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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

“At the heart of all thinking about education, whether Christian or secular, lies the problem of integration” (Gaebelein 1954, ix). Is it possible to live an integrated life of faith and scholarship within secular academia today? Can a Christian scholar integrate his faith with his chosen discipline in such a way as to avoid the charge of either fundamentalism or accommodationism (Craig and Gould 2007, 18)? In seeking to answer the above questions, Christian educators are called to apply biblical truth to the whole educational process, not just parts of it (Graham 2003, xiii). Christian school teachers need to practice the art and science of educating the next generation in a Christianly manner. A biblical starting point for thinking about loving God with our minds can be found in the words of Jesus called the great commandment (Matt 22:36-40), when he states,

“Oh Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?” And he said to him, “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it: You shall love your neighbor as yourself. On these two commandments depend all the Law and the Prophets.”

In this text, Jesus declares the importance of a holistic and complete way of loving God with our hearts, our souls, and our minds. These words of Jesus serve as the framework for carrying out the distinctive mission of Christian education to this ever-changing postmodern culture (Dockery 2007, 11).
All schooling aids children in learning about the world and their place and tasks in it. Christian schooling does this job in the context that challenges students to celebrate the Lordship of Jesus Christ over all creation (Braley, Layman, and White 2003, 69). It is imperative for a Christian school to begin with Scripture at its center in the process of learning in order to convey a biblical worldview (Lockerbie 2007, 7). In relation to Scripture being the epicenter of the formation of a biblical worldview, Kenneth Gangel states, “Any foundation for a Christian worldview must begin with Scripture” (Braley, Layman, and White 2003, 56). This guiding principle is the center of the research concern.

**Introduction to the Research Problem**

The declaration of biblical truth and the acquisition of knowledge intersect into the primary mission of many Christian schools. One of the chief endeavors of a Christian school is to develop a community of faith and learning where discipleship into Christ-likeness is a result. Ideally, when Christians “gather into a community of faith and learning, namely, a Christian school, the teaching and learning is integrated with faith, and the education that occurs leads to transforming young minds and hearts to be more Christ-like” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 52). The praxis of the integration of faith and learning is “the quintessential component linking mission with content, with teacher, and with student” (Eckel 2009, 136). Mark Cosgrove shares that the integration of faith and learning “means the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54). The discipline of the integration of faith and learning occurs when “an assumption or concern can be shown
internally shared by (integral to) both the Christian vision and an academic discipline” (Heie and Wolfe 1987, 5).

The integration of faith and learning is “the raison d’être for Christian schools” or the primary reason Christian schools exist (Nwosu 1998, 3). Kenneth Gangel declares the importance for Christian education to develop in this area when he states, “The teachers and students who wish to develop their minds in an evangelical world-and-life view by thinking Christianly about the surrounding culture, discover that at least three steps seem essential: knowing the Scriptures intimately, studying the culture diligently, and analyzing events and issues theologically” (Gangel 2001, 367). The tendency of modern evangelicals is to compartmentalize in many areas of life resulting in a generation of people who have lost a spiritual center, which results in a fragmented world-and-life view.

Learning how to teach from a biblical point of view is the cornerstone of what it means to teach in a Christian school (Burton and Nwosu 2003; Korniejczuk and Kijai 1994). The unity of knowledge is at best an ideal, but it is nonetheless implicit in the theological conviction that truth is one coherent whole in the omniscient mind of God (Holmes 2001, 115). Arthur Holmes presents the following seven points to show that integration is a biblical mandate:

1. There is a biblical mandate to do and make use of the arts and sciences.
2. The biblical narrative helps us to understand the possibilities and present state of our disciplines and professions.
3. Biblical concepts intersect with particular concepts and theories in the disciplines.
4. There are biblical implications for the methodology and knowledge claims of our disciplines.
5. Biblical virtues are requisite for disciplined scholarship and teaching. (Holmes 1983, 1-4)

Any theocentric philosophy of education requires that biblical truth “permeate the entire academic program and every subject in that program” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 356).

The praxis of the integration of faith and learning in the Christian school movement is a key initiative for Christian educators to produce students who think and act in the world in which they live in a Christ-like manner. The current research investigated and compared the degree to which accredited Christian schools and classical Christian schools practice the integration of faith and learning. The study specifically compared Christian schools to classical Christian schools since each of these Christian school movements employ different pedagogical approaches and differ in educational philosophy. There are key philosophical differences between Christian schools and classical Christian schools that may affect the degree to which the schools practice the integration of faith and learning.

_The Integration of Faith and Learning in Higher Education_

The practice of the integration of faith and learning is more prevalent in Christian higher education than in Christian primary and secondary schools. Many Christian colleges claim as their distinctive concern an active integration of faith and learning across the entire curriculum (Holmes 1991, vii-viii). However, the changes in higher education seem to be “ever-shifting in terms of philosophy, methodology, and delivery system possibilities” (Dockery 2007, 3). All institutions must have some ideology underpinning them: “the secular one has an agnostic or atheistic ideology, while
the Christian one has a faith-based ideology framed from Scripture” (Astley et al. 2004, 8).

In the culture of academia, there seems to be a schism between the Christian faith and serious scholarship because a typical Christian scholar who is committed to a particular view of the world is often quite antithetical to the established secular ethos (Craig and Gould 2007, 18). In Christian higher education, there has been a decomposition of the “Christian worldview in the intellectual life of the colleges” (Ringenburg 2006, 13). This changing influence of what is happening at the intellectual center in colleges and universities has changed the educational foundation of educators being trained in Christian institutions. Frank Gaebelein alludes to the syncretism occurring between secularism and evangelical thought when he states, “Much of evangelical educational thought has yet to move beyond a kind of scholastic schizophrenia in which highly orthodox theology coexists uneasily with a teaching of non-religious subjects that differs little from that in secular institutions” (Gaebelein 1964, 40-41). In relation to this phenomenon, it should be noted that Bible colleges from the beginning of the movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the present have made Scriptures the heart of its curriculum (Ringenburg 2006, 155-60).

One of the leading institutions in Christian higher education in the concept of remaining faithful to biblical truth in every discipline being studied is Union University, led by David Dockery. In relation to the current culture in academia, Dockery states,

We must think wisely, carefully, strategically, and creatively as we look toward the future to enable Christian colleges and universities to become more thoroughly mission driven, grounded in our commitment to offer education that is academically rigorous and unapologetically Christian as we seek to become resources for serious Christian thinking and scholarship in all disciplines for the initial decades of the twenty-first century. (Dockery 2007, 4)
The primary role of a Christian college or university is to represent various academic divisions of the kingdom enterprise so that students take what they learn and apply it in the world with a spirit of Christ-like servanthood (Dockery 2007, 25).

In the last two decades, there have been several studies conducted on the concept of faith and learning integration in Christian post-secondary institutions. In *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from their Christian Churches*, James Burtchaell conducted one of the most comprehensive studies in relation to higher Christian education institutions when he studied the tie of denominational institutions in regard to why their authentic relationship has tended to whither over time. Burtchaell studied institutions with historic bonds to the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Lutherans, the Catholics, and the evangelicals (Burtchaell 1998, ix-x). While this study was not specific to the integration of faith and learning, the work was significant in discovering that most of the institutions no longer have a serious, valued, or functioning relationship with their Christian sponsors of the past (Burtchaell 1998, xi). This loss of relationship between the institution and Christian “sponsor” has made a significant impact upon the research base in the last decade in the area of faith and integration learning at higher education institutions.

Many Christian teachers teaching at Christian schools in the United States are earning degrees from the institutions Burtchaell studied, which indicates that many of the institutions do not have a denomination holding them accountable to delivering a Christian education to the student populations at these institutions. A possible fallout effect for Christian teachers is the potential for teachers to not be teaching their subjects
in a Christocentric way, resulting in the delivery of a secular education within the walls of a Christian school.

**Studies in Higher Education Related to the Integration of Faith and Learning**

In the context of Christian higher education, there have been several specific studies conducted in relation to the integration of faith and learning. Ken Badley examined the various ways the term “integration” and the phrase “the integration of faith and learning” had been used throughout the Christian academy (Badley 1986, 3-10). David Masterson conducted a case study at Gordon College to determine how the school attempts Christian humanistic faith/reason integration throughout its curricular and extra-curricular program (Masterson 1999). Charles Morton explored the phenomenon of faith and learning integration on how the college instructor’s faith actually impacts his or her responsibilities to the academy. Morton’s study focused upon faculty members at colleges affiliated with Southern Baptists (Morton 2004).

Larry Burton and Constance Nwosu conducted a study on Christian teacher education programs, which describe the students’ perceptions of the integration of faith, learning, and practice in educational context. The study helped to provide some tentative evidence of which types of learning experiences are efficacious in helping students integrate faith and learning (Burton and Nwosu 2002).

Constance Nwosu investigated how to train teachers in Christian higher education for the integration of faith and learning in their classrooms, noting that professional development of teachers in Christian schools can foster the integration of faith and learning in individual classrooms and entire campuses. Nwosu focused on the
training methodology of Jesus by identifying components used in the training of Jesus’ disciples and compared these components with current research on training. The outcome of his research was to suggest some specific implications for training related to the integration of faith and learning (Nwosu 1998).

In educational institutions related to the Church of Christ, a study was conducted to investigate the integration of faith with learning in teacher education. The results of the research indicated that three-quarters of the respondents believed it was easy to integrate faith with learning in teacher education. However, the respondents did not feel as strongly about integrating specific religious doctrine as the respondents felt about integrating values and positive principles of faith (Hardin, Sweeney, and Whitworth 1999).

Studies in Elementary and Secondary Education Related to the Integration of Faith and Learning

In relation to Christian higher education, there has been much less research conducted on faith and learning integration at the elementary and secondary levels of Christian education, and more specifically, research conducted in classical Christian schools. Raquel Bouvet de Korniejczuk validated a model for the deliberate integration of faith and learning by secondary teachers in the Seventh Day Adventist tradition (Korniejczuk 1994).

Lesli Welch examined the perceptions of school administrators regarding the factors necessary for integration of faith and learning within secondary education. This nationally scoped research was designed to help identify the perceived institutional and student learning factors necessary for the integration of faith and learning from a school
administration perspective in institutions related to the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) (Welch 2008).

Mark Eckel compared the practice of faith and learning integration between graduates of Christian and secular universities who teach grades 6 to 12 in Mid-America Region schools related to the ACSI (Eckel 2009). Eckel discovered that “individuals who graduated from a Christian university had more knowledge and were better equipped in faith-learning integration overall” (Eckel 2009, 138-39). Prior to this study, Eckel wrote *The Whole Truth: Classroom Strategies for Biblical Integration*, a book to help Christian educators integrate Scripture into their classrooms on a daily basis (Eckel 2003).

You Jung Jang examined the proficiency level of elementary school teachers in ACSI affiliated schools in achieving the task of integrating faith and learning across the academic curriculum. Jang analyzed various factors that influenced teachers when they practice the integration of faith and learning concluding ACSI elementary teachers self-reported a high implementation of the integration of faith and learning. Teachers who took theology classes, participated in biblical integration training, and spent time preparing for integration in their daily pedagogy implemented faith and learning at higher levels (Jang 2011).

There has been no research discovered to indicate if various teaching methods are more effective in the praxis of the integration of faith and learning. There has been limited research conducted on the integration of faith and learning in primary and secondary institutions related to ACSI, but there has been no research discovered that includes institutions that are related to the Association of Classical and Christian Schools.
(ACCS) in the discipline of faith and learning integration. In relation to the research concern, it is necessary to communicate the differences between ACSI and ACCS.

Description of the Association of Christian Schools International

The Association of Christian Schools International (ASCI) formed in 1978 through a merger of the following three associations: The National Christian School Education Association, the Ohio Association of Christian Schools, and the Western Association of Christian Schools. A short time later, several other Christian school associations joined ASCI including 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. In 1994, ACSI formed its international headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado, with seventeen regional offices worldwide. Currently, ACSI has 26 regional offices in 106 countries and serves over 5,900 member schools containing 70,000 teachers and administrators with an enrollment of nearly 1.45 million students. There are 390 ACSI accredited schools with approximately 7,800 teachers in the United States. The mission of ACSI is “to enable Christian educators and schools worldwide to effectively prepare students for life” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). ACSI seeks to achieve this mission by accreditation, certification, and resources.

Description of the Association of Classical and Christian Schools

The Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) formed in 1994, and grew out of a national response to Douglas Wilson’s book, Recovering the Lost Tools
of Learning, published in 1991. The book described the classical philosophy of Logos School in Moscow, Idaho, that was formulated based upon an essay by Dorothy Sayers titled, “The Lost Tools of Learning,” where she presents the Trivium and the need for students to be taught how to learn (Sayers 1947). ACCS began to host national conferences and has continued a steady increase in member schools. The primary mission of ACCS is “to promote, establish, and equip schools committed to a classical approach to education in the light of a Christian worldview grounded in the Old and New Testament Scriptures” (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org).

There has been a rebirth of classical Christian education in the United States within the past thirty years. In 1983, a group of parents founded Logos School in Moscow, Idaho, becoming the first classical Christian school in the modern era. Douglas Wilson, a leader in the movement of classical Christian education, was one of the founders of Logos School. The purpose in founding Logos School was to impart an education that was based not in fundamentalism, but with a purposeful connection to the historic Christian faith (Wilson 2003, 87). In classical Christian education, there is a commitment to Christian orthodoxy and the implementation of teaching methodology related to the Trivium – grammar, logic/dialectic, and rhetoric. Nearly ten years after Logos School formed, the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) was birthed in 1994, due to the desire of many parents seeking to begin classical Christian schools all over the United States. There are approximately 229 ACCS member schools serving 35,162 students. There are twenty ACCS accredited schools and approximately
300 teachers in the United States (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org).

**Difference between ACSI and ACCS Christian Schools Movements**

The primary difference between ACSI and ACCS is related to educational philosophy, and more specifically on a practical level, teaching methodology. ACCS schools utilize the classical teaching methods of the *Trivium* as a pedagogical approach. In addition to teaching methods, another key difference between these school associations is accreditation. ACSI and ACCS schools both have a voluntary accreditation process available to their member schools.

ACSI builds the accreditation process around two main themes: a reflection on the spiritual aspects of each component of the organization and the evaluation of the educational quality and integrity of the organization. “The former addresses the distinctive of a faith-based program or Christian school and the components which make an eternal impact on children, students, and families. The latter addresses the issues demonstrating that the school is true to its own statements of philosophy, mission, and goals and that it is meeting the standards of quality and effectiveness” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). An ACSI “school that commits to striving for excellence through accreditation is agreeing to a process of ongoing review to strengthen and improve effectiveness and the quality of instruction for the population it serves. A school will need to identify the data and research, the information, the evidence, and the documented results that ensure and confirm that it is meeting each standard” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org).
Approximately 390 ACSI accredited schools in the United States will be the focus population for this research with approximately 7,800 teachers.

In the ACCS accreditation process, the accrediting team seeks to measure the following:

How well schools are consistently implementing a classical Christian philosophy of education throughout the entire school organization from school board oversight to classroom pedagogy, including student participation, conduct, development, staff training, parent-teacher relations, operational and financial policies, community support, and the overall spiritual demeanor in the school classrooms. Accredited schools integrate Scripture throughout their schools curricula and demonstrate conformity with the *Trivium* in their teaching. (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org)

In the United States, there are approximately 229 ACCS member schools containing about 3,435 teachers in kindergarten to 12*th* grade serving more than 35,162 students. There are 20 ACCS accredited schools in the United States with approximately 300 teachers (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org).

The two associations have an emphasis on the focus of spiritual components of the educational primarily known as biblical integration. The primary difference of the accreditation process between ACSI and ACCS is related to ACCS’s school “conformity with the *Trivium*” in the teaching methodology.

**Research Purpose**

The literature base regarding the integration of faith and learning is primarily related to Christian higher education. This present study fills a void in the literature gap by analyzing and comparing the integration of faith and learning being conducted in K-12 Christian schools that are accredited by the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) and by the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS).
The larger worldwide Christian school movement is headed by ACSI, and ACCS leads the larger classical Christian school movement. Accredited schools from both ACSI and ACCS have been through an extensive process during the self-study for accreditation to note their implementation of integration. The researcher examined whether the distinctive of classical Christian education in relation to Christian education is more effective in the implementation of faith and learning integration. Unlike ACSI educators, classical educators do not see “subjects as self-contained and isolated, but knowledge is more like a web than a chest of drawers; there are no subjects unrelated to each other” (Perrin 2004, 26).

Research Questions

The following questions directed the collection and analysis of data for the research study:

1. To what degree, if any, are Christian educators integrating faith and learning in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI?

2. To what degree, if any, are classical Christian educators integrating faith and learning in classical Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACCS?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools?

4. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?

Delimitations of the Study

In order to gain a fresh perspective on the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools, the research was delimited to teachers teaching at a Christian school for at least three years. This aided in
reducing various factors that may have distorted the collected data such as inexperience in Christian education, unfamiliarity with subject being taught, and lack of commitment to Christian education.

The study was delimited to schools that are accredited members of ACSI, and therefore not generalizable to Christian schools that are not accredited member schools of ACSI. Every accredited member school is required to hold to the ACSI Statement of Faith that distinguishes them as an evangelical school. All accredited ACSI schools have gone through a process of intentional biblical integration within the classroom that is the practical result of faith and learning integration.

