co.

- Boyd, William. 1950. *The history of western education*. London: Adam and Charles Black.
- Braley, James W., ed. 1998. *How to start a Christian school*. International ed. Colorado Springs, CO: Association of Christian Schools International.
- Brantely, Paul. 1995. Can we be Christian and excellent, too? *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 4 (1): 3-6.
- Brown, Samuel Windsor. 1912. *The secularization of American education*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Brummelen, Harro Van. 2002. *Steppingstones to curriculum: A biblical path*. 2nd ed. Colorado Springs, CO: Purposeful Design Publications.
- Buchanan, Henry A., and Bob W. Brown. 1967. Will Protestant church schools become a third force? *Christianity Today* 11 (12): 3-5.
- Burton, Larry D., and Constance C. Nwosu. 2002. *Student perceptions of the integration of faith, learning, and practice in a selected education course*. Adventist Virtual Learning Network. Retrieved 3 December 2007 from <http://www.avln.org/resources/CCTEPaper.pdf>.
- Butts, R. Freeman, and Lawrence A. Cremin. 1953. *A history of education in the American culture*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and company.
- Cairns, Earle E. 1996. *Christianity through the centuries: A history of the Christian church*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Caper, James C., and Jack Layman. 1995. Independent Christian day schools: Past, present, and prognosis. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 4(1): 6-19.
- Chadwick, Ronald P. 1990. *Christian school curriculum: An integrated approach*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books.
- Claerbaut, David. 2004. *Faith and learning on the edge: A bold new look at religion in higher education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Clark, Gordon H. 1988. *A Christian philosophy of education*. Rev. ed. Unicoi, TN: The Trinity Foundation.
- Cohen, Sheldon S. 1974. *A history of colonial education, 1607-1776*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Colson, Charles, and Nancy Pearcey. 1999. *How now shall we live?* Wheaton, IL: Tyndale.

- Cremin, Lawrence A. 1970. *American education: The colonial experience, 1607-1783*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Cressman, George R., and Harold W. Benda. 1966. *Public education in America: A foundations course*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Cubberley, Ellwood P. 1919. *Public education in the United States*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- _____. 1920. *The history of education*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Cunningham, James, and Anthony Fortosis. 1987. *Education in Christian schools: A perspective and 'training model.'* Whittier, CA: The Association of Christian Schools International.
- Daniel, Eleanor, John W. Wade, and Charles Gresham. 1987. *Introduction to Christian education*. Cincinnati, OH: Standard Publishing.
- DeJong, Norman. 1974. *Education in the truth*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed.
- Dewey, John. 1956. *The school and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dockery, David S., and David P. Gushee, eds. 1999. *The future of Christian higher education*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Dockery, David S. and Gregory A. Thornbury. 2002. *Shaping a Christian worldview*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman.
- Dunn, William Kailer. 1958. *What happened to religious education?* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Eavey, Charles B. 1964. *History of Christian education*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Eby, Frederick. 1934. *The development of modern education*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Eby, Frederick, and Charles Flinn Arrowood. 1940. *The history and philosophy of education ancient and medieval*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Eckel, Mark. 2003. *The whole truth: Classroom strategies for biblical integration*. Longwood, FL: Xulon.
- _____. 2009. A comparison of faith-learning integration between graduates from Christian and secular universities in the Christian school classroom. Ed.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