The study was confined to schools that are accredited member schools of the ACCS; therefore, the research is not generalizable to Christian schools that are not accredited member schools of ACCS. All ACCS accredited member schools are required to hold to a statement of faith that distinguishes them as an evangelical Christian school committed to Christian orthodoxy. ACCS member schools conduct a form of integration of faith and learning during the praxis of educating, which is termed biblical integration. There is a conscious effort on ACCS member schools to conduct biblical integration in all subject areas.

The study was delimited to accredited ACSI schools and accredited ACCS schools within the United States; therefore, the study is not generalizable to accredited ACSI schools or accredited ACCS schools outside the United States.

The study did not explore faith and learning integration of Christian education at a post-secondary level. The intent for the research was to examine and compare the
integration of faith and learning occurring between the elementary and secondary levels of Christian schools and classical Christian schools (grades K-12).

**Terminology**

The following definition of terms aided in understanding the current research and how they were used in the study:

*Ability to do.* One of the four research subscales of the integration of faith and learning that correlates with the research instrument (Appendix 1, questions 15-21). The *ability to do* subscale of the integration of faith and learning measures a teacher’s capacity to practice the integration of faith and learning from both internal and external factors (Eckel 2009, 163).

*Accreditation.* The Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) defines accreditation as “a national benchmark of quality that is a voluntary process validated by peer review and involving systematic self-evaluation against nationally accepted standards” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). The goal of the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) school accreditation program is to provide objective and recognized standards of quality for those schools desiring to serve Christ through an explicitly classical Christian protestant Christian approach to undergraduate education (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). The operative definition of accreditation for this study will be the successful completion of a specific process set forth by either ACSI or ACCS where a school has conducted a voluntary self-study that has been validated by peer review and meets specific standards set forth by ACSI or ACCS.
ACSI. The Association of Christian Schools International is an international organization established to enable and equip Christian educators and schools worldwide to effectively educate children and young people with the mind of Christ. ACSI believes biblical integration of every planned learning experience is crucial to effective Christian schooling. This organization offers accreditation programs to ensure excellence in Christian education (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org).

ACCS. The Association of Classical and Christian Schools is an “international organization established to promote, establish, and equip schools committed to a classical approach to education in light of a Christian worldview grounded in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. This organization offers membership and accreditation processes for membership schools in order to ensure a standard of excellence in classical Christian education” (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org).

Christian education. Robert Pazmiño articulates a classic definition of Christian education when he states, “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 expressed in the Scriptures and preeminently in the person of Jesus Christ, as well as any outcomes of that effort” (Pazmiño 1997, 87). For this study, the researcher used Pazmiño’s definition in the context of the broader category of Christian education to refer to primary and secondary schools.


Christian school. A Christian school is different than Christian education and may be defined as “the formal pedagogical instruction of children in a school that manifests the principles of biblical Christian doctrine through both teaching and living. The entire curriculum of a Christian school should exemplify a biblical world-and-life view” (Lockerbie 2007, xxi). The curriculum of a Christian school will seek to impart a biblical worldview in all aspects of life. A Christian school will utilize Christian doctrines as set forth in Scripture as the foundation for all teaching.

Christian worldview. A worldview is simply the “sum total of a person’s answers to the most important questions in life” (Nash 1999, 13). It is the “interpretive framework for creating understanding and making sense of reality” (Harris 2004, 4). “The Christian worldview is structured, first of all, by the revealed knowledge of God” (Mohler [2011], albertmohler.com). The Christian worldview is composed of those fundamental Christian beliefs that describe the relationship between God and creation (Pazmiño 1997, 82).

Classical Christian schools. A classical Christian school shapes its understanding of all things, including the educational endeavor, from Christian truth. The pedagogical methodology of the Trivium is utilized in classical schools, which includes the following three stages: grammar, logic/dialectic, and rhetoric (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). The combination of Christian truth and incorporation of the three stages of the Trivium in the pedagogy sets a classical Christian school apart from mainstream Christian schools. These schools are applying the pedagogical approach of the Trivium with the heritage of the Western culture (Wilson 2003, 84).
**Common grace.** This concept of “the grace of God is the means by which God gives people innumerable blessings that are not a part of salvation in Jesus Christ” (Grudem 1994, 1238). “Ordinary or general grace aims at the preservation of the powers of the original creation, to develop them to some extent, and thus prepare the field in which by and by the seed of eternal life will be planted. And altho this ordinary grace is not effectual to salvation, any more than the mere plowing of the field can ever germinate the wheat which is not sown in the furrows, yet this plowing of ordinary grace has real significance for the future growth of the seed of eternal life” (Kuyper 1900, 634). The doctrine of common grace “recognizes the gifts we see in unregenerate human beings as gifts from God” (Hoekema 1986, 200).

**Doctrine.** The entirety of Scripture’s teaching about a particular topic. It is a theological formation that attempts to provide a summary of the teaching of Scripture on a particular theological topic (Grenz, Guretzki, and Nordling 1999, 40).

**Education.** The Latin root of the word education, *educare,* “originally contains both an infilling process as well as a drawing out process where the emphasis is on impression and expression as well as nourishing and exercising” (Chadwick 1982, 23). Education should seek to “address all aspects of the human person” (Pearcey 2004, 129). In seeking to define education in a succinct and comprehensive manner, Michael Anthony states, “In its most basic form, education can be understood as the intentional process of facilitating preferred learning. As such, education is a systematic approach to intentional learning that combines the activity of educating students, the process of students becoming educated, and the educational result of this approach” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 16).
Education is not limited to schooling or the traditional curriculum or methodologies of a church or school. The process of education is “lifelong that can take place in an infinite variety of circumstances and contexts” (Knight 1998, 10). At the core of education, “the innermost component is a worldview or the philosophical and theological understanding of reality, truth, and values” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 18).

_Equipped._ One of the four research subscales of the integration of faith and learning that correlates with the research instrument (Appendix 1, questions 8-14). The _equipped_ subscale of the integration of faith and learning measures a teacher’s skills, resources, and instructional approaches to practice the integration of faith and learning (Eckel 2009, 163).

_Faith._ In this study, faith will be tied to the concept of saving faith where one trusts in Jesus Christ alone for forgiveness of sins and for eternal life with God (Grudem 1994, 710). This will enable one to see life from a biblical worldview in the area of metaphysics and epistemology.

_Grammar stage._ This is first stage of the _Trivium_ in the liberal arts tradition referring to grades K-6. The grammar stage is concerned with the accumulation of facts since children of this age, kindergarten through sixth grade, love to memorize (Wilson 1991, 93). The student learns the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. Students in grades kindergarten to sixth are naturally good at memorization, and the grammar stage takes full advantage of this fact. Grammar is simply “the study of the structure of language requiring both preparation (the development of reading, writing, spelling, and vocabulary skills) and materials for practice (literature, both in the
vernacular and in other language)” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 89). This forms the foundation from which all other subjects can be approached.

Integration. “Integration is the process of bringing together the knowledge discovered through search for truth with the special revelation of truth through God’s communication with humans” (Clement 2001, 365). “Genuine integration occurs when an assumption or concern can be shown to be internally shared by both the Judeo-Christian vision and an academic discipline” (Heie and Wolfe 1987, 5). “Integration is concerned not so much with attack and defense as with positive contributions of human learning to an understanding of the faith and to the development of a Christian worldview” (Holmes 1987, 46). Christian integration rests on spiritual mindedness and involves “knowing the Scriptures intimately, studying the culture diligently; and analyzing events and issues theologically” (Gangel 2001, 367).

Integration of faith and learning. The integration of faith and learning “may be defined as a scholarly project whose goal is to develop integral relationships which exist between the Christian faith and human knowledge, particularly as expressed in the various academic disciplines” (Hasker [2005], cccu.org). The integration of faith and learning “means the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54).

Intentionality. One of the four research subscales of the integration of faith and learning that correlates with the research instrument (Appendix 1, questions 22-28). The intentionality subscale of the integration of faith and learning measures a teacher’s deliberate implementation and intent to improve in the integration faith and learning.
Intentionality also measures the teacher’s coordination with other teachers to maximize the impact of the integration faith and learning (Eckel 2009, 163).

**Learning.** Learning involves a series of interrelated complex processes that involve perceiving, remembering, applying, and valuing (Anthony 2001, 118). Learning occurs when one is able to acquire knowledge through a series of connecting certain responses to stimuli and then weaves new material and old material into insightful reorganizations (Wilhoit and Dettoni 1998, 8-9). Learning requires the involvement of the person, occurring at a level that engages the person’s whole being, and requires a person to commit to something as the truth and then act upon it (Graham 2003, 148). Effective learning requires the continuing presence and work of the Holy Spirit (Pazmiño 1997, 39).

**Level.** One of the four research subscales of the integration of faith and learning that correlates with the research instrument (Appendix 1, questions 1-7). The level subscale of the integration of faith and learning measures a teacher’s overall knowledge and preparation to practice the integration of faith and learning in the classroom (Eckel 2009, 163).

**Logic stage.** This is second stage of the Trivium in the liberal arts tradition referring to grades 7-9. Many in the classical Christian movement use the term dialectic to refer to this stage. The student studies formal logic and art of argumentation. Students in grades seventh through ninth have a natural argumentative tendency, which if properly channeled will enable children to think and draw their own conclusions based on facts. A key component of this stage is the development and progression of critical thinking skills. Literally, this is the art of “talking things through” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 108).
**Perennialism.** A contemporary theory of education arising in the 1930s as a response to progressive education that stresses the importance of mind, reason, and the great works of the intellectual past. Perennialism advocates a “return to the absolutes and focus on time-honored ideas of human culture – those ideas that have proven their validity and usefulness by having withstood the test of time” (Knight 1998, 108).

**Primary and secondary Christian schools.** This form of Christian education includes the pedagogy of individuals between the ages of 5 and 19. For this study, the researcher will focus upon teachers who are in the classroom with kindergarten to 12th grade.

**Quadrivium.** The Quadrivium refers to the last four of the seven liberal arts and consists of astronomy, arithmetic, music, and geometry. In the artes liberales tradition, or “liberal arts,” the Quadrivium was known as the quantitative arts that followed the Trivium or verbal arts in scope of study (Perrin 2004, 11).

**Rhetoric stage.** This is third stage of the Trivium in the liberal arts tradition referring to grades 10-12. Aristotle called rhetoric, “The faculty of seeing all available means of persuasion in any situation” (Aristotle 1991). The rhetoric student learns how to give expression to thoughts and depends a great deal on the grammar and logic stages. In the high school years, self-expression is very important. The student who is classically trained will be able to communicate their thoughts with eloquence and clarity.

**Teacher.** A person using classrooms, books, laboratories, and co-curricular teaching aids to transmit information to students (Jessen 2001, 678). A teacher may teach students information, skills, habits, and values using curricular resources and by
modeling his or her life in front of the students as the living curriculum (Anthony 2001, 12).

Teaching. Teaching is “an art guided by educational values, personal needs, and by a variety of beliefs or generalization that the teacher holds to be true” (Eisner 2002, 154).

Teaching methodology. “Methods are selected for the purpose of engaging students in the learning process. Methods are the means by which teachers engage in various learning domains” (Richards and Bredfeldt 1998, 184).

Trivium. The Trivium refers to the first three of the seven liberal arts and consists of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. The Trivium “corresponds to three basic, progressing stages in the development of a child: from kindergarten through about the sixth grade is the grammar stage; the junior high years (seventh through ninth grade) are the dialectic, or logic stage; and the high school years (tenth through twelfth) are the rhetoric stage” (Strawbridge 2002, 4). Grammar is understood as the constituent parts of each subject. Dialectic, also known as logic, is the process and formation of critical thinking about the grammar data. The study of rhetoric is concerned with the art of speaking with eloquence and persuasiveness (Wilson 2003, 132-33). The distinct stages of the Trivium are “the fundamental art of education, of teaching, and of being taught” (Joseph and McGlinn 2002, 6-7). The Trivium is “not a pedagogical paradigm, but a collection of disciplines that are transferable to other subjects” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 74).

Worldview. A worldview contains a person’s answers to life’s biggest questions and the lenses by which a person views reality. It may be thought of as the
“framework of a person’s beliefs” (Nash 1999, 13). A worldview is similar to “a mental map that tells people how to navigate the world effectively” (Pearcey 2004, 23). A worldview is “a set of presuppositions (assumptions which may be true, partially true or entirely false) which is held (consciously or subconsciously, consistently or inconsistently) about the basic makeup of the world” (Sire 1997, 16).

**Research Assumptions**

The research assumptions foundational to this study were as follows:

1. It was assumed that all the teachers in this study were Christians.
2. It was assumed that each of the self-reports conducted in the study were accurate with what the teachers practice.
3. It was assumed that classical Christian schools operate from the *Trivium* in teaching methodology.
4. It was assumed that ACSI and ACCS accredited schools seek to incorporate a biblical worldview by practicing biblical integration in the classroom.
5. It was assumed that the integration of faith and learning is a chief component of Christian education and classical Christian education.
6. It was assumed that Christian teachers and classical Christian teachers have formulated and teach from their Christian worldview philosophy, which impacts both the teaching and the learning occurring in the classroom.

**Procedural Overview**

The purpose of this study was to analyze and compare the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools. This study used a quantitative survey format with a randomly selected group of ACSI and ACCS teachers serving in accredited ACSI and ACCS schools. The researcher used an instrument originally developed and used by Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk.
(Korniejczuk 1994) and modified by Mark Eckel (Eckel 2009) to examine the degree to which Christian school teachers and classical Christian school teachers conduct faith and learning integration on the elementary and secondary levels.

The researcher gathered data from kindergarten to 12th grade teachers in ACSI and ACCS accredited schools in the United States. The teachers received a survey disseminated to them by email from their school administrator asking questions about the level of the integration of faith and learning based on the following research subscales: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality. The teachers were requested to respond to a survey that asked general demographic information, number of years taught in Christian schools or classical Christian schools, and training they have received regarding the integration of faith and learning.
CHAPTER 2
PRECEDENT LITERATURE

The heart of Christian education is to manifest wisdom, knowledge, and understanding by integrating learning under the reality and Lordship of Jesus Christ (Lockerbie 2007, xxv). James Estep describes the importance of theology in the Christian education endeavor when he states, “Christian education is Christian because what one believes theologically should inform and influence not only the content of education but also the overall approach to education” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 2). Kenneth Gangel grounds the approach to education in Scripture when he says, “The Bible stands at the center of curriculum for any evangelical institution wishing to pursue integration” (Gangel 2001, 366). In relation to Christian school education, Frank Gaebelein states, “We must recognize that we need teachers who see their subjects, whether scientific, historical, mathematical, literary, or artistic, as included in the pattern of God’s truth” (Gaebelein 1954, 23).

Christian educators who are evangelical in theological orientation need to make a concerted effort to affirm those biblical insights that provide the essential authority for both theory and practice (Pazmiño 1997, 9). Unfortunately, Christian educators and schools do not always seek to put forth an effort to align Christian beliefs with the praxis of teaching. Nancy Pearcey communicates this travesty well when she says,
In many Christian schools, the typical strategy is to inject a few narrowly defined “religious” elements into the classroom, like prayer and Bible memorization – and then teach exactly the same content as secular schools. The curriculum merely spreads a layer of spiritual devotion over the subject matter like icing on a cake, while the content itself stays the same. (Pearcey 2004, 37)

A Christian educator must seek to address all aspects of the student, which may be thought of as a holistic approach to education. Kenneth Gangel communicates the difficulty of a holistic approach to education and thinking when he states,

Holistic Christian thinking does not just happen; effective Christian teachers deliberately design it. An evangelical philosophy calls Christian educators to bring culture and Christ into close union without fear that culture will destroy truth. But such practice can only happen if teachers approach the procedure with a careful balance between open-mindedness and unchallenged doctrine. (Gangel 2001, 367)

A holistic approach to Christian education and thinking is necessary for the compilation and adoption of a biblical worldview that will be practiced in all aspects of a student’s life. The integration of faith and learning is the crux of delivering a Christian education that helps students to adopt a biblical worldview in which they think and apply it holistically to their lives.

The art and science of unifying one’s faith with learning in the discipline of Christian education is known as the integration of faith and learning. The concept of faith and learning integration is a concept that has been written about by the early church fathers and throughout the history of the church (Augustine 1954; Lockerbie 2007; Martyr 1948; Origen 1950; Tertullian 1982). In relation to God’s truth, “the early church fathers summed up what has become a guidepost for Christian scholars ever since – all truth is God’s truth, wherever it is found” (Holmes 1987, 17). Studying the early church fathers provides value for contemporary Christians seeking to understand how theology relates to issues in culture both in the past and in the present (Haykin 2011).
During the period of the early church, there was controversy whether or not believers in Jesus Christ should learn, especially from secular philosophers, because the thought of the day was that a pagan education could lead to corruption. For example, Justin (AD 100 – AD 165) served as a teacher of philosophy prior to coming to faith in Christ and may have been the first Christian to express “the integration of faith and learning” (Lockerbie 2007, 27). In *The Second Apology*, he writes concerning the Logos, “Whatever were rightly said among all people are the property of us Christians. For next to God, we worship and love the logos who is from the unbegotten and ineffable God, since also He became man for our sakes, that, becoming a partaker of our sufferings, He might also bring us healing” (Justin 1997, 84). Justin searched for truth in philosophy and believed biblical revelation was the criterion for truth while welcoming all philosophy that was congruent with Scripture (Gangel and Benson 1983, 84).

Tatian the Syrian called for a “complete withdrawal from all secular learning” for Christians because of the rampant paganism entrenched in the school’s curriculum (Jones 2009, 5). Tertullian of Carthage (AD 160 – AD 220) was opposed to Christian teachers serving in secular schools, but did think it was permissive for children to attend secular schools (Gangel and Benson 1983; Jones 2009, 5; Reed and Prevost 1993). Tertullian served as a lawyer and opposed Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen who were proponents of pagan literature being beneficial for Christians, but also “recognized that Christians could not live in ignorance without cultivating their critical powers of reason” (Lockerbie 2007, 49). Tertullian’s conviction began many to think and write about the relationship between secular literature and philosophy to biblical truth when he formulated the questions:
But what Relation is there between Athens and Jerusalem? What Communion hath the Academy with the Church? or what part have Hereticks with Christians? Our Institution is from Solomons Porch, who hath taught us to seek the Lord in Simplicity of Heart. And let Them look to this who have introduced a Stoical, a Platonick, or a Sophistical Christianity. (Tertullian [2011], tertullian.org)

A vigilant “suspicion” of Greek and Roman literature was a common thread of Tertullian’s thinking of Christian faith in relation to the secular culture (Reed and Prevost 1993, 78).

Augustine of Hippo (AD 354 – AD 430), a teacher of rhetoric, taught “knowledge of pagan culture and learning is worthwhile for a Christian, provided such knowledge finds its proper place” (Lockerbie 2007, 29). In relation to the integration of faith and learning, Augustine was a forerunner to see value in utilizing some of the truths gained from what he calls “heathen,” as evidenced by his writings in On Christian Doctrine when he states,

If those who are called philosophers . . . have said aught that is true . . . we are not only to shrink from it, but to claim it for our own use from those who have unlawful possession of it . . . they contain also liberal instruction which is better adapted to use the truth in the same way all branches of heathen learning . . . we must take and turn to Christian use. (Augustine 1954, 655)

Augustine believed that wisdom is superior to knowledge and faith is superior to both wisdom and knowledge (Lockerbie 2007, 29). The use of secular thought by Christians in the realm of academia has been discussed for centuries and finds a prominent role in contemporary education especially for the Christian educator.

The praxis of faith and learning integration is critical for a professional educator teaching at any Christian institution. Eddie Baumann confirms the importance of educators engaging in integration for the development of biblical thinking when he states, “Educators comprehend the necessity to engage in integration when they
understand that a biblical worldview requires distinctively biblical thinkers – people who can apply biblical concepts to how they operate in the world” (Baumann 2008, 32). To be truly Christian, to find truth, “learning must start with God in every discipline” (Clauerbaut 2004, 93). In this precedent literature review, the researcher will share a biblical and theological foundation for the integration of faith and learning, state the terms relevant to the current research, present salient models of the integration of faith and learning, and communicate a history of classical Christian education.

**Biblical Foundations for the Integration of Faith and Learning**

David Dockery states, “Christian thinking must surely subordinate all other endeavors to the improvement of the mind in pursuit of truth, taking every thought captive to Jesus Christ (2 Cor 10:5)” (Dockery and Thornbury 2002, 14). Thinking Christianly involves the believer bringing every thought captive to the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Truly, “all learning, all schooling, formal or informal, simple or sophisticated – exists for the love of God and the love of man” (Piper 2010, 54). The apostle Paul shares three different times in 2 Corinthians of the importance of thinking in a Christ-centered manner and the result of being led astray from Christ when one does not engage in thinking Christianly (2 Cor 3:14; 4:4; 11:3). In 2 Corinthians 3:14, Paul reminds the church at Corinth that the minds of the Israelites were hardened in Moses’ day (Exod 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9). Francis Schaeffer argues that “true spirituality covers all of life, and the Lordship of Christ covers all of life and all of life equally. In this sense, there is nothing concerning reality that is not spiritual” (Schaeffer 1981, 19).
Theology is central to Christian teaching ministries and to every dimension of life (Yount 2008, 32). The definition of theology is simply the study of the nature of God. In relation to theology and education, Perry Downs states, “The educational task itself is sacred, because it concerns those who bear God’s image, and is a means of participation in God’s redemptive work in the world” (Anthony 2001, 696).

In pondering the relationship between the integration of faith and learning and Christian education, it is helpful to think of the central turning points in biblical history as creation, fall, redemption, and consummation. The original creation of God was “very good” (Gen 1:31). At the Fall of man in Genesis 3, the rebellion of the entire created order entered and exists to this day. The plan of redemption by placing faith and trust in Jesus Christ alone is the centerpiece of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ (Gen 3:15; Rom 3:24; 1 Cor 1:30; Eph 1:7; Col 1:13-14; Heb 9:12). In redemption, God gives a “new heart and new spirit” (Ezek 36:26), meaning that our entire being is being made new (2 Cor 5:17). God redeems the whole person, giving new direction to his or her thoughts, emotions, will, and habits (Pearcey 2004, 46).

The biblical metanarrative of the Christian faith of creation, fall, redemption, and consummation (Carson 2008; Goldsworthy 2002; Graham 2003; Littlejohn and Evans 2006; Miller 1956; Pazmiño 1997; Pearcey 2004; Plantiga 2002) is foundational for laying a biblical and theological foundation for the integration of faith and learning. Albert Mohler states, “The biblical master narrative serves as a framework for the cognitive principles that allow the formation of an authentically Christian worldview” (Mohler [2011], albertmohler.com). Since one of the chief goals of Christian school education is to teach students a biblical worldview, the “master narrative” or biblical
metanarrative must be explored in relation to the integration of faith and learning. The biblical metanarrative and the doctrine of revelation will serve as the framework for the declaration of the biblical and theological foundation relevant to the integration of faith and learning.

Creation

The first order of the metanarrative of the Christian faith is the doctrine of creation. How did everything come into existence? The question of origin is a foundational question for any worldview to seek to answer, and this is foundational for the starting point of the educational endeavor and the integrative process. The starting point for the Christian world-and-life view is the doctrine of creation. Creation generally refers to the events of Genesis 1, when God created the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all that is in them. In Scripture, “there is a beginning of all things, and that beginning occurred when God created the world (Gen 1:1; Job 38:4; Ps 90:2; 102:25; Isa 40:21; 41:4; 46:10; John 1:1; Heb 1:10; 1 John 1:1; Rev 1:8; 3:14; 21:6; 22:13)” (Frame 2002, 290). The biblical evidence teaches that God created the entire universe ex nihilo, literally “out of nothing,” creation was originally very good (Gen 1), and God created for his own glory (Grudem 1994, 262-263). Nothing internal or external to God compelled him to create (Plantiga 2002, 22).

The work of creation is attributed to God the Father (Gen 1:1), God the Son (Col 1:16), and to God the Holy Spirit (Job 26:13; Ps 104:30) (Tozer 1961, 23). The doctrine of creation provides a framework for attributing authority and origination with God (Exod 20:11; Neh 9:6; Ps 19:1; 33:6, 9; 146:5-6; Rom 11:36). Creation is an
expression of the wisdom of God and a revelation of the great mind of the triune God (Ps 104:24; Prov 3:19; 8:1, 22-36; Jer 10:12; 51:15; Job 38-42) (Frame 2002, 294).

The doctrine of creation provides the starting point for an understanding of the biblical worldview that is the framework for the praxis of faith and learning integration. An understanding of the doctrine of creation is important because it is foundational in understanding other doctrines (Erickson 1998, 393). In relation to education, the doctrine has relevance for educators because “God enthusiastically and repeatedly declared what He had created as good” (Graham 2003, 28). There are two key subcategories of the doctrine of creation related to the integration of faith and learning: human beings as image-bearers and the cultural mandate.

**Human Beings as Image-Bearers**

An essential doctrine of Scripture in relation to Christian education is that mankind is created as *imago Dei* or in the image of God (Gen 1:26-27). Anthony Hoekema shares the importance of this Genesis 1:26-27 when he states,

> The Hebrew word for image, *tselem*, is derived from a root that means “to carve” or “to cut.” It could therefore be used to describe a carved likeness of an animal or a person. When it is applied to the creation of man in Genesis 1, the word *tselem* indicates that man imaged God, that is, is a representation of God. The Hebrew word for likeness, *demuth*, comes from a root that means “to be like.” One could therefore say that the word Demuth in Genesis 1 indicates that the image is also a likeness, “an image unto is.” The two words together tell us that man is a representation of God who is like God in certain aspects. (Hoekema 1986, 13)

When originally created, human beings imaged God in a sinless and perfect way towards God, towards others, and towards nature. An implication of the *imago Dei*, is that human beings reflect God as responsible agents and are ultimately responsible to their Creator and Ruler (Hoekema 1986, 14). As image-bearers of God, human beings also possess
creativity and can think, learn, and reason in the world. In relation to education, Nancy Pearcey states, “Creation tells us that children are created in the image of God, which means they have the great dignity of being creatures with a capacity for love, morality, rationality, artistic creation, and all the other uniquely human capabilities” (Pearcey 2004, 129). Eddie Baumann believes developing the image of God is an essential component in the integrative process when he shares,

“Unlike curriculum integration, developing the image of God is not only a call to know but a call to act. The effects of sin have distorted God’s image, so developing the image of God humanizes students in a Godly manner – a purpose shared by but misapprehended by Enlightenment thinkers. For Christian educators, the goal of developing knowledge and reason is to prepare students to respond to God and to use knowledge in ways to bring glory to Him. Integration that seeks to develop God’s image requires teachers to give students opportunities to use what they have learned in ways that correspond to God’s purposes for learning.” (Baumann 2010, 33-34)

The development of image-bearers of God is a key aspect of the integration of faith and learning.

**Cultural Mandate**

In relation to the integration of faith and learning, the cultural mandate is significant in thinking about the created order and human beings in relation to culture. As part of the doctrine of creation, Genesis 1:28-29 is a biblical starting point for the integration of faith and learning since humanity is called to rule the earth for God and develop a God-glorifying culture (Hoekema 1986, 14). A key task for educators is to “encourage persons to fulfill their responsibilities, ultimately with respect to their relation to the Creator God” (Pazmiño 1997, 70). The doctrine of creation provides a critical foundation for epistemology; that is, the order, structure, and validity of knowledge (Nash 1999, 388) and the way in which many subjects are taught, specifically in the area
of science and the arts. Arthur Holmes presents a helpful connection between the


doctrine of creation and the integration of faith and learning when he states,

Implicit in the doctrine of creation is a cultural mandate and a call to the creative
integration of faith and learning and culture. It is a call, not just to couple piety with
intellect, not just to preserve biblical studies in our school, but more basically to see
every area of thought and life in relation to the wisdom and will of God to replenish
the earth with the creativity of human art and science. (Holmes 1987, 21)

A significant aspect of the cultural mandate in a fallen world is the redemption of culture
for the glory of God. Ultimately, the doctrine of creation presents humankind with the
impetus to carry forth the mission and calling upon Christians to connect all aspects of
life to the infinite wisdom of the Creator.

The principle of stewardship is embedded in the cultural mandate. Eddie
Baumann states, “Any unit of instruction that seeks to give students an understanding of
how to use the content knowledge and their talents in light of God’s value fulfills the
biblical mandate to educate students to be stewards – and prepares students to fulfill their
biblical obligation to use their talents and resources to develop and care for others and the
creation” (Baumann 2010, 34). Christian schools are called to extend the cultural
mandate to apply biblical stewardship in all academic disciplines and extracurricular
activities. The primary way this occurs in praxis is through the integration of faith and
learning.

Fall

“The consequences of the Fall are universal and devastating because they are
first and foremost a revolt against the Almighty” (Carson 2008, 47). When the Fall
occurred, sin entered the world corrupting the imago Dei, but not destroying it. The
biblical teaching on humanity and the human nature is summed up well by John
Hammett’s categories: humans are created beings, humans are created in the image of God, humans are created as male and female, humans are created to work, humans are created for community, and humans are not as we were once created – humans are fallen (Akin 2007, 341-42). The Fall of man perverted the image of God in man in such a way that it “perverted the image of man” causing “man to now use the earth and its resources for selfish gain” (Hoekema 1986, 85). In relationship to the cultural achievement of humans, the goal in a post-Fallen world is to magnify self instead of seeking to magnify God. It is pertinent to explore the effects the Fall has had upon education.

**The Effects of the Fall on Education**

In Christian education, it is imperative to recognize the believer as a learner having a dual nature in that he is made in the image of God, but is a fallen creature (Chadwick 1982, 22). Human beings do have a nature to sin, and this nature to sin was not God’s original plan before the Fall of man. The “noetic” effects of the Fall subvert a person’s ability to understand the world apart from God’s regenerating grace (Pearcey 2004, 45). In other words, the Fall did affect and corrupt a person’s ability to think and reason, but the Fall did not make this human ability obsolete. The Fall has had a significant impact on all of the processes involved in cognition and epistemology.

The effect sin has upon the mind corrupts the educational process and the ability to learn and garner knowledge. The good news is that God has addressed human corruption, and it is on this gracious initiative that Christian hope centers (Plantiga 2002, 68). How does sin impact the teaching process? In seeking to answer this question, Robert Pazmiño states, “One obvious way is that when persons are involved, sin is a given. The challenge for the teachers and all participants is to reduce the potential for
dysfunction and to encourage a liberating or transformative educational experience for all” (Pazmiño 2001, 43).

An understanding of humanity as image-bearers of God that have fallen into sin is critical in seeking to understand the nature and role of the learner. After the Fall, the image of God was not annihilated but perverted so that human beings now function wrongly towards God, towards others, and towards nature (Hoekema 1986, 95). Even though the entrance of sin brought alienation and the deterioration of relationships, the essence of the Gospel is restoration and rebuilding relationships (Knight 1998, 195). All human beings are image-bearers of God even in their unbelieving state (Baumann 2010, 33). This biblical truth is foundational to understanding the contributions unbelievers can make to the field of knowledge.

The implications for Christian education are that human beings are able to think and act imperfectly in a fallen world. The image of God practically shows up in the following areas of life: moral aspects, spiritual aspects, mental aspects, relational aspects, physical aspects, and dignity aspects (Grudem 1994, 445-49). George Knight presents the following four points that a Christian educator should note in relation to the student:

1. The Bible treats individuals as holistic units (Gen 2:7; John 5:28-29; 1 Thess 4:16-17; 1 Cor 15:51-54).
2. If persons are to be fully human, they must be controlled by their minds rather than by their animal appetites and propensities.
3. The Christian educator should recognize and respect the individuality, uniqueness, and personal worth of each person.
4. There are biblical implications for the methodology and knowledge claims of our disciplines.
5. Since the Fall, the problems of the human race have not changed between the forces of good and evil. (Knight 1998, 195-97)
One of the key purposes of Christian education is the restoration of the image of God in each student by the person and work of Jesus Christ continuing to work in the fallen image-bearer (Phil 2:12-13). Nancy Pearcey articulates this truth well when she says, “Each child should understand that God has given him or her special gifts to make contribution to humanity’s task of reversing the effects of the Fall and extending the Lordship of Christ in the world” (Pearcey 2004, 129).

**Redemption**

The plan of redemption unfolds throughout the Scriptures and centralizes in the person and work of Christ. Redemption is achieved through God’s plan of salvation through the person and work of Jesus Christ. The term *redemption* literally means to “buy back” or “to buy free.” There are universal applications to God’s redemptive activity in Christ, and one of the spheres redemption affects is knowledge, which is directly related to education and the integration of faith and learning. Graeme Goldsworthy notes how important this redemptive activity is to epistemology when he states, “The process of redemption involves the restoration of the right way of thinking because the human mind is as much the object of regeneration as is the body or the soul” (Goldsworthy 2002, 173).

Redemption is connected to creation and the Fall because there is a sense in which “all educational pursuits should be characterized by, and lead to, a sense and experience of wholeness” (Graham 2003, 25). Nancy Pearcey sums the concept of redemption in relation to the cultural mandate in a fallen world well when she states, “The term redemption does not just refer to a one-time conversion event, it means entering a lifelong quest to devote our skills and talents to building things that are
beautiful and useful, while fighting the forces of evil and sin that oppress and distort the creation” (Pearcey 2004, 49). All school curricula, indeed all learning activities, should be a pursuit towards wholeness and unity. Donovan Graham states, “Fractured, piecemeal knowledge and experience would be anti-normative” (Graham 2003, 25). In relation to redemption, the doctrines of soteriology and sanctification are necessary to explore in relation to integrating faith and learning.

**Doctrine of Soteriology**

*Soteriology* is the theological term denoting the doctrine of salvation. In relation to salvation in Scripture, Bruce Demarest states, “In sum, the word *salvation* in its theological sense denotes, negatively, deliverance from sin, death, and divine wrath, and, positively, the bestowal of far-ranging spiritual blessings both temporal and eternal” (Demarest 1997, 27). In relation to the doctrine of soteriology, Gregg Allison states, “Salvation involves God’s gracious and powerful work to rescue his created yet fallen people from sin and its penalty through the person and work of Jesus Christ, and the human response to this divine initiative” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 200). One can only enter into this plan for redemption by saving faith which is trusting in Jesus Christ as a living person for the forgiveness of sins and for eternal life with God (Grudem 1994, 1253). In relation to Christian education, saving faith in Christ alone is the foundation for any form of education centered on Christ. The centrality of Christ in the integration of faith and learning is the linchpin for education to be Christian education.