- Edlin, Richard J. 1999. *The cause of Christian education*. 3rd ed. Colorado Springs, CO: Association of Christian Schools International.
- Eisner, Elliot. 1992. Curriculum ideologies. In *Handbook of research on curriculum*, ed. Philip Jackson, 302-26. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Erickson, Donald A. 1986. Choice and private schools: Dynamics of supply and demand. In *Private education: Studies in choice and public policy*, ed. Daniel C. Levy, 82-112. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Erickson, Millard J. 2001. *Christian theology*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Ferguson, Wallace K., and Geoffrey Bruun. 1969. *A survey of European civilization*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fowler, Stuart. 1980. The Bible in the school. In *No icing on the cake*, ed. J. Mechielsen. Mount Evelyn, 138-40. Victoria, Australia: Brookes-Hall.
- Furst, Lyndon G. 1995. The Excellence Movement: Lessons Learned for Christian Education: An interview with Andrews University's Lyndon G. Furst. Interviewed by Terrel H. Bell. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 4 (Spring): 83-88.
- Gaebelein, Frank. 1954. *The pattern of God's truth: Problems of integration in Christian education*. New York, NY: Oxford University press.
- _____. 1962. Toward a Christian philosophy of education. *Grace Journal*. Retrieved 10 September 2007 from <http://www.te.jbc.edu/syllabus/hled3113/Other%20Info/Articles.pdf>.
- _____. 1964. Toward a philosophy of Christian education. In *An introduction to Evangelical Christian education*, ed. J. Edward Hakes, 37-50. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Gall, Joyce, M. D. Gall, and Walter Borg. 1999. *Applying educational research: A practical guide*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. 1975. August Hermann Francke. In *A history of religious educators*, ed. Elmer Towns, 190-99. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- _____. 1988. Christian school education. In *Schooling choices*, ed. H. Wayne House, 89-167. Portland, OR: Multnomah.
- _____. 1994. Integrating faith and learning: Principles and process. In *A passion for learning: The History of Christian thought on education*, ed. D. Bruce Lockerbie, 395-401. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

- _____, ed. 1983. *Toward a harmony of faith and learning: Essays on Bible college curriculum*. Farmington Hills, MI: William Tyndale College Press.
- Gangel, Kenneth, and Warren S. Benson. 1983. *Christian education: Its history and philosophy*. Chicago, IL: Moody.
- George, Staughton, Thomas McCamant, and Benjamin M. Nead, eds. 1879. *Charter to William Penn, and laws of the province of Pennsylvania, passed between the years 1682 and 1700*. Harrisburg, PA: Lane S. Hart.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Glenn, Charles Leslie, Jr. 1988. *The myth of the common school*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Good, Harry G. 1960. *The history of Western education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Good, Harry G., and James D. Teller. 1969. *A history of western education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Graendorf, Werner C., ed. 1981. *Introduction to biblical Christian education*. Chicago, IL: Moody.
- Graff, Henry J. 1987. *The legacies of literacy*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Graham, Donovan L. 2003. *Teaching redemptively: Bringing grace and truth into your classroom*. Colorado Springs, CO: Purposeful Design Publications.
- Greene, Albert E. 1998. *Reclaiming the future of Christian education: A transforming vision*. Colorado Springs, CO: Association of Christian Schools International.
- Greidanus, Sidney. 1982. The use of the Bible in Christian scholarship. *Christian Scholar's Review* 2:138-47.
- Groves, Fred Herbert. 1990. A qualitative study of the beliefs and professional backgrounds of secondary level science teachers in a public school and a protestant Christian school in Colorado. Ph.D. Diss., University of Colorado.
- Grudem, Wayne. 1984. Biblical reasons for sending children to a Christian school. *Christian School Comment* 16 (4): n.p.
- Guttek, Gerald L. 1983. *Education and schooling in America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- _____. 2001. *Historical and philosophical foundations of education: A biographical introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Hall, Gene E., and Shirley M. Hord. 1984. *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hall, Gene E., and Susan F. Loucks. 1978. *Innovation configurations: Analyzing the adaptations of innovations*. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Hasker, William. 2001. Faith-learning integration: An overview. *Christian Scholar's Review*. Retrieved 3 December 2007 from http://www.cccu.org/resourcecenter/resID.973,parentCatID.89/rc_detail.asp.
- Haycock, Ruth C. 2005. *Encyclopedia of Bible truths*. Colorado Springs, CO: Purposeful Design Publications.
- Heie, Harold, and David L. Wolfe, eds. 1987. *The reality of Christian learning: Strategies for faith-discipline integration*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian university Press.
- Helmreich, Ernst Christian. 1959. *Religious education in German schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hittleman, Daniel R., and Alan J. Simon. 1992. *Interpreting educational research: An introduction for consumers of research*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Hocking, David L. 1978. The theological basis for the philosophy of Christian school education. In *The philosophy of Christian school education*, ed. Paul A. Kienel, 7-28. Whittier, CA: Association of Christian Schools International.
- Holmes, Arthur F. 1987. *The idea of a Christian college*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- _____. 1999. Integrating faith and learning in a Christian liberal arts institution. In *The future of Christian higher education*, ed. David S. Dockery and David P. Gushee, 155-72. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Hord, Shirley M., William L. Rutherford, Leslie Huling-Austin, and Gene E. Hall. 1987. *Taking Charge of Change*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Hunt, Thomas C., and James C. Caper, eds. 1997. *Religion and schooling in contemporary America*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.