Salvation is the deliverance from death, sin, and Satan through the shed blood of Jesus Christ by belief in Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior of one’s life. It is about a restoration that takes place between a transcendent and immanent God and His chosen
people. In understanding salvation, it is imperative to understand that humanity is in union with Adam. The original sin Adam committed has affected humanity in such a way that humans no longer are able to have fellowship with God unless God acts. Actually, humanity is in rebellion against God (John 6:44). In order to receive salvation there must be a defeat of the king of the world, Satan, and humanity must get a new king, Jesus. The reign of Adamic sin has infected humanity in such a way that man is incapable of doing anything in and of himself to merit righteousness before God. The only solution to the problem is resolved in the person and work of Jesus.

Salvation is a multi-faceted doctrine that needs to be taught and understood in Christian schools today. All the different aspects of salvation – calling, regeneration, conversion, repentance, faith, and sanctification are related to one another, and each is essential in order to be able to get a biblical understanding of the doctrine of salvation (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 200-30). The most important concept in the doctrine of soteriology is that the focus is on Christ. The centrality of Christ, who is the true Israel and the perfect Adam, is the foundation for the deliverance from death, sin, and Satan. In Christian education, salvation in Christ is a prerequisite and paramount for any teacher to conduct faith and learning integration.

In relation to teachers and students, salvation is a requirement for the individual teacher and students to be able to integrate faith and learning. The Holy Spirit empowers and enables the integrative enterprise whereby the teacher leads the student in being able to discern truth. The task of the integration of faith and learning is achieved when every “subject area is taught from a solidly biblical perspective so that students grasp the interconnections among the disciplines, discovering for themselves that all
truth is God’s truth” (Pearcey 2004, 129). The praxis of the integration of faith and learning is linked to the doctrine of salvation because a teacher is only able to see every subject and the “interconnections among disciplines” when the Holy Spirit is guiding the teacher. Ultimately, “the Holy Spirit’s teaching is directed toward instilling biblical truth in such a manner that it develops and nurtures the believer” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 159). The integration of faith and learning is a spiritual task and the “Holy Spirit enlightens the minds of persons to discern truth in special and general revelation” (Pazmiño 2001, 68).

**Doctrine of Sanctification**

The doctrine of sanctification is primary to the endeavor of faith and learning integration. What is sanctification? It is imperative to define the word sanctify according to its use in Scripture. The specific word sanctification is not used anywhere in the OT, but rather employs the verb form of the word, sanctify. The word ἁγιάζω is the Greek word used for sanctification in the NT, which originates from the word ἁγία, meaning holy (Rom 6:22; 1 Cor 1:20; 1 Thess 4:3; 2 Thess 2:13; Heb 12:14.). This word is equivalent to the Hebrew word קדש, transliterated as qadosh meaning “set apart as sacred.” Thomas Schreiner states, “The term sanctification derives from the cultic sphere (hagiazō, hagiasmos), signifying that which is set aside for the realm of the holy” (Schreiner 2008, 371). In the majority of instances in Scripture, the word sanctify means to appoint, dedicate, or set apart unto God for a holy and special use. In summary, sanctification is the work of God by which he makes a believer holy (Hoekema 1989,
progression of a believer becoming holy is essential to the task of Christian education and the art and science of the integration of faith and learning.

The doctrine of sanctification is both a definitive work and a progressive work directed at Christians becoming more like Christ in all aspects of their being – intellect, emotions, will, body, motivations, and purposes (Calvin 1960; Gundry 1987; Hoekema 1989; Peterson 1995). In relation to the process and goal of sanctification to Christian education, Gregg Allison states,

The goal of this process of sanctification is the restoration of sinners to bear fully the image of God, an image defaced by sin. This provides Christian education with its goal in terms of what it should purpose to accomplish in terms of its participants. . . . The constant goal of Christian education is to facilitate greater and greater conformity to the image of Jesus Christ so that Christians are enabled to reflect him in the world in which they live. (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 229)

Integrated Christian learning is dependent upon salvation through faith alone in Christ alone and the ongoing work of sanctification in the life of the believer.

Redemption as Restoration

God’s plan of redemption begins in Genesis 3:15 when God tells the serpent, “I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel” (Gen 3:15). Several theologians (Hamilton [2011], jimhamilton.wordpress.com; Hoekema 1986; Schreiner 2008, 24) have referred to this as the protoevangelion or “the first gospel announcement” proving that God’s first response to the Fall was a “response of grace” (Hoekema 1986, 134). The relationship of redemption is directly tied to restoration because in many ways redemption in Christ (Col 1:13-14) allows for humans to begin to think, act, and live in a fallen world seeking restoration to the way things once were before the Fall (Col 2:2-3;
In relation to integration, restoration is a way to impact all academic areas by allowing students to first examine how sin has affected a particular area of study and then consider and implement strategies for restoring the area to the authority of God (Baumann 2009, 23). Redemption as restoration, in relation to the process of sanctification, ultimately points to the culmination of God’s redemptive plan in glorification (Rom 8:28-30).

**Consummation**

The final category in the biblical metanarrative is consummation, which refers to “the return of Jesus Christ, the arrival of the new heaven and the new earth, the dawning of resurrection, the glory of perfection, and the beauty of holiness” (Carson 2008, 64). In Christian education, and particularly in thinking about the practice of faith and learning integration, it is easy for teachers and students to be unnecessarily preoccupied with the present. Ultimately, Christian education’s primary goal is to educate for eternity, or to assist believers to “set [their] minds on things above, not on earthly things” (Col 3:2) (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 120). However, Christian education is ultimately kingdom education, and the Christian message reminds believers of a glorified future. Carl F.H. Henry states,

> No study of kingdom teaching of Jesus is adequate unless it recognizes His implication both that the kingdom is *here*, and that it is *not here*. This does not imply an ultimate paradox, but rather stresses that the kingdom exists in incomplete realization. The task of the Bible student is to discover (1) in what sense it is here; (2) in what sense it is to be further realized before the advent of Christ; and (3) in what sense it will be fully realized at the advent of Christ. (Henry 1947, 48)

In essence, for the Christian, the doctrine of eschatology is about the *already-but-not-yet* (Ladd 1993; Schreiner 2008), a reality in the individual life of the believer and the
corporate life of the believer being identified in Christ. It is about living a realized presence of being wholly justified before God in Christ, and looking forward to a future glorification that awaits believers in Christ (Rom 8:30 and 1 Pet 1:13). In understanding education achieved with the kingdom of God in mind, it is important to understand the fact that “the kingdom is already here, inaugurated by Christ, but is not yet fully come” (Mohler [2011], albertmohler.com).

Christian education should always point to the future hope of eternal life. In understanding the future hope of Christianity, Henry notes, “Christianity still affords the supreme dynamic, the supreme world-view, the supreme hope; wherever men tend to rest with a lesser dynamic, with a sub-Christian philosophy, and with a lesser hope” (Henry 1947, 62-63).

In the context of the integration of faith and learning, consummation motivates a Christian educator and student to continue to seek to acknowledge the truths God has placed in the world. The motivation to redeem the culture for Christ is a byproduct of the already-but-not-yet aspects of the Christian faith. Consummation is the concluding movement of the biblical narrative that grants a yearning for eternity and for the glory that is to come (Isa 65:17; 66:22; Matt 25:34; Rev 21:1; 22:3) (Mohler [2011], albertmohler.com).

The application of the biblical narrative culminating in consummation is a significant piece of the integration of faith and learning because it reminds teachers and students that they are not to seek ultimate fulfillment in this life, but follow Christ in obedience by giving their lives to those things that bring glory to God in the midst of a fallen world. In 1 Corinthians 13:12, the apostle Paul states, “For now we see in a mirror
dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known” (1 Cor 13:12). The text refers to the promise of seeing Christ face-to-face one day will bring clarification to the cloudy view humans currently have in a fallen world. “This is the final and triumphant piece of the biblical metanarrative paradigm – consummation” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 49).

The Doctrine of Revelation

The Christian faith claims that God is revealed in Jesus Christ and the continuing revelation of the Holy Spirit; therefore, God’s revelation is the starting point for learning (Pazmiño 2001, 9). Robert Drovhdahl articulates the importance of revelation in the field of Christian education,

One’s theological perspective on revelation shapes both the history and practice of Christian education. If God’s revelation may be found in creation (general revelation) and in Christ (special revelation), then humans may seek truth in both realms. Humans inquire into creation through the natural and social sciences; humans learn of Christ through theological inquiry. Social science inquiry yields insights in human development, learning processes, relational dynamics, instructional theory, and social behavior. Theological inquiry yields insight into spiritual maturity, human nature, and the faith community. Some theorists examine Christian education through one stream of inquiry. . . . Effective theory building in Christian education blends truth gained from several streams of inquiry. (Anthony 2001, 599)

The doctrine of revelation examines Scripture to determine the way in which God reveals himself to humanity, which is typically classified in two ways: general revelation and special revelation (Erickson 1998, 177). In relation to the integration of faith and learning, the doctrine of revelation is critical to an understanding that all truth is God’s truth. Arthur Holmes communicates this connection in a winsome fashion when he states,
To say that *all truth is God’s truth*, moreover, does not mean that all truth is contained in the Bible or deducible from what we find there. Historic Christianity has believed in the truthfulness of Scripture, yet not as an *exhaustive* revelation of everything men can know or want to know as true, but rather as a *sufficient* rule for faith and conduct. Human knowledge in mathematics and science has risen from other sources than Biblical teachings. Historical and philosophical knowledge overlap here and there with Biblical knowledge: but there is no Biblical history of modern Europe nor any Biblical theory of sense perception, to cite two obvious examples. (Holmes 1977, 8)

Traditionally, theologians have divided the doctrine of revelation into the following two categories: general revelation and special revelation.

**General Revelation**

The general revelation of God may be God’s general or common grace administered by the Holy Spirit in the illumination of general revelation (Lewis and Demarest 1994, 47). A working definition of general revelation is “God’s existence and particular attributes can be ascertained through an innate sense of God’s reality and conscience as well as through observation of the universe and history” (Grentz, Guretzki, and Nordling 1999, 102). In Psalm 19:1-2 and Romans 1:19-20, one understands that God has made important information known to all mankind by “God’s creative work of creation and continuing providence” (Erickson 1998, 1995).

In speaking about the knowledge of God’s existence, Wayne Grudem states, “General revelation comes through observing nature, through seeing God’s directing influence in history, and through an inner sense of God’s existence and his laws that he has placed inside every person” (Grudem 1994, 122-23). In Scripture, there are two primary avenues of general revelation: creation (Ps 19; Rom 1:17-20) and conscience (Rom 2:14-16).
In essence, general revelation or the doctrine of common grace provides an important initiative for the praxis of faith and learning integration for Christian education. All truth is ultimately the wisdom of God, and the wisdom of God was made accessible to human reason by the “light of the Logos, no matter where it is found” (Holmes 2001, 32). The doctrine of common grace is an important distinctive of a Christian understanding of education especially in the integrative task of faith and learning.

**The Doctrine of Common Grace**

Wayne Grudem defines common grace as “the grace of God by which he gives people innumerable blessings that are not part of salvation” (Grudem 1994, 657). All the operations of general or common grace are the work of the Holy Spirit (Kuyper 1900, 635). In seeking to understand the value of common grace, Anthony Hoekema presents the following three points:

1. The doctrine of common grace underscores the destructive power of sin. When properly understood, it is not a denial of either the antithesis between a Christian and a non-Christian way of looking at culture, or the pervasive depravity of fallen man.

2. The doctrine of common grace recognizes the gifts one sees in unregenerate human beings as gifts from God and that all of life is to be brought under the obedience of Christ.

3. The doctrine of common grace helps account for the possibility of civilization and culture on this earth despite man’s fallen condition. (Hoekema 1986, 199-200)

In this world, common grace is manifested in the following areas: the physical realm (Gen 3:17-19; 39:5; Ps 145:9, 15-16; Matt 5:44-45; Luke 6:35-36; Acts 14:16-17; Rom 8:21-20), the intellectual realm (John 1:9; Acts 17:22-23; Rom 1:21), the moral realm (Rom 1:32; 2:14-15), the creative realm, the societal realm (Rom 13:1), and the religious realm (Matt 5:44-45; Luke 4:40; 1 Tim 2:1-2) (Grudem 1994, 658-62). An understanding
of this important doctrine is significant to an understanding of the need for faith and learning integration because unbelievers have access to God’s truths and may discover God’s truth.

The doctrine of common grace recognizes the variety of gifts one sees in unregenerate human beings as gifts from God. In relation to common grace pointing to a way in which God reveals himself, Cornelius Van Til states,

When God therefore gives His gifts to men, the gifts of rain and sunshine in season, these gifts are the means by which God’s challenge to man speaks forth. God’s challenge means that men are asked to love their Creator and to repent of sin and ask Him for His forgiveness. In long-suffering patience God calls men to Himself through these gifts. If they are not conceived then these gifts are not conceived according to their function in the plan of God. To say the facts of rain and sunshine in themselves do not tell us anything of God’s grace is to say in effect that the world and what is therein does not speak forth the revelation of God. (Van Til 1951, 13)

As image-bearers of God, believers and unbelievers act as God’s agents of redemption, performing redemptive acts in various realms of service. The unbeliever often acts as Christ’s redemptive agent through political action or medical science while believers should be conscious agents of redemptive change in the world (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 48).

Common grace may be thought of as a possible watering ground for eternal life, or saving grace in Christ alone. Abraham Kuyper communicates this insight when he says,

Ordinary or general grace aims at the preservation of the powers of the original creation, to develop them to some extent, and thus prepare the field in which by and by the seed of eternal life will be planted. And altho this ordinary grace is not effectual to salvation, any more than the mere plowing of the field can ever germinate the wheat which is not sown in the furrows, yet this plowing of ordinary grace has real significance for the future growth of the seed of eternal life. (Kuyper 1900, 634)
Common grace is significant for one’s understanding of the integration of faith and learning because it results in an ability to grasp truth and distinguish it from error, and to experience growth in knowledge of all things in the universe (Grudem 1994, 659). Gregg Strawbridge communicates the importance of understanding the doctrine of common grace in relation to scholarship when he states, “Because of common grace, we should not throw out legitimate scholarship, art, and literature of less than consistent Christians, or even non-Christians” (Strawbridge 2002, 9).

The integration of faith and learning is directly related to the doctrine of common grace because unbelievers are still able to recognize God’s truths in a fallen world. Arthur Holmes articulates this point in a poignant manner when he shares,

The point is that God’s goodness as well as human sin affects culture. Theologians speak of the “common grace” of a God who makes the sun to shine on the just and the unjust alike, and preserves among fallen people a measure of civil justice and social order and a degree of human love and compassion. Fallen people, whether they want it or not and however distortedly, still image their Creator. The mathematical genius of an Einstein and the artistic creativity of a Picasso are God’s gifts to humankind through common grace. . . . Human beings are called to the creative integration of faith and learning and culture. It is a call, not just to preserve biblical studies in our school, but more basically to see every area of thought and life in relation to the wisdom and will of God and to replenish the earth with the creativity of human art and science. (Holmes 1977, 21)

The integration of faith and learning in Christian education is a praxis that seeks to not blindfold students’ eyes to what the entire world has to offer, but to open the students’ eyes to truth wherever it may be found. Ultimately, truth is unified in God and derived from God (Holmes 1977, 19). A distinctly Christian approach to education stands firm on God’s Word and recognizes God’s common grace in culture and civilization (Strawbridge 2002, 9).
Special Revelation

Special revelation is distinctive from general revelation because special revelation refers to “God’s words addressed to specific people, such as the words of the Bible, the words of the Old Testament prophets and the New Testament apostles, and the words of God spoken in personal address, such as Mount Sinai or at the baptism of Jesus” (Grudem 1994, 123). Millard Erickson proposes a broader definition of special revelation when he says, “By special revelation we mean God’s manifestation of himself to particular persons at definite times and places, enabling those persons to enter into a redemptive relationship with him” (Erickson 1998, 201).

Doctrine of Special Grace

The special grace of God is in the person and work of Jesus Christ. The extent and work of special grace is salvation for sinners. In distinguishing between God’s common grace to all and his special grace, Bruce Demarest refers to John Calvin:

John Calvin stressed that every good that sinners experience derives from God’s grace. He distinguished between God’s common grace to all and his special grace bestowed to the elect. Common grace refers to God’s universal goodness in supplying the necessities of life, restraining evil, and maintaining the moral order of the universe. Special grace is salvific; it frees the wills and enlightens the minds of the elect enabling them to respond to the Gospel. (Lewis and Demarest 1994, 27)

Special grace is a clear motivation for Christian education since it is rooted in the salvation of sinners.

What is the difference between special grace and common grace? Carl F.H. Henry notes the difference between special grace and common grace, observing, “The supernatural regenerative grace of God, proffered to the regenerate, does not prevent His natural grace to all men, regenerate and unregenerate alike. Because He brings rivers of
living water to the redeemed, He does not on that account withhold rain from the unjust and just alike. The realm of special grace does not preclude the realm of common grace” (Henry 1947, 85-86). The primary purpose of the integration of theology and educational philosophy is to enable students to see the unity of general and special revelation by teaching subjects as part of the total truth of God (Gangel 2001, 366). In thinking about general and special revelation, George Knight shares, “The findings of science and the daily experiences of life must be interpreted in the light of the scriptural revelation, which supplies the framework for epistemological interpretation” (Knight 1998, 170).

**Scripture as Special Revelation**

A primary building block for the integration of faith and learning is epistemology, which is the study of the origin and acquisition of knowledge. For Christians, the primary source for knowledge of God is Scripture. The written Word of God as contained in the Old and New Testaments is the special revelation of God that points us to the living Word of God, Jesus Christ (John 1:1-3, 14), and stands as the final authority in matters of faith and practice. Scripture is truth without error (Ps 12:6), sure truth (Ps 119:89), and the ultimate standard of truthfulness (Matt 4:4, 7, 10; John 17:17; 2 Tim 3:16-17; 2 Pet 1:20-21).

God’s revelation may be thought of as the starting point for learning (Pazmiño 2001, 9). Scriptures provide the basis for truth, thus supplying the framework for the integration of faith and learning in Christian education. Robert Pazmiño communicates the importance of the Word of God for evangelical educators when he says, “The written Word of God is Scripture in its entirety and variety, and evangelicals seek to teach the whole counsel of God” (Pazmiño 1997, 56).
The role of Scripture in the integration of faith and learning is foundational for the Christian educator. In order to present a unity of truth, the Bible provides the frame of reference from which truth is to be derived and measured. George Knight communicates the importance of the Bible to the Christian educator’s endeavor to unify truth in various disciplines when he states, “Many Christian educators see the Bible as the integrating point at which all knowledge comes together for contextual interpretation. The Bible is the focus of integration for all knowledge, because it provides a unifying perspective that comes from God, the source of all truth” (Knight 1998, 213).

One of the primary activities of the integration of faith and learning is to explore the connections of epistemology to Scripture. In matters related to integration, particularly in the area of psychology, it is common to elevate the discipline being studied as more important than Scripture. However, the truthfulness of Scripture serves as the bedrock foundation for truth and what should be classified as useful truth for praxis. In reference to the “epistemological priorities” related to exploring the intersection of psychology and theology, David Powlison notes:

The Bible gives no warrant for Christians to be intellectual isolationists, Biblicists, cut off from culture and speaking a private language to our own kind. Fallen though it is, this world is God’s stage of redemption. But appropriation of culture should always be subordinated first to a clear grasp of God’s truth, and second to a keen-eyed skepticism about fallen alternatives. Paul obviously learned a great deal from culture. But he did not learn the living, systematic truth he proclaimed from sterile and deviant substitutes; rather, the truth he proclaimed radically reworked these substitutes. (McMinn and Phillips 2001, 36)

The enterprise of integration begins with a clear grasp of God’s truth in Scripture. In education, the integration of faith and learning can be suitable for the Christian community of faith when the educational theory and methodologies of instruction reflect
a theologically informed worldview that is bibliocentric (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 38).

**Jesus Christ as Special Revelation**

God’s divine self-revelation culminates in the incarnation of Jesus Christ (John 1:1-3, 14; Heb 1:1-3; 1 John 1:1-3). Any education that is Christian in nature should be Christocentric. In *Engaging God’s World: A Christian Vision of Faith, Learning, and Living*, Cornelius Plantiga communicates, “Christ is not only the Son of God but also the ‘wisdom of God’ and the ‘word of God’ (John 1:1; 1 Cor 1:24). These metaphors suggest that the work of Jesus Christ represents the intelligence and expressiveness of the triune God” (Plantiga 2002, 21-22).

In essence, Christian education needs to be Christ-centered because Christ is the source of all subjects studied, Christ is the example for teaching, and to know Christ and make him known is the chief aim of education centered on the Christian faith. Jesus Christ is the beginning and end of all one may think or do (Col 1:15-18). Michael Anthony articulates the importance of studying God the Son, when he proclaims, “One of the ultimate goals of Christian education is to make Christ, his person and work, known so that all who are involved may in turn know God and his Son Jesus Christ” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 142). In Colossians 2:2-3, the apostle Paul articulates the importance of a Christocentric view of wisdom and knowledge, when he writes, “That their hearts may be encouraged, being knit together in love, to reach all the riches of full assurance of understanding and the knowledge of God’s mystery, which is Christ, in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col 2:2-3). In relation to these verses, Robert Pazmiño notes,
It is in Christ that Christians must center their education. It is in Christ that integration and wholeness in education can be found because in him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. It is essential that the Christocentric character of Christian education be recognized and affirmed at its roots. Christ himself is at the center of all of life from a Christian world and life view. (Pazmiño 1997, 41)

In the integrative process between the Christian faith and learning, Christ must be at the center of this process because in the person and work of Jesus is true wisdom, knowledge, and truth (John 1:14, 17; 18:37; Eph 4:21; Col 2:2-3; Titus 1:1). Christian educators who really seek integration “must recognize Christ as the measure and unifying force of all things” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 340). In relation to the integration of faith and learning, Christ is the source, center, and foundation for the attainment of wisdom and knowledge.

**Definitions of Related Terms**

The language of faith and learning integration needs to be clarified in order to understand the foundation of the current research. It is imperative to define the following related terms for the current research: faith, learning, integration, and worldview.

**Faith**

The Christian faith represents a belief system that profoundly affects one’s entire life (Cosgrove 2006, 36). Scripture defines faith as “the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen” (Heb 11:1). Faith is not a way of knowing or a source of knowledge, but rather an openness and wholehearted response to God’s self-revelation to the person and work of Jesus Christ (Holmes 1977, 18). It is important to note that faith is consistent with correct knowledge and facts (Rom 10:17).
In relation to Christian education, faith should increase as knowledge increases. Wayne Grudem shares, “Faith is not weakened by knowledge but should increase with more true knowledge” (Grudem 1994, 712). The majority of culture places faith and reason as being antithetical to one another, even though this is a presupposition that is unable to be substantiated. In fact, faith and reason complement one another. John Frame argues, “It is true that faith is not something established on an antecedent basis by indisputable evidence. But faith, once engaged in, enables us to reason and to recognize various supporting evidences. This means that faith is a form of knowledge; it works in concert with, not against, reason” (Frame 2002, 953). Mark Cosgrove adds value to the discussion of the interconnection between faith and learning:

Faith cannot be separated from ordinary ways of learning or made into a separate, detached, religious learning process. This means that faith cannot be considered an anti-intellectual, spiritual journey to knowing truth but that it is an intellectual and personal journey into areas within and beyond our understanding. . . . It is apparent that faith and learning inhabit similar ground in that faith should always have a learning component, and learning should always be based on faith assumptions. (Cosgrove 2006, 36 and 40)

Faith is a real component of knowledge and the processes of cognition in learning.

Integration

The concept of integration may occur if “an assumption or concern can be shown to be internally shared by (integral to) both the Judeo-Christian vision and academic discipline” (Heie and Wolfe 1987, 5). Integration is concerned with “making a whole by bringing parts together” (Gangel and Benson 1983, 340). A definition that seeks to present the epistemological emphasis of faith and learning integration in relation to education is given by William Hasker when he states, “Faith and learning integration may be defined as a scholarly project whose goal is to develop integral relationships...”
which exist between the Christian faith and human knowledge, particularly as expressed in the various academic disciplines” (Hasker [2003], cccu.org). The integration of faith and learning “means the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54). This is the primary definition that will be used for the current research.

Several attempts to define integration for Christian education should be noted. Ronald Chadwick defines integration as “the bringing together of parts into a whole, and so integration in Christian education is the living union of not only concepts with concepts, of truth with Truth, but the living union of the subject matter with life – the eternal, infinite pattern of God’s written Truth woven together with all truth and all of life” (Chadwick 1982, 54-55). Integration is concerned with integral relationships between faith and knowledge, or the “relationships that inherently exist between the content of faith and the subject matter of this or that discipline” (Hasker 1992, 234).

The work for Christian educators in Christian schools is a primary exercise that requires knowledge of subjects and a biblical worldview. Kenneth Gangel articulates the importance of the task of integration when he states, “Christian educators integrate faith and learning by recognizing basic ways in which the subject fits into or is congruent with God’s revelation, and by noting and demonstrating how the facts, theories, and implications of any subject have been negatively affected by sin and, therefore, distorted” (Gangel 2001, 367). The formation of a biblical worldview only occurs when a child is learning how the Christian faith, the Bible, and God himself are integral to everything (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 45).
Learning

What is learning? One way to love God is to seek to know God and to love God’s work. Learning is therefore a spiritual calling: properly done, it attaches us to God (Plantiga 2002, xi). Perhaps, Richard Patterson sums a framework for individual learning up best when he says, “A workable principle argues that individuals learn as they adjust their perceptions of past experiences and form new perceptions in response to new information and/or experiences. These perceptual determinants include their beliefs, values, needs, attitudes, and self-experiences. As these perceptual determinants change, the individual learns within three domains – the cognitive, the affective, and the psychomotor (or conative)” (Gangel and Wilhoit 1993, 132).

Individuals tend to learn the most when he or she feels that his or her personal needs are being met, their own experiences are being recognized, and they are interacting in a meaningful way that contributes to the group (Yount 2008, 357). Learning is essential to the strengthening of one’s faith. Mark Cosgrove communicates the importance of learning in relation to Christian faith and academic integrity when he states, “Christian education is taking seriously the notion that one’s beliefs affect the academic process and, therefore, it is most intellectually honest to understand and be able to test relevant worldviews, including one’s own” (Cosgrove 2006, 52).

Worldview

The relationship of theology to the Christian worldview is one of the primary tasks of Christian theology. A key initiative of the Christian school is how to present the revelation of God in Scripture as an orderly whole throughout the processes of thinking and learning. In relation to Christian thinking and worldview, Albert Mohler posits, “A
robust and rich model of Christian thinking – the quality of thinking that culminates in a God-centered worldview – requires that we see all truth as interconnected” (Mohler [2011], albertmohler.com). In relation to what makes Christian schooling distinctively Christian, Bruce Lockerbie says, “An essential goal in molding disciples of Jesus Christ is to develop in them a maturing biblical worldview” (Lockerbie 2008, 7). Charles Evans and Robert Littlejohn expound, “The biblical worldview can be logically established as both an epistemological (how we know) and a relational basis for teaching and learning” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 52).

The concept of a worldview originates within German Romanticism toward the end of the Enlightenment Period. The German word Weltanschauung refers to a world outlook and is rooted in German philosophy and epistemology. The Germans believed that cultures were complex wholes where a certain outlook on life was expressed in art, literature, philosophy, and social institutions; and that the best way to understand a culture was to understand the Weltanschauung being expressed (Pearcey 2004, 23).

A worldview may be defined as a person’s belief system or lens through which he or she defines reality and acts those beliefs out in the world. There have been many attempts to define a worldview. Ronald Nash believes that a worldview contains a person’s answers to the major questions in life and is a conceptual framework of a person’s beliefs (Nash 1999, 13). Nancy Pearcey believes a worldview acts like a mental map that tells us how to navigate the world effectively (Pearcey 2004, 23). The product of a person’s worldview will define one’s actions and often reflects the scope of a particular culture’s beliefs. In seeking to define worldview, it is necessary to examine the composition of a worldview and the relationship of Christian education to worldview.
Composition of Worldview

After defining the concept of worldview, it is imperative to present a framework for the makeup of a worldview. There are several different ideas on the components of a worldview. Many philosophers have sought to define the major questions that need to be answered to compose a view of the world. It is necessary to present some of the significant writers in the field of worldview. Each component of a worldview begins with theology, or the study of God.

Ronald Nash believes that the following five clusters of questions define what is most important in a worldview:

1. God – Does God exist? What is God’s nature? Is there but one God? Is God a personal being, that is, is he the kind of being who can know, love, and act? Or is God an impersonal force or power?

2. Metaphysics – What is the relationship between God and the universe? Is the existence of the universe a brute fact? Is the universe eternal? Did an eternal, personal, and all-powerful God create the world? Are God and the world co-eternal and interdependent beings? Is the world best understood in a mechanistic way? Is there purpose in the universe? What is the ultimate nature of the universe? Is the cosmos material, spiritual, or something else? Is the universe a self-contained system in the sense that everything that happens is caused by and thus explained by other events within the system? Can a supernatural reality act causally within nature? Are miracles possible?

3. Epistemology – Can we trust our senses? What are the proper roles of reason and sense in knowledge? What is the relationship between religious faith and reason? Is the scientific method the only or the best method of knowledge? Is knowledge about God possible? Can God reveal himself or information to human beings?

4. Ethics – Are there moral laws that govern human conduct? If so, what are they? Are these moral laws the same for all human beings? Is morality subjective, or is there an objective dimension to moral laws that means their truth is independent of our preferences and desires? Is morality relative to individuals, cultures, or historic periods? Does it make sense to say the same action may be right for people in one culture or historical epoch and wrong for others? Does morality transcend cultural, historical, and individual boundaries?
5. Anthropology – Are human beings free, or are they pawns of deterministic forces? Are human beings only bodies or material bodies? Is there a human soul? What is the human soul or mind, and how does it relate to the body? Does physical death end the existence of the human person? Are there rewards and punishment after death? Are humans good or evil? (Nash 1999, 15-17)

Defining the concept of worldview is necessary to be able to get a clear understanding on what will be evaluated in the students to see if Christian schools are equipping students with a biblical worldview. Charles Kraft purports a worldview is imposed upon the young of society by a familiar process of teaching and learning (Kraft 2005, 43). The academy creates a place where ideas are discussed, assessed, and transmitted to the next generation. It is now necessary to examine the importance of worldview to Christian education.

**Worldview and Christian Education**

What is the relationship of worldview to Christian education? In order to build a framework for answering the question at hand, one needs to start with Scripture. In *A Passion for Learning: A History of Christian Thought on Education*, Bruce Lockerbie states,

The biblical texts demonstrate the foundational principles upon which Christian schooling depends in conveying a biblical worldview: Creation and the uniqueness of the human being; the Fall; the Law of God expressed in the Ten Commandments; the mandate to instruct children; the importance of godly wisdom, knowledge, and understanding; the Great Commission; the example of the child Jesus; the call to subject all thoughts to the lordship of Jesus Christ; the reality of that lordship over all things; the example of the apostle Paul and his student Timothy. (Lockerbie 2007, 7)

The formation of a Christian worldview is a focal point of Christian education and remains central to the application of faith and learning integration. The integration of truth and Christian education demands the development of the Christian worldview
(Gangel 2001, 367). The integration of faith and learning is the primary discipline within Christian education to teach a biblical worldview to students so they will think and live their lives in a manner that brings glory to God.

In *Wisdom and Eloquence: A Christian Paradigm for Classical Learning*, Robert Littlejohn and Charles Evans relate the importance of faith, learning, and integration in the formation of biblical worldview within the context of community within a school:

> The mission of the school, in short, is not to evangelize, not to parent, not to generate revenue, but to educate. As such, every school exists as a community of people who gather to pursue the twin purposes of teaching and learning; so schools are communities of teaching and learning. When this mission is pursued in the context of the Christian life of faith, a higher purpose is achieved – that of *discipleship*. Ideally, when Christians gather in such communities, the *teaching* and *learning* is *integrated* with *faith*, and the education that occurs leads to transforming young hearts and minds to be more Christlike. Such schools are *communities of faith and learning*. It is within this context of “schoolness” that we are best able to achieve our educational ends imparting wisdom and eloquence and to keep our focus on our goal of emphasizing worldview formation, character development, academic quality, and cultural relevance. (Littlejohn and Evan 2006, 52)

Each of the terms presented, *faith, learning, integration*, and *worldview* are related to one another within the community of the school set to disciple students to think and live their lives in a manner that brings honor and glory to God.

**Summary of the Integration of Faith and Learning Models**

There are a variety of models of faith and learning integration among contemporary evangelicals within Christian education. Many scholars have shared various perspectives regarding faith and learning integration. In this section, the researcher summarizes various models of the integration of faith and learning related to the current study that have been influential throughout academia.
Mark Cosgrove

In the book *Foundations of Christian Thought: Faith, Learning, and the Christian Worldview*, Mark Cosgrove presents the interconnection between faith and learning and shares the contemporary worldviews in relation to the Christian worldview. Cosgrove argues that faith and learning are interconnected when he states, “My own position on faith and learning integration is that faith needs the world of learning in order to be tested, and that learning and thinking are always dependent upon faith assumptions. Faith and learning should revolve around each other in a continuing dynamic relationship” (Cosgrove 2006, 35-36). He dedicates an entire chapter of his book to sharing the various models of faith and learning, and he communicates his own model of faith and learning integration: the foundational authority model. The following two questions are used by Cosgrove as the mediating questions for the book: (1) What does the Bible contribute to our knowledge about reality and human beings, and (2) What does “secular” learning contribute to those same arenas? (Cosgrove 2006, 55).

Cosgrove presents the following four models: sole authority model – faith against learning, separate authorities model – faith and learning, equal authorities model – faith plus learning, and foundational authority model – faith supports learning (Cosgrove 2006, 55-59). As stated earlier, Cosgrove favors the foundational authority model or the worldview model of faith and learning. This model places a high view on Scripture and a high view on the Christian worldview as the foundation for faith and learning integration. Cosgrove believes the foundational authority model or worldview model can aid faith and learning integration in the following three ways: (1) integration of faith and learning can provide a filter for one’s thinking, (2) integration can change
people and their thought patterns and thus change how they learn and interpret information, and (3) integration produces a two-way growth process between faith and learning (Cosgrove 2006, 59). The benefit of this model is that it gives the learner or scholar a biblical worldview, granting the foundation from which to conduct studies in science, social science, and the arts (Cosgrove 2006, 57).

According to Cosgrove, the integration of faith and learning is “the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54). This definition will be used in the research instrument because of the simplicity of wording upon first read and understanding.