- Hunt, Thomas C., and Monalisa Mullins. 2005. *Moral education in America's schools: The continuing challenge*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Hunter, James Davison. 1983. *American evangelicalism: Conservative religion and the quandary of modernity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Johnson, Pauline B. 1972. Art. In *Christ and the modern mind*, ed. Robert W. Smith, 69-78. Downers Grove, IL: IVP.
- Johnson, Phillip E. 1994. Shouting "heresy" in the temple of Darwin: Naturalism has become the civil religion of our universities. *Christianity Today* 38 (24): 22-26.
- Kahn, Samuel G. 1960. *A short history of education*. Jerusalem: Yesodot Publishers.
- Keatinge, M.W. 1896. *The great didactic of John Amos Comenius*. London: Adam and Charles Black.
- Kibuuka, Hudson E. [2011]. *The role of the institution and the teacher in integration of faith and learning: A two dimensional approach for Adventist tertiary institutions*. Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies. Retrieved 15 February 2011 from http://www.aiias.edu/ict/.../12cc_103-120.htm.
- Kienel, Paul A. 1998. *A history of Christian school education*. Vol. 1. Colorado Springs, CO: The Association of Christian Schools International.
- _____. 2005. *A history of Christian school education*. Vol. 2. Colorado Springs, CO: The Association of Christian Schools International.
- _____, ed. 1978. *The philosophy of Christian school education*. Whittier, CA: The Association of Christian Schools International.
- Kittelsohn, James M. 1985. Luther the educational reformer. In *Luther and Learning*, ed. Harran, Marilyn J., 87-102. London: Associated University Presses, Inc.
- Knight, Edgar W. 1940. *Twenty centuries of education*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Knight, George R. 1998. *Philosophy and education: An introduction in Christian perspective*. 3rd ed. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.
- Korniejczuk, Raquel Bovet de. 1994. Stages of deliberate teacher integration of faith and learning: The development and empirical validation of a model for Christian education. Ed.D. diss., Andrews University.

- _____. [2008]. *Integration of faith and learning: Theory and practice*. Part I. The Institute for Christian Teaching. Retrieved 30 March 2008 from http://www.aiias.edu/ict/vol_21/21cc_377-394.pdf.
- _____. 2011. Email from Raquel Bovet de Korniejczuk to You Jung Jang, 16 February.
- Kurtz, Paul, and Edwin H. Wilson. 1973. *Humanist Manifesto II*. American Humanist Association. Retrieved 20 October 2005 from <http://www.jcn.com/manifestos.html>.
- Latourette, Kenneth Schott. 1965. *Christianity through the ages*. New York, NY: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Leedy, Paul and Ormrod Jeanne. 2005. *Practical research: Planning and design*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Luna, Luis Miguel. 1996. *The biblical and theological foundations for the concepts of the integration of faith and learning*. Adventist International Institute of Adventist Studies. Retrieved 15 February 2011 from http://www.aiias.edu/ict/vol_17/17cc_171-191.htm.
- Manson, Mike. 1985. *The mystery of marriage: As iron sharpens iron*. Portland, OR: Multnomah Press.
- Marrow, H.I. 1964. *A history of education in antiquity*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Co.
- Masterson, David Laurence. 1999. Christian humanistic faith/reason integration in contemporary American Protestant evangelical higher education: A case study. diss., Marquette University. Retrieved 15 February 2011 from <http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations/AAI9953493>.
- Mayer, Frederick. 1960. *A history of educational thought*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.
- McBirnie, Robert S. 1978. Assessing the inadequacy of the present. In *The philosophy of Christian school education*, ed. Paul A. Kienel, 175-202. Whittier, CA: The Association of Christian Schools International.
- Mills, Dennis W. 1997. Keys to integration in the faith-learning process. *CSRnet*. Retrieved 3 December 2007 from <http://www.csrnet.org/csrnet/articles/faith-learning.html>.
- Nash, Ronald H. 1990. *The closing of the American heart: What's really wrong with America's schools*. Richardson, TX: Probe Books.