James Estep

In *A Theology for Christian Education*, James Estep, Michael Anthony, and Gregg Allison collaborate to share foundational principles of theology and education that need to be assessed in formulating a theology of Christian education. For education to be Christian in its fullest sense, “it must be an integrated field of theology and social science that understands itself in the service to the church” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 41). James Estep shares a five-tiered progression of integration each with a different emphasis of the Christian faith in the process of integration. In the relationship between Christian education and integration, Estep shares, “By its very nature Christian education is a practical expression of the evangelical concern for faith-learning integration” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 32). The following are the various levels of integration (Figure 1):

*Level 1 – Disintegration:* Use of social science, theology unknown or regarded as irrelevant.
**Level 2 – Segregation:** Use of theology, social sciences known and rejected.

**Level 3 – Paradoxical:** Social sciences and theology used independently.

**Level 4 – Synthetic:** Primary and substantial use of social sciences, theology used sparingly and marginalized, an appendix for appearances.

**Level 5 – Paradigmatic:** The social sciences and theology are both valued as necessary and legitimate, both are used simultaneously and interactively. Integrative endeavors to be holistic, transformative, and based on a worldview informed by evangelical theology. (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 34-37)

---

**Figure 1: Estep’s student integrative endeavor**
Each of these progressions is helpful in seeking to understand the level to which theology engages the social sciences, and the relationship that may exist between the two areas within Christian education. Estep espouses the “paradigmatic” view in relation to integration as he notes when he shares, “Christian education is actually designed to serve as a taxonomy for the integration of theology and the social sciences (that is, progressive levels of integration) and to indicate the process of moving from the absence of integration (which is undesirable to Christian educators) toward a thorough integration of theology and the social sciences” (Estep, Anthony, and Allison 2008, 32).

**Mark Eckel**

In 2003, Mark Eckel wrote *The Whole Truth: Classroom Strategies for Biblical Integration*, which was designed to be a practical handbook for educators concerning the praxis of biblical integration. This work seeks to “wed the philosophy of biblical integration with the practice of biblical integration” (Eckel 2003, vii). A presupposition of the work is that biblical integration is the bedrock upon which the distinction between Christian and non-Christian schools must be built (Eckel 2003, vii). Eckel shares that biblical integration brings to light the truth or error of a subject by interpreting it through Scripture (Eckel 2003, 64).

Eckel’s model of biblical integration is based on viewing “all of life through the ‘lens’ of Scripture” (Eckel 2003, 87). The model of biblical integration begins with God’s thoughts about the world he created and how to teach from God’s perspective (Figure 2). In essence, biblical integration is to “recapture the fragments of truth scattered by sin into a whole – God’s perspective on the world” (Eckel 2003, 87). Eckel believes integration begins with Scripture, as God’s “supernatural revelation,” utilizing
God’s natural revelation and recreating the wholeness, completeness, and synthesis God intended to occur pre-Fall. The challenge for the teacher seeking to integrate faith and learning is to recreate the wholeness using God’s revelation, both special and natural, in forming a complete picture for the Christian to operate in the world from a Christian worldview (Eckel 2003, 88-100).

![Diagram of Eckel's model of biblical integration]

Figure 2: Eckel’s model of biblical integration

Mark Eckel’s research in the area of the integration of faith and learning is significant for the current research. Eckel modified Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk’s research instrument (Korniejczuk 1993) to examine the correlation of faith-learning processes between Christian graduates of Christian and secular institutions (Eckel 2009). Eckel’s modified instrument will be adopted for the current research to compare the level of integration occurring in accredited ACSI and ACCS schools.
Frank Gaebelein

Frank Gaebelein (1899-1983) wrote a seminal work in the area of the integration of faith and learning titled, *The Pattern of God’s Truth: The Integration of Faith and Learning*. The published work was originally a series of lectures on Christian education given at Dallas Theological Seminary in 1952. He served as founder and headmaster of Stony Brook School in New York and later as an editor for Christianity Today and Eternity magazines. Stony Brook School was a school founded on the conviction that “Christian faith is no hindrance to scholarship, and since God’s Word is truth, the study of the Bible must be central to any curriculum” (Lockerbie 2007, 326). The primary presupposition of Gaebelein’s work is that there is no place for a dichotomy between sacred and secular truth in a consistently Christian philosophy of Christian education (Gaebelein 1954, vii).

In a foundational treatise of the integration of faith and learning for Christian schools, *The Pattern of God’s Truth: The Integration of Faith and Learning* (1954), Gaebelein presents and holds the premise that “all truth is God’s truth” and the “unifying factor of Christian education is the Bible with its life-giving revelation of Jesus Christ” (Gaebelein 1954, 28). For Gaebelein, “a liberal education must be based upon the unity of truth in God” and “a dichotomy between sacred and secular truth has no place in a consistently Christian philosophy of Christian education” (Gaebelein 1954, vii-viii). Gaebelein presents the importance of integration in education when he shares, “At the heart of all thinking about education, whether Christian or secular, lies the problem of integration” (Gaebelein 1954, ix). Gaebelein sets forth his conviction and challenges in the discipline of integrating faith and learning when he states, “Integration in Christian
education is the living union of its subject matter, administration, and even of its personnel, with the eternal and infinite pattern of God’s truth. This is the heart of integration and the crux of the problem” (Gaebelein 1954, 9).

The model of the integration of faith and learning Gaebelein supports is “revelation plus reason” (Gaebelein 1954, 29). The seat of truth for a Christian is God’s revelation contained primarily in the inspired Word of God but also manifested in God’s creation (Ps 19) (Gaebelein 1954, 29). Christian education must recognize “the fragmentary state of human knowledge and that the ultimate criterion of truth is found in the revealed Word of God” (Gaebelein 1954, 30-31). Ultimately, Gaebelein believed Christian education should adopt as its unifying principle that “all truth is God’s truth” (Gaebelein 1954, 20). The presupposition of “all truth is God’s truth” is foundational for the current research.

**Kenneth Gangel**

Kenneth Gangel (1935-2009) served as chairman of the Christian Education department at Dallas Theological Seminary and later as vice president for academic affairs and academic dean. Gangel believed the Bible should stand at the very center of any education that seeks to be centered on the Christian faith. For example, Kenneth Gangel shares that the Bible serves as “the center of curriculum for any evangelical institution wishing to pursue integration” (Gangel 2001, 366).

For Gangel, the phrase “integration of truth” refers to the teaching of all subjects as a part of the total truth of God, thereby enabling a student to see the unity of natural and special revelation (Lockerbie 2007, 372). Gangel uses the nomenclature of “biblical integration” in referring to his model of the integration of faith and learning.
The primary impetus of biblical integration is the Christian teacher who has committed him or her self to “thinking in a context which defines morality in terms of biblical absolutes and subjects all conclusions to Lord and Word” (Gangel and Hendricks 1988, 78). Gangel believes the following four steps are crucial for a teacher to teach a student to thinking Christianly about the surrounding culture: know the Scriptures intimately, study the culture diligently, analyze events and issues theologically, and adopt a set of distinctly Christian presuppositions (Gangel and Hendricks 1988, 76-77).

For Gangel, “integrating faith and learning falls within the boundaries of that magical word liturgy – it is both worship and service” (Anthony 2001, 367). Integration begins with the general and special revelation of God influencing each level of education that leads to students learning “about himself, interpersonal relations, family life, job skills, citizenship, and a host of other things which produce the well-rounded Christian gentleman or lady – the holistic view of life in the world” (Gangel 1978, 102) (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Gangel’s model of biblical integration
Douglas Wilson

Douglas Wilson is one of the primary leaders of the contemporary classical Christian education movement built from the Trivium and Quadrivium. He serves as the pastor of Christ Church in Moscow, Idaho, and has written several works related to classical Christian education: Recovering the Lost Tools of Learning: An Approach to Distinctively Christian Education (1991) and The Case for Classical Christian Education (2003). In 1981, Wilson, along with Shirley Quist and Larry Lucas, helped found Logos School in Moscow, Idaho. Logos was the first classical Christian school formed in the United States in the twentieth century intending to deliver a Christocentric education using the academic categories of the Trivium.

In relation to integration, he believes there should be no distinction made between the sacred and the secular. Wilson does not have an explicit model for the integration of faith and learning, but does propose the importance of understanding the antithesis existing in the Christian heart and mind (Wilson 2003, 95-100). In Repairing the Ruins, Wilson articulates this viewpoint using Scripture as a stimulus for thought:

The truth is there is no secular/sacred distinction. “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof” (1 Cor 10:26). Consequently, we cannot protect and preserve any truth by isolating it from the rest of God’s world. To do so kills it. The division is not between the secular and the sacred, but between theology and literature. The antithesis is between seeing the entire world the way God sees it, or refusing to see the entire world the way God sees it. (Wilson 1996, 170)

The Christian heart and mind should be dedicated to the antithesis that God has placed in this world, and the antithesis should be an organizing feature of every Christian curriculum (Wilson 2003, 97).

Wilson also believes Scripture is key in understanding the nature of knowledge and the way integration should be about presenting subjects as parts of a
unified whole. In *Recovering the Lost Tools of Learning: An Approach to Distinctively Christian Education*, he communicates,

> God is the Light in which we see and understand everything else. Without Him, the universe is a fragmented pile of incomprehensible particulars. Indeed, the universe can no longer be understood as a universe; it has become a multiverse. Christian education must therefore present all subjects as part of an *integrated whole* with the Scriptures at the center. Without this *integration*, the curriculum will be nothing more than a dumping ground for unrelated facts. When God is acknowledged, all knowledge coheres. It is obvious that all aspects of this coherence cannot be known to us – we are finite creatures. (Wilson 1991, 59)

Wilson’s proclamation of integration begins with Scripture as the center of the integrative process. In fact, it is the way in which a person cognitively makes sense or what he terms *coherence* of the universe. For Wilson, integration does not just include the integration of subjects with Scripture, but integration also includes the *unification* of subjects with each other grounded in biblical truth. He communicates this well by sharing:

> The truths of each subject are related to God in some way, and that relationship is understood in the light of the teacher’s worldview. But if the education is Christian, not only will each subject bear this relationship to the God of the Bible, each subject will also be firmly related to every other subject. Because the Christian worldview is based on the Scripture, the students can be given a *unified education*. That unity is only possible because of the centrality of the Scriptures in the educational process. Without that centrality, true education will wither and die. With it, all subjects will be understood, and more importantly, they will be understood as parts of an *integrated* whole. (Wilson 1991, 68)

A *unified education* that is delivered to students is grounded in the truths in Scripture and applied in seeing the interconnectedness in the world. The important piece of the puzzle in aiding to help students understands how subjects are related to each other and God in Christian education is the “teacher’s worldview.”
Arthur Holmes

Arthur Holmes is one of the chief influencers in the twentieth century in the area of the integration of faith and learning in higher education (Eckel 2009, 56). In The Idea of a Christian College (1987), Holmes presents that a Christian college distinctive should be “an education that cultivates the creative and active integration of faith and learning” (Holmes 1987, 6). He believes the reality for many Christian institutions of higher education is that the integration of faith and learning is more like an interaction of faith and learning. Holmes shows that he believes with conviction the apostle Paul’s written warning to the church at Corinth to take every thought captive to obey Christ (2 Cor 10:5) when he states, “To bring every thought into captivity for Christ, to think Christianly, to see all of life in relationship to the Creator and Lord of all, this is not an optional appendage of secondary importance, but it is at the very heart of what it means to be Christian (Holmes 1985, 11).

In 1977, Holmes followed The Idea of a Christian College with All Truth is God’s Truth purposed to “wrestle with the relation of Christianity to human learning” (Holmes 1977, ix). The presupposition of the work is that “all truth is God’s truth,” a common thread of the thinking of the early church. He elaborates on his position when he shares,

The early church claimed that all truth is God’s truth wherever it is found. The focus here is on truth. But the ultimate locus of truth is God. If he is the eternal and all-wise creator of all things, as Christians affirm, then his creative wisdom is the source and norm of all truth about everything. And if God and his wisdom are unchangeingly the same, then truth is likewise unchanging and thus universal. If all truth is his, and he understands fully its interrelatedness, then truth is unified in his perfect understanding. (Holmes 1977, 8)
The “interrelatedness” of God’s truth is a foundational concept in the function of integration because, in essence, integration is about acknowledging the “integral relationships” (Hasker 2003) existing between the Christian faith and human knowledge.

Both of these works by Holmes, *The Idea of a Christian College* and *All Truth is God’s Truth*, are directly related to the present study. He provided the philosophical framework for the research instrument originally developed by Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk (Korniejczuk 1993) and later modified by Mark Eckel (2009) used in this study. The philosophical framework of Korniejczuk’s original research instrument was developed from two of Holmes’ works related to the integration of faith and learning – *The Idea of a Christian College* (Holmes 1975) and *All Truth is God’s Truth* (Holmes 1977). According to Holmes’ ideas, four teaching models are common in integrating faith and learning: (1) complete disjunction, (2) injunction, (3) conjunction, (4) integration or fusion (Holmes 1987, 6-7; Korniejczuk 1993). These four teaching models informed the design of Korniejczuk’s original research instrument to measure the integration of faith and learning (Korniejczuk 1993).

**Framework Summary of the Models**

In order to better synthesize each of the models of integration of faith and learning, it is helpful to present a table serving as a framework summary about the various models. The primary similarity with many of the various models is the importance of Scripture as the foundation for truth in the integrative endeavor. In Table 1, the various models will be described using the following categories: author, nomenclature, terms used, and a brief description of the integration of faith and learning models.
Table 1. Integration of faith and learning models summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Terms Used</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Cosgrove</td>
<td>Foundational Authority Model</td>
<td>Biblical worldview, integration, IFL</td>
<td>IFL gives filter for thinking, change how one learns and interprets information, two-way growth process between faith and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Estep</td>
<td>Paradigmatic</td>
<td>Holistic, Social sciences, theology</td>
<td>Integration is cooperation between both social sciences and theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Eckel</td>
<td>Model of biblical integration</td>
<td>Christian worldview, completeness, natural revelation, Supernatural revelation, synthesis, wholeness</td>
<td>All of life viewed through the lens of Scripture, biblical integration recaptures the fragments of truth scattered by sin into unified whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gaebelein</td>
<td>Revelation plus reason</td>
<td>Dichotomy, God’s revelation, integration, sacred, secular, truth</td>
<td>All truth is God’s truth, Truth is God’s revelation in Scripture and creation, integration is the living union of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Gangel</td>
<td>Biblical integration</td>
<td>Bible, integration of truth, thinking in culture, worship and service</td>
<td>Know Scriptures, study culture, analyze events, adopt Christian presuppositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Wilson</td>
<td>Unified education</td>
<td>Antithesis, Bible, sacred, secular, unified education</td>
<td>Unified education is grounded in Scripture and able to see interconnectedness of world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Holmes</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Integration, interrelatedness, fusion, truth</td>
<td>All truth is God’s truth, IFL is more like an interaction of faith and learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration of Faith and Learning Model for Current Research

The integration of faith and learning model that used in this research was developed by Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk (Korniejczuk 1993). The model uses The Concern-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) of Hall and Loucks to provide the educational scaffolding and the philosophical framework of Arthur Holmes from his works The Idea
of a Christian College (Holmes 1975) and All Truth is God’s Truth (Holmes 1977).

According to Holmes’ ideas, four teaching models are common in integrating faith and learning: (1) complete disjunction, (2) injunction, (3) conjunction, (4) integration or fusion (Holmes 1987, 6-7; Korniejczuk 1993). The model is structured upon the following seven levels of implementation of deliberate integration of faith and learning:

1. **Level 0: Non-use.** Level 0 teachers are those who are not aware of the possible underlying worldviews of the subjects they teach. They are not even aware that they are making no effort or they have no intention of integrating the Christian worldview into academic discipline. Teachers in this level may think that the subjects they teach are not related to religion, or that if there are relations, integration of faith and learning is not the answer to accomplishing the mission of schools.

2. **Level 1: Orientation.** Level 1 teachers are those who are not implementing systematically their faith into the subjects. They are interested in doing it, however. Teachers in this level of concern have acquired or are in the process of acquiring information on how to relate the subject matter that they teach with Christian beliefs. They are aware that worldview should give the perspective of the subject matter, but they do not know how to implement it in their classes. Also included in this level are the teachers who think of planning to introduce integration of faith and learning in the future systematically. Teachers who think that integration of faith and learning cannot be applied to all levels of education, subjects, or topics are also included in this category.

3. **Level 2: Preparation.** Level 2 stage include those teachers who spontaneously, but sporadically correlate the Christian beliefs and values with the subjects they teach, but do not yet incorporate this integration in the curriculum. They plan to do it within a definite time and are taking the necessary steps to do so.

4. **Level 3: Irregular use.** Level 3 teachers are conscious of the Christian worldview. They comprehend what is the ideal approach of their subject matter from the Christian perspective, but some obstacles, namely, time, management, resources, etc., impede the effort to implement the integration of faith and learning systematically; therefore integration of faith and learning is irregular and fragmented.

5. **Level 4: Routine.** Teachers in level 4 already have incorporated their beliefs systematically into their subject matter. The syllabus and objectives show the integration in a variety of ways: content, values, methodologies, etc. Although these teachers recognize that some things can be improved upon, they are comfortable with the way they teach and have no plans for change. For them,
integration of faith and learning is something that the teacher needs to do regardless of the students' reaction.

6. **Level 5: Refinement.** At level 5, a systematic and ongoing use of integration of faith and learning is established, but the teachers shift the focus of integration from the teacher to the students. Such teachers believe that the teacher is the booster in the process, but the integration should take place in the students' minds and lives; therefore, these teachers vary the strategies of integration according to the student impact.

7. **Level 6: Dynamic integration.** Level 6 teachers not only incorporate Christian faith systematically into their subject, but they are concerned with the students’ integration. They talk with colleagues on ways to improve integration of faith and learning. This regular collegiate activity in integration of faith and learning has the purpose of provoking a collective and holistic impact on students. The whole school (or at least a group of teachers) provides a coherent Christian worldview and emphasizes the student response. (Korniejczuk 1993)

**ACSI and ACCS Schools**

It is imperative to explore the historical backgrounds of the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) and the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) to be able to fully understand differences in the educational philosophy of each organization. In relation to ACCS, it is essential to define classical education in a comprehensive manner in order to understand the contemporary movement of classical Christian education.

**History of ACSI Schools**

Between 1920 and 1960, approximately 150 independent evangelical Christian schools were established. During the 1960s, public schools achievement scores began to plummet and Bible reading and prayer were banished from schools by the courts. During approximately a 30-year span between the mid-1960s and the 1990s, between 8,000 and 12,000 schools were established to combat the increasing secularism occurring in the
public school system (Braley, Layman, and White 2003, 46). The Christian school movement was established and the natural progression was to organize the movement by the emergence of Christian school associations. In 1978, the Western Association, the Ohio Association, and the National Christian School Association merged to form the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI).

ACSI was first headquartered in La Habra, California, the former office of the California Association of Christian Schools. The organization continued to experience growth and moved to its new international headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in 1994. Currently, ACSI has 26 regional offices worldwide serving over 5,900 member schools in approximately 106 countries with an enrollment of approximately 1.45 million students. Programs and services are designed to assist Christian schools at every grade level including early education and higher education (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org).

The Bible is key to all aspects of education within ACSI schools. ACSI declares the following three concepts as “core beliefs” in relation to Scripture:

1. **Biblical Philosophy**: A thoroughly biblical philosophy of education should be implemented in Christian schools in all cultural contexts.

2. **Bible As A Core Subject**: The teaching of Bible as a core subject is essential to the academic curriculum.

3. **Biblical Integration**: The biblical integration of every planned learning experience is crucial to effective Christian schooling. (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org)

The Bible is central as “a core subject” and for conducting “biblical integration” in Christian schools. These are critical aspects in ACSI ability to help “students learn how
to process information and think critically in the context of a biblical worldview”
(Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org).

**Classical Education Defined**

What is classical Christian education? A rebirth of classical education has occurred in the last three decades, and the movement collaborated to form the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) in 1991. In order to understand ACCS and the modern day classical Christian education movement, it is helpful to explore a brief historical sketch of classical education movement, examine the primary purpose of classical Christian education, discuss the significance of Dorothy Sayers to the modern day movement, and communicate the key distinctives of ACCS.

**Historical Sketch of Classical Education**

The genesis of classical education began with the Greek and Roman civilizations (600 BC to AD 476), “who have bequeathed to us classical myths, art, literature, and the classical languages of Greek and Latin” (Perrin 2004, 6). The education of the Greeks was directed and modeled by Plato, Aristotle, and Isocrates emphasizing the medieval arts curriculum – grammar, logic, and rhetoric (Gangel and Benson 1983, 53). The Greeks and Romans are credited with forming the rudiments of classical education over 2,000 years ago; however, the Hebraic background of Christian education is important for understanding a history of classical education (Perrin 2004, 6; Wilson 2003, 117-18).
Hebraic Influence

Hebrew education was concerned with teaching a child early in life (Reed and Prevost 1993, 48). The religious instruction of children is an all-encompassing enterprise given to the family (Lockerbie 2007, 3). In Deuteronomy 6:4-9, the Lord gives the people a mandate for teaching with intentionality:

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might. And these words that I command you today shall be on your heart. You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise. You shall bind them as a sign on your hand, and they shall be as frontlets between your eyes. You shall write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates. (Deut 6:4-9)

This passage, known as the Shema, presents both the goal and process of education being to be proactive in teaching children about the one true God in all aspects of life (Anthony 2001, 17). The Hebraic form of education intended to synthesize all aspects of life. Carl F.H. Henry states, “Hebrew-Christian thought, historically, has stood as a closely-knit world and life view. Metaphysics and ethics went everywhere together, in Biblical intent. The great doctrines implied a divinely related social order with intimations for all humanity” (Henry 1947, 30). The vision of Hebrew education was to be holistic and integrative in the formation of thought and life.

The Jewish system of education followed the Baylonian exile after the collapse of the southern Hebrew kingdom of Judah (c. 506 BC). Judaism developed from the Hebrew religion and a system of education developed that emphasized religious education. In the new scheme of education, synagogues emerged to instruct and study the law and became the first formal educational institutions the Hebrews developed (Gangel and Benson 1983, 30; Reed and Prevost 1993, 49). In relation to modern day
classical education, many of the pedagogical methods of the grammar stage of the
*Trivium* originated when children were instructed in the synagogues. The pedagogical
method of catechizing, prevalent in the grammar stage of classical education, began
during this time period. A catechism follows a question and answer format whereby a
teacher asks a series of questions to the students, and they are required to answer with the
correct answer (Lockerbie 2007, 5).

*The Impact of Hellenism*

The zenith of Greek influence occurred after the military conquests of
Alexander the Great towards the end of the fourth century, B.C. During this time, known
as Hellenism, Greek culture made a significant impact upon the all aspects of culture and
especially education throughout the world. The genesis of the elementary schools arose
during this time period when reading and writing were “taught through oral recitations
and drills and the copying of passages and maxims form classical authors and poets”
(Reed and Provost 1993, 33). The impact of Greek culture upon education is significant,
and classical Christian schools seek to model their pedagogy after the teaching methods
employed during this time period.

*Formalization of the Seven Liberal Arts*

During the Middle Ages (c. AD 500-1460), classical education became more
systematic and the term *Trivium* emerged to refer to the *verbal arts* of grammar, logic,
and rhetoric, which prepared students for the *Quadrivium* referring to the *quantitative
arts* of geometry, astronomy, music, and arithmetic (Perrin 2004, 11). Both the *Trivium*
and *Quadrivium* form the *artes liberales* or the “seven liberal arts.” The growth of
cathedral schools and their development into “universities” occurred where the *artes liberales* were taught.

**Historical Progression of Classical Education**

The Renaissance, generally dated as the latter part of the fourteenth century to the sixteenth century, is thought of as a period of European history when a “rebirth” of interest in classical languages and the fine arts occurred. The Renaissance was highly influenced by Christian humanism when there was an increased faith in the capabilities of man. This period of time brought about a vocal movement to return to the learning of the past. During the Reformation, a spiritual re-awakening and classical education emphasized a study of the classical languages for overall development of people (Perrin 2004; Wilson 2003). The Enlightenment (AD 1600-1800) was a time in history when a great emphasis was placed upon the study of reason, science, and naturalism.

**Period of Enlightenment.** The “Enlightenment” or “Age of Reason” during the eighteenth century was key to the intellectual life of Western Europe (Reed and Prevost 1983, 241). For evangelicals, this time period was a dark time because there was a constant shift away from sound biblical teaching (Gangel and Benson 1983, 219). There was a heavy influence of humanistic thought that began to take root in and throughout intellectual thought.

The fallout of the Enlightenment was a growing divorce between reason and faith and a shift to a more naturalistic viewpoint. The church as a whole was no longer regarded as the primary institution to bring education to the masses. Even though this time period was difficult for the centrality of Scripture and the place of faith in academia,
there was a fresh work in colonial America where the explorers and founders were able to develop a culture and society where Scripture was integrated into the fabric of society (Anthony 2001, 249).

A departure from the authority of Scripture, brought on by the Enlightenment, produced an entire culture seeking to understand the world without referencing biblical authority. Christopher Perrin expounds the impact of Enlightenment thinking upon the classical tradition of education when he shares, “experiment, change, and modification to the classical tradition did begin (especially with the advent of the scientific experimentation), but it was in no way abandoned” (Perrin 2004, 14). Up until the early twentieth century, various forms of classical education were the norm for the United Stated and Europe (Perrin 2004, 5-8, 14). The erosion of classical education began in the 1800s; and in the early 1900s, American education adopted a progressive model of education grounded in pragmatic philosophy (Knight 1998, 98).

American education. In colonial America, parents normally taught prayers, Scripture, and hymns to their children at home. The method of teaching and content of curricula in colonial education differed depending on the varieties of climate, religions, vocation, and background (Reed and Prevost 1983, 293).

In the nineteenth century, America experienced an intellectual revolution and religion was a “formative ingredient” in the development of education (Reed and Prevost 1983, 300). The colonial period moved from a heavy saturation of Christian education to the tide of secular thought rising from the growing voice of the Enlightenment (Gangel and Benson 1983, 254). In the latter part of the nineteenth century and during the twentieth century, the progressive movement shaped the growing movement of public
education under the pragmatism of John Dewey and William James. The progressive movement as an “educational theory arose out of a reaction against traditional education, which had emphasized formal methods of instruction, mental learning, and the literary classics of Western civilization” (Knight 1998, 98).

The twentieth century of American education has been marked by a fallout affect from pragmatic philosophy and progressivism focused on preparing people to be productive members of society. This is in direct contrast to the perennial perspective of education characterized by learning absolute truths and the “Great Works” of the past leading to educating persons who are able to think and reason well in culture (Knight 1998, 108-09). In the wake of the progressive movement, philosophical relativism, touting no universal truths or moral standards, now “reigns without rival in the popular culture and in education” (Perrin 2004, 17). In response to modern-day American education, the classical Christian education movement is a movement intended to teach students the art and science of thinking and living their lives in culture in a way that brings glory to God. G. K. Chesterson once said that every revolution is a restoration – the recapturing and re-introduction of something that once guided and inspired people in the past (Chesterson 1910; Perrin 2004).

**Primary Purpose of Classical Christian Education**

The goal of classical Christian education is presented eloquently by Robert Littlejohn and Robert Evans in *Wisdom and Eloquence: A Christian Paradigm for Classical Learning*, when they state,

Ultimately, the key to our students’ understanding of culture is a transcendent view based in the cultural values of the kingdom of heaven. A vision of civilization
endowed with justice, mercy, and charity is the vision we want our students to adopt. As they do, we will find them able both to commend and criticize our own present-day context, even as they develop a global vision that submits every culture on our globe to the same evaluative criteria. This same informed global vision will better prepare our wise and eloquent servants to effectively represent Christ’s kingdom in their own culture and in others with a winsomeness befitting the gospel and its relevance to every culture under heaven. (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 186-87)

Essentially, classical Christian education is about teaching students how to think and act Christianly in the world in which they live. In order to achieve this, classical Christian educators claim to unify the two halves of the head that were once split into the sacred and secular, and begin thinking “Christianly” about all areas of life by integrating Christian teaching into every subject (Perrin 2004, 37).

**Significance of Dorothy Sayers**

Dorothy Sayers was a classical scholar, amateur theologian, and popular author who delivered a speech titled, “Lost Tools of Learning,” to a class in education at Oxford University in 1947. The larger classical Christian education movement, organized as ACCS in 1991, is committed to Dorothy Sayers’ basic insight that “children grow naturally through stages that correspond nicely with the three stages of the Trivium” (Wilson 2003, 84). For Sayers, the three stages of the Trivium – grammar, logic, and rhetoric – are associated with cognitive development of children, which she identifies as Poll-Parrot, the Pert, and the Poetic (Littlejohn and Evans 2006; Sayers 1947).

In “The Lost Tools of Learning,” Sayers communicates the telos or the end goal of education when she shares, “for the sole true end of education is simply this: to teach men how to learn for themselves; and whatever instruction fails to do this is effort spent in vain” (Sayers 1947, 16). Perhaps one of the primary points Sayers makes
Throughout the essay is the importance of teaching students how to think and learn for themselves. Sayers laments the observation that while “we often succeed at teaching our pupils ‘subjects,’ we fail lamentably on the whole in teaching them how to think they learn everything, except the art of learning” (Sayers 1947). The significance of Sayers work is that ACCS schools from their beginning have advocated the form of classical education she described in the essay known as the implementation of the pedagogical methodology of the \textit{Trivium}, which includes grammar, logic, and rhetoric (ACCS Board 2008, 12). The insight of Sayers does not mean that the stages of the \textit{Trivium} are to be “watertight categories,” but that “we emphasize the grammar of all subjects in the elementary years, the dialectic of all subjects in the junior high years, and the rhetoric of all subject in the high school years” (Wilson 2007, 4).

\textbf{Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS)}

In modern day education in the United States, there has been a rebirth of Christian classical education that began with the formation of Logos School in Moscow, Idaho, in 1983. There are now approximately 229 Christian classical schools in the United States, and the movement continues to grow at a rapid rate (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). The Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) was formed in 1991 to formalize the movement of classical and Christian education (Littlejohn and Evans 2006; Wilson 2003). ACCS is committed to a Christ-centered and classical curriculum because “the Jewish and Greek cultures serve as foundational categories for both Christian and Western thought” (Seel 2007, 4). In order to communicate the unique characteristics of ACCS, it is necessary to explore
the following three key distinctives: (1) the function of the *Trivium*, (2) *The Seven Laws of Teaching*, and (3) the inter-connectivity of subjects.

**Function of the Trivium**

From its beginning, ACCS has advocated as its definition of “classical” the form of education that Dorothy Sayers described in her 1947 essay, “The Lost Tools of Learning,” and subsequently popularized in *Recovering the Lost Tools of Learning* by Douglas Wilson (Wilson 1991). Both of these authors advance the pedagogical methodology of the *Trivium*, which includes three stages – *grammar*, *logic/dialectic*, and *rhetoric* (ACCS Board 2008, 12). The *Trivium* equips students with the “tools of learning in order to undertake the discipline and specialization of the *Quadrivium*” (Wilson 1991, 91). The distinction between the *Trivium* and the *Quadrivium* is that the *Trivium* includes those aspects of the liberal arts that pertain to the mind, and the *Quadrivium* pertains to the aspects of the liberal arts related to matter (Joseph 2002, 3). The *Trivium* subjects – *grammar*, *logic*, *rhetoric* – are termed *verbal arts* and the *Quadrivium* subject – *geometry*, *astronomy*, *music*, and *arithmetic* – are known as the *quantitative arts*, which together form the *artes liberales*, or the seven liberal arts (Perrin 2004, 11).

The *Trivium* defines broad developmental stages as well as subjects for study (Sayers 1947; Scouller 2011, 34). Teachers who educate students in grades K-12 in accordance with the *Trivium* – *grammar*, *logic*, and *rhetoric* – teach students “with the grain” of their cognitive development and enable students to enjoy learning and equip students to become lifelong learners. The *Trivium* is not to function as “watertight categories,” but there is an intentional pedagogical emphasis at each stage of the *Trivium*
(Littlejohn and Evans 2006; Perrin 2004; Strawbridge 2002; Wilson 2007). For Gregg Strawbridge, the Trivium is shorthand to describe three foundational academic categories that operate as (1) an approach to learning, (2) an approach to subjects, and (3) a set of subjects (Strawbridge 2002, 3). In order to understand the distinct pedagogy being offered in classical Christian schools, it is necessary to explore the function of the Trivium beginning with the Grammar stage.

**Grammar stage.** The grammar stage in classical Christian schools involves grades K-6. Grammar is the “art of inventing symbols and combining them to express thought” (Joseph and McGlinn 2002, 3). Students in grades kindergarten to sixth are naturally good at memorization, and the grammar stage takes full advantage of this fact. The elementary level students tend to show signs of curiosity of learning new knowledge. Grammar is simply “the study of the structure of language requiring both preparation (the development of reading, writing, spelling, and vocabulary skills) and materials for practice (literature, both in the vernacular and in other language)” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 89). The grammar stage forms the foundation from which all other subjects can be approached.

**Logic stage.** The logic stage, sometimes termed dialectic stage, in classical Christian schools involves grades 7-9. Typically, the logic stage is the “art of inventing symbols and combining them to express thought” (Joseph and McGlinn 2002, 3). A middle school aged student cognitive operations moves from concrete thought to more abstract thought. As a result, students during this time period develop a tendency to question or even argue particular points. The primary target at this stage is to formalize
critical thinking and comprehension. Students in grades seventh through ninth have a natural argumentative tendency, which if properly channeled will enable children to think and draw their own conclusions based on facts. A key component of this stage is the development and progression of critical thinking skills or the art of “talking things through” (Littlejohn and Evans 2006, 108). During the logic stage, the students take a course in logic, either formal or informal logic, in order to hone the critical thinking skills and prepare them for the last stage of the Trivium, the rhetoric stage.

**Rhetoric stage.** The rhetoric stage in classical Christian schools involves grades 10-12, and refers to “the art of communicating thought from one mind to another” (Joseph and McGlinn 2002, 3). The capstone of the stages of the Trivium, rhetoric is designed to teach students how to express and articulate with eloquence and persuasion. The rhetoric student learns how to give expression to thoughts and depends a great deal on the foundation of the grammar and logic stages. In the high school years, self-expression is important to the individual students. The student who is classically trained will be able to communicate their thoughts with eloquence and clarity.

**The Seven Laws of Teaching**

In ACCS, *The Seven Laws of Teaching* by John Milton Gregory is a prominent resource for training and development of classical Christian teachers. Douglas Wilson states, “Every classical Christian school ought to have this work as an essential part of its teacher training, and every teacher, veteran or novice, should be able to apply each of the laws to what is done in the classroom” (Wilson 2003, 191). ACCS purports Gregory’s work as a foundational book in helping restore “a classical and Christian
education framework to schools” (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). In The Seven Laws of Teaching, John Milton Gregory gives the following seven laws and their practical applications for teaching:

1. A teacher must be one who knows the lesson or truth to be taught. Know thoroughly and familiarly the lesson to teach.

2. A learner is one who attends with interest to the lesson given. It is important to gain and keep the attention and interest of pupils upon the lesson. Refuse to teach without attention.