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A nation at risk*. Retrieved 22 November 2005 from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html>.
- Noll, Mark A. 1992. *A history of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapid, MI: Eerdmans.
- Nwosu, Constance C. 1998. Professional development of teachers: A process for integrating faith and learning in Christian schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Michigan Academy of Arts, Science, and Letters, Alma, MI, 27 February. ERIC, ED 422 326.
- Online Dictionary of the Social Sciences. [2008]. *Hidden Curriculum*. Retrieved 11 February 2008 from <http://bitbucket.icaap.org/dict.pl?alpha=H>.
- Orr, James. 1897. *The Christian view of God and the world as centering in the incarnation*. New York, NY: Scribners.
- Overman, Christian, and Don Johnson. 2003. *Making the connections: Biblical worldview integration training workshops*. Nashville, TN: LifeWay.
- Painter, Franklin V.N. 1889. *Luther on education*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House.
- Pazmiño, Robert W. 1997. *Foundational issues in Christian education: An introduction in evangelical perspective*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Pearcey, Nancy. 2004. *Total truth: Liberating Christianity from its cultural captivity*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Peterson, Michael L. 1986. *Philosophy of education: Issues and Options*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Plantinga, Theodore. 1980. *Rationale for a Christian college*. St. Catharines, ON: Paideia Press.
- Qualben, Lars P. 1942. *A history of the Christian church*. New York, NY: Nelson.
- Ravitch, Diane. 1974. *The great school wars*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Reed, James E., and Ronnie Prevost. 1993. *A history of Christian education*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman.
- Religious Education Association, Princeton Religion Research Center, and Gallup Organization. 1985. *Faith development and your ministry*. Princeton, NJ: The Center.

- Ringenberg, William C. 1984. *The Christian college: A history of Protestant higher education in the United States*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Richards, Lawrence O. 1975. *A theology of Christian education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Ringenberg, William C. 1984. *The Christian college: A history of Protestant higher education in the United States*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Rockefeller, Steven C. 1991. *John Dewey: Religious faith and democratic humanism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Rogers, Everett M., and F. Floyd Shoemaker. 1971. *Communication of innovation: A cross-cultural approach*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Roper, David H. 1975. John Dewey. In *A history of religious educators*, ed. Elmer L. Towns, 310-26. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Schaeffer, Francis. 1976. *How should we then live?* Old Tappan, NJ: Revell.
- _____. 1982. *The Christian manifesto*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Schultz, Glen. 1998. *Kingdom education: God's plan for educating future generations*. Nashville, TN: LifeWay Press.
- _____. 2002. *Kingdom education: God's plan for educating future generations*. 2nd ed. Nashville, TN: LifeWay Press.
- _____. 2005. Email from Glen Schultz to You Jung Jang, 25 August.
- Sherrill, Lewis Joseph. 1944. *The rise of Christian education*. New York, NY: the Macmillan Company.
- Smith, David. 1988. Public school education. In *Schooling choices*, ed. H. Wayne House: 19-72. Portland, OR: Multnomah.
- Sollod, Robert N. 1992. The hollow crown. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.18 (March): 55-65.
- Spina, Frank. 1993. What makes it Christian. *Moody Monthly* (March): 41-46.
- Spring, Joel. 1986. *The American School 1642-1985*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Spykman, Gordon. 1997. The place and role of the Bible in the school. In *Shaping school curriculum: A biblical view*, eds. Geraldine Steensma and Harro Van Brummelen, 1-23. Tucson, AZ: Signal.

- Swift, Fletcher H. 1919. *Education in Ancient Israel*. Chicago, IL: The Open Court Publishing Company.
- Taylor, John Wesley V. [2011]. *Instructional strategies for the integration of faith and learning*. Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies. Retrieved 3 January 2011 from http://www.aiias.edu/ict/vol_27/27cc_409-425.htm.
- Ulich, Robert. 1968. *A history of religious education*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Ullmann, W. 1946. A medieval document on papal theories of government. *The English Historical Review* 61: 180-201.
- White, Robert. 1969. The school in Calvin's thought and practice. *Journal of Christian Education* 12(1): 5-26.
- Wilds, Elmer Harrison. 1971. *The foundations of modern education*. New York, NY: Rinehart and Co. Inc.
- Wilhoit, Mel R. 1987. Faith and learning reconsidered: The unity of truth. *Faculty Dialogue*. 9(Fall): 77-87.
- Williams, T. Harry, Richard N. Current, and Frank Freidel. 1966. *A history of the United States [since 1865]*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Willimon, William H. 1993. I was wrong about Christian schools. *Christianity Today* 8 (Fall): 30-32.
- Williams, Dennis E. 1992. *Curriculum planning for evangelical churches*. Denver, Co: Denver Seminary.
- Woodring, Paul. 1953. *Let's talk sense about our schools*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Wyckoff, D. Campbell. 1961. *Theory and design of Christian education curriculum*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.
- Zuck, Roy B. 1971. *Spiritual power in your teaching*. Chicago, IL: Moody.

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING IMPLEMENTED BY CHRISTIAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

You Jung Jang, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011
Chair: Dr. Dennis E. Williams

The integration of faith and learning has been an important topic of discussion in regard to the identity of Christian schools and their reason to exist. Christian educators and researchers, however, have provided minimal help to teachers with the task of its practical implementation. Christian school teachers, therefore, talk about the importance of the integration of faith and learning while they often fail to practice it in their daily classroom teaching. In this regard, this dissertation examined Christian elementary school teachers in order to evaluate their proficiency level to integrate faith and learning in their teaching. It also presented the factors that influence teachers when achieving biblical integration.

For the purposes of this study, ACSI elementary school teachers in Southeast region and Mid-America region were included. The survey instrument, which was originally developed by Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk in her dissertation in 1994 were utilized with a minor revision. The data were analyzed to determine teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning. A *t*-test was conducted in

order to examine if there is any difference in teachers' implementation level according to their educational background or demographic factors. This study also identified the most difficult subject teachers considered when they tried to integrate a biblical worldview and considered the teachers management concerns related to the biblical integration. Finally, a multiple linear regression was run to find out the influential factors on teachers' implementation level of the integration of faith and learning.

The study concluded that ACSI elementary school teachers ranked high in regard to the implementation of the integration of faith and learning. They, however, still need to work on changing their teaching techniques, involving students' opinion, and working together with colleagues. Teachers who took classes in theology, participated in training on the biblical integration, and spent more time to prepare for integrating their faith into their daily teaching tended to reach higher levels of implementation.

Keywords: Christian elementary school teachers, Christian school education, integration of faith and learning

VITA

You Jung Jang

PERSONAL

Born: March 31, 1975
Parents: Chun-myong Jang and Hanook Kim
Married: Young Seo, June 23, 2001

EDUCATIONAL

Diploma, Myoung-sung Woman's High School, Seoul, Korea, 1994
B.A., Ehwa Womans University, Seoul, Korea, 1999
M.Div., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003

MINISTERIAL

Children's Minister, True Light Korean Baptist Church of Louisville,
Louisville, Kentucky, May 2000-April 2002
Children's Minister, Grace Mission Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee,
April 2002-September 2004
Children's Minister, Hanshin Church, Nashville, Tennessee, July 2005-June
2006
Children's Minister, Knoxville Korean Baptist Church, Knoxville, Tennessee,
July 2006-May 2008
Children's Minister, Yeongi Baptist Church, Yeongi-gun, Chung-nam, Korea,
January 2010-August 2011

ACADEMIC

Research Assistant of Dr. Williams, The Southern Baptist Theological
Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2004
Part-time Lecturer, Korean Baptist Theological University, Dae-jeon, Korea,
August 2009-December 2010
Teacher, Global Vision Christian School, Munkyeong-si, Kyeoungsangbuk-
do, Korea, August 2011-

ORGANIZATIONAL

Christian School Education Research Center