3. The language as a medium between teacher and learner must be common to both. It is important to use words understood by both teacher and pupil in the same sense – language clear and vivid alike to both.

4. The lesson to be learned must be explicable in the terms of truth already known by the learner – the unknown must be explained by the known. It is important to begin with what is already known to the pupil in the lesson or upon the subject, and proceed to the unknown by single, easy, and natural steps, letting the known explain the unknown.

5. Teaching is arousing and using the pupil’s mind to form in it a desired conception or thought. It is important to use the pupil’s own mind and excite his or her self-activities. It is important to keep the pupil’s thoughts as much as possible ahead of the teacher’s expression in order to make the pupil a discoverer of the truth.

6. Learning is thinking into one’s own understanding a new idea or truth. It is important to require the pupil to reproduce in thought the lesson he or she is learning while thinking it out in its parts, proofs, connections, and application until the pupil can express it in his or her own language.

7. The test and proof of teaching done – the finishing and fastening of the process – must be reviewing, rethinking, reknowing, and reproducing of the knowledge taught. It is important to reproduce correctly the old, deepening its impression with new thought, correcting false views, and completing the true. (Gregory 1886; Spencer 2003)

Many classical Christian educators tout Gregory’s work as the primary handbook for the praxis of teaching and for conducting integration and the sequencing of materials. In the foreword of The Seven Laws of Teaching, Tom Garfield notes,
As with classical instruction, these seven laws encourage a natural and biblical integration of knowledge and a deeper, vs. broad, understanding of a topic. For example, the lesson must connect new to old knowledge, that’s sequencing. The classical curriculum must self-consciously repeat and reinforce, sequentially, the important material and concepts. This, of necessity, will lead to doing more with less – another justification for integration. (Gregory 1886, 12)

ACCS, as the primary classical Christian school movement, uses Gregory’s book as the primary paradigm and model for teaching students in the classroom.

Inter-Connectivity of Subjects

The integration of learning is imperative in the classical Christian school movement. Christopher Perrin remarks,

Knowledge is more like a web than a chest of drawers; there are no subjects that are unrelated to others. Literature, history, and theology for example are quite intertwined. Anything from the past (in any subject) can be literature; anything committed to creative or excellent writing can be history; and any subject considered in relation to God and biblical teaching can be theology. Until the nineteenth century, educators understood and taught knowledge as a web, rather than as separate departments. Classical educators, therefore, while teaching classes in “history” or “literature” keep boundaries light and fluid and emphasize the inter-relationship of all knowledge. (Perrin 2004, 26)

The inter-connectivity of subjects and knowledge serves a prominent role in and throughout classical Christian schools. In essence, there was a need for classical Christian education to be established in the latter part of the twentieth century – to teach a unified and integrated curriculum.

The teaching of Latin is a primary distinctive of classical Christian schools where integration is practiced. Approximately fifty-percent of English words originate from Latin root words, so teachers are constantly showing students Latin roots in English words, which expands the students understanding and vocabulary of the English language. Integration in classical Christian schools extends beyond just the integration of
Scripture in other subjects. For the classical Christian educator, integration is foundational to the teaching and learning that occurs because connections can be discovered in all of the subjects with biblical truth providing the fixed point of reference for truth. In order to understand the significance of this research, it is necessary to explore the differences between the accreditation standards and processes of ACSI and ACCS.

**Difference between ACSI and ACCS Accreditation Standards**

The research will compare the integration of faith and learning between ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools. What are the significant differences in the accreditation standards of both of these Christian education associations? In order to delineate the key differences between ACSI and ACCS accredited schools, it is crucial to communicate the standards for both organizations in a comprehensive manner.

**ACSI Accreditation Standards**

The goal of ACSI school accreditation is to “assist schools in changing for the better in an orderly and systematic way by engaging every staff member in a process of organizational appraisal” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). ACSI defines accreditation as “a national benchmark of quality that is a voluntary process validated by peer review and involving systematic self-evaluation against nationally accepted standards” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). Schools and programs, in order to validate their quality and to verify that they are striving for excellence, seek accreditation. Most ACSI schools bear the name of Christ, which is excellent, and should reflect his name in the way they provide
high-quality education. The philosophy of ACSI accreditation is “an ongoing process of
school-wide improvement and development through which a school or program strives
for educational and spiritual excellence. It is a process of recognizing and assessing
schools and programs against accepted standards of performance, integrity, and quality”
(Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). The ACSI
Accreditation is centered on the following two main themes:

1. Reflection on the spiritual aspects of each component of the organization.

2. Evaluation of the educational quality and integrity of the organization.
The former addresses the distinctive of a faith-based program or Christian school
and the components, which make an eternal impact on children, students, and
families. The latter addresses the issues demonstrating that the school/program is
true to its own statements of philosophy, mission, and goals and that it is meeting
the standards of quality and effectiveness. (Association of Christian Schools
International [2011], acsi.org)

**ACCS Accreditation Standards**

The goal of the ACCS school accreditation program is to provide objective
and recognized standards of quality for those schools desiring to serve Christ through an
“explicitly classical and Christian protestant Christian approach to undergraduate
education” (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). An
ACCS accredited school will have a well-conceived program committed to a classical
approach to education in light of a Christian worldview grounded in the Old and New
Testament Scriptures; have sufficient, qualified administrative, teacher, and support staff
to achieve its goals; and have sufficient instructional and other facility resources to
achieve its goals. In order to achieve accreditation, a school will need to meet the ACCS
accreditation standards, and conduct a self-study where all of the ACCS Conditions of
Eligibility and Criteria for Accreditation are met.
Summary of Accreditation Differences

A key difference between the ACSI and ACCS accreditation standards is that ACCS requires “teaching methods to be largely consistent with and clearly applying the Seven Laws of Teaching as described in John Milton Gregory’s work, The Seven Laws of Teaching” (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). The work is foundational to being a classical Christian school associated with ACCS. Instructional teaching methods should evidence an understanding and application of the applicable “tools of learning” such as grammar, logic, and rhetoric in the appropriate levels of the Trivium (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). The fundamental difference between these educational associations is a philosophical difference related to the pedagogical methodologies employed by the different schools of each association. ACCS schools will teach using the Trivium as a basis for the teaching methods that occur each and every day. ACSI schools do not adopt and employ the Trivium as the framework for methodology of teachers. ACSI uses a broader scope of teaching methodologies than ACCS. During the accreditation process, both ACSI and ACCS desire to see evidence of biblical truth infused into the various subjects.

Profile of the Current Study

The current research builds upon the biblical and theological foundation for the integration of faith and learning in relation to accredited Christian schools. The literature review has substantiated the dearth of research in the area of faith and learning integration in K-12 Christian education and K-12 classical Christian education. The
biblical and theological importance of pursuing Christian education is essential for the evangelical community to develop a Christian worldview.

**Conclusion**

The integration of faith and learning is the cornerstone for the formation of biblical worldview within Christian school and classical Christian school graduates. “The ultimate test of the human capacity to integrate faith and learning relates to the degree to which people are able to allow the principles and the truths they have internalized to inform their daily practice” (Matthews and Gabriel 2001, 33). Perhaps, James Estep sums the importance of proper integration of faith and learning best when he states, “Education can be Christian, suitable for the community of faith, if the educational theory and methodologies of instruction directly reflect a theologically informed worldview” (Estep, Anthony, Allison 2008, 38).

The large aim of this study was to better understand the integration of faith and learning occurring in K-12 Christian schools in the United States. Specifically, this study attempted to determine if there is a difference in the level of integration of faith and learning between accredited Christian schools and accredited classical Christian schools. The question guiding this research: Is there a difference in the degree of the integration of faith and learning occurring between Christian schools and classical Christian schools implementing classical pedagogy?
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

The literature review points to a paucity in the literature base regarding the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian primary and secondary education, and more specifically, the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools. This chapter outlines the methods used in this study to analyze and compare the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring between ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools.

Research Questions Synopsis

The following questions directed the collection and analysis of the data for the current study:

1. To what degree, if any, are Christian educators integrating faith and learning in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI?

2. To what degree, if any, are classical Christian educators integrating faith and learning in classical Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACCS?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools?

4. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?
Research Design Overview

This research was a quantitative descriptive study utilizing a one-phase research model (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 186-89). A modified instrument originally developed and used by Raquel Bouvert de Kornejczuk (Kornejczuk 1994) and later modified by Mark Eckel (Eckel 2009) was used to examine the degree to which Christian school teachers and classical Christian school teachers conduct the integration of faith and learning on the elementary and secondary levels. The researcher sought to explore the relationship by utilizing both descriptive and inferential statistics in order to make inferences about the two different populations (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 162). Prior to launching the survey, a group of teachers from Christian schools and classical Christian schools were given the survey instrument and provided feedback to the researcher via email on the design of the survey. The overall feedback received from the teachers was that the questions were easy to understand and direct. The researcher then sent the survey instrument to the Research Ethics Committee of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for approval.

After approval, the survey was sent to teachers serving in ACSI and ACCS accredited K-12 schools disseminated to them by email from their school administrator (Appendix 9) (Appendix 10). The self-reported data from K-12 teachers serving in ACSI and ACCS accredited schools located in the United States was gathered to determine the relationship that exists between the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring between the accredited schools of these Christian school associations. As part of the survey, the teachers responded to questions specifically related to general demographic information, number of years taught in Christian schools or classical Christian schools,
and training they have received regarding the integration of faith and learning. The demographic questionnaire determined whether demographic and/or organizational factors impacted the integration of faith and learning between Christian schools and classical Christian schools. The data gathered from the instrument was imported into Excel and SPSS for the purpose of analysis.

**Population**

The two populations of this study were teachers serving in ACSI accredited schools and teachers serving in ACCS accredited schools in the United States. According to ACSI, there are approximately 390 ACSI accredited K-12 schools in the United States with approximately 7,800 teachers that was the *theoretical population* for this research (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). In the ACCS organization, there are twenty accredited ACCS schools with approximately 300 teachers that was the *theoretical population* for this research (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). A listing of all twenty ACCS accredited schools and their geographical location for the study is in Table 2.

The rationale for choosing accredited ACSI and ACCS schools is that each of the accredited schools has been through a rigorous process of evaluating the quality of Christian education in depth. The researcher excluded the Southeast and Mid-America Regions of ACSI accredited K-12 schools due to other recently accomplished research in relation to the integration of faith and learning in those regions. The researcher includes the ACSI Regions and their geographical location for the study in Table 3. The number of accredited ACSI schools in the United States, excluding the Mid-America and Southeast Regions, was 261.
Table 2. ACCS accredited schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad Fontes Academy</td>
<td>Centreville, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis Christian Academy</td>
<td>Corpus Christi, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary Christian School</td>
<td>Cary, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangel Classical Christian School</td>
<td>Alabaster, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos School</td>
<td>Moscow, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars Hill Academy</td>
<td>Mason, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra Academy</td>
<td>Bozeman, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence Classical Christian School</td>
<td>Lynnwood, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence Classical School</td>
<td>Spring, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents School of Austin</td>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend Academy</td>
<td>Ormond Beach, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockbridge Academy</td>
<td>Millersville, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaeffer Academy</td>
<td>Rochester, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Oaks Classical School</td>
<td>Newark, Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ambrose School</td>
<td>Meridian, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oaks: A Classical Christian Academy</td>
<td>Spokane, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinitas Christian School</td>
<td>Pensacola, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veritas Academy</td>
<td>Leola, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veritas School</td>
<td>Newberg, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Academy</td>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. ACSI regions for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACSI Region</th>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California/Hawaii</td>
<td>Northern California and Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio River Valley</td>
<td>Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain</td>
<td>Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central</td>
<td>Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Sample

The researcher was not able to determine the exact number of teachers serving in accredited K-12 ACSI schools serving for three years or more. This limitation made it difficult to determine the research sample with precision. Approximately 5,220 teachers serving in 261 ACSI accredited K-12 schools were the focus sample of the research. The researcher used an approximate number of twenty teachers at each of the ACSI schools serving for at least three years or more. The estimated minimum research sample for teachers serving in these 261 ACSI accredited schools was 358.

The researcher used all twenty ACCS accredited schools in the United States for the research sample size. Again, similar to ACSI schools, the researcher was not able to determine the exact number of teachers serving in accredited K-12 ACCS schools serving for three years or more making it arduous to determine the exact research sample size. The approximate number of teachers serving in the twenty ACCS accredited schools was 300 using an approximate number of fifteen teachers at each these ACCS schools serving for at least three years or more. The estimated minimum research sample for teachers serving in the twenty ACCS accredited schools was 169. The research sample size was based on a 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of plus or minus five.

Delimitations and Limitations of Generalization

This study limited the generalization of faith and learning integration to Christian schools accredited with ACSI and classical Christian schools accredited with ACCS in the United States. The research focused upon the teachers of these institutions instead of school administrators, boards, parents, or students.
The focus of the research was delimited to the available population of accredited ACSI and accredited ACCS schools in the United States. The research was delimited to teachers who have been teaching at a Christian school or classical Christian school for at least three years. This limit aided in reducing various factors that could distort the collected data such as inexperience in Christian education, unfamiliarity with subject being taught, and lack of commitment to Christian education.

Another delimitation was schools that are accredited members of ACSI, and therefore not generalizable to Christian schools that are not accredited member schools of ACSI. Every accredited member school is required to hold to the ACSI Statement of Faith that distinguishes them as an evangelical school. All accredited ACSI schools have gone through an intentional process of intentional biblical integration within the classroom that is the practical result of faith and learning integration.

The study was confined to schools that are accredited member schools of the ACCS. Therefore, the research is not generalizable to Christian schools that are not accredited member schools of ACCS. All ACCS accredited member schools are required to hold to a statement of faith that distinguishes them as an evangelical Christian school committed to Christian orthodoxy. ACCS member schools conduct a form of integration of faith and learning during the praxis of educating. There is a conscious effort on ACCS member schools to conduct biblical integration in all subject areas.

The research was delimited to accredited ACSI schools and accredited ACCS schools within the United States. Therefore, the study does not generalize to accredited ACSI schools or accredited ACCS schools outside the United States.
The intent for the research was to examine and compare the integration of faith and learning occurring between the elementary and secondary levels of Christian schools and classical Christian schools (grades K-12). Therefore, the research did not explore the integration of faith and learning of Christian educators at a post-secondary level.

The examination of the practice of the integration of faith and learning in and between accredited ACSI and ACCS K-12 schools was the purpose of this research. The limitations of generalization are based upon the scope, sample, and purpose of the study. Therefore, the findings of this research do not generalize to membership schools of ACSI or ACCS because these schools have not been through the accreditation process. The study does not generalize to Catholic schools since the research focused upon schools considered to be Protestant and evangelical. The research does not generalize to schools that are not affiliated with ACSI or ACCS.

**Research Instrumentation**

The researcher used a quantitative format to compare and analyze the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools by utilizing an instrument originally developed by Raquel Bouvert de Korniejezczuk and later modified by Mark Eckel (Eckel 2009; Korniejezczuk 1994). The modification of Korniejezczuk’s instrument was pilot tested and used by Eckel in research conducted on ACSI schools to compare the practice of faith and learning integration between graduates of Christian and secular universities who teach in grades 6 through 12 at ACSI schools located in the Mid-America Region (Eckel 2009, 13-14).

The instrument developed by Korniejezczuk was built from the philosophical framework of Arthur Holmes in identifying levels of integration of faith into educational
practice. Korniejczuk developed the model because there was “no model that represented the deliberate process of teachers integrating faith and learning” (Korniejczuk 1994). In *The Idea of a Christian College* (1975) and *All Truth is God's Truth* (1977), Holmes presents the way teachers in a Christian school generally approach integration.

According to Holmes’ ideas, four teaching models are common in integrating faith and learning: (1) complete disjunction, (2) injunction, (3) conjunction, (4) integration or fusion (Korniejczuk [1993], aiias.edu). Korniejczuk used Arthur Holmes’ philosophy of integration and The Concern-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) of Hall and Loucks to provide the educational scaffolding to create an integration of faith and learning model to determine levels of teacher implementation of integration (Hall and Loucks 1978).

Korniejczuk created a questionnaire based on the integration of faith and learning model “to assess teacher perceptions of IFL” (Korniejczuk 1994, 65). Each respondent was asked to respond to 32 statements calibrated by the Likert scale: N = irrelevant; 1-2 = not true of me now; 3-5 = somewhat true of me now; and 6-7 = very true.

The reliability of Korniejczuk’s instrument was validated by submitting the instrument to integration of faith and learning authorities throughout the use of the process of development, the use of pilot testing, and replicated use of the instrument in other studies (Eckel 2009; Jang 2011; Morton 2004; Nwosu 1999). Korniejczuk corroborated her resultant quantitative analysis with interviews. The data analysis included chi-square tests for the relationship between selected teacher demographic variables and teacher knowledge and ability in IFL. The reliability figures using cross-validation created a 0.84 alpha level (Korniejczuk 1994, 70) (Eckel 2009, 107).
Mark Eckel diverged from using Korniejczuk’s survey for the following reasons:

1. The population of respondents shifted from Seventh Day Adventist teachers to teachers in the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI).
2. The Likert numerical scale was modified from seven points to five points for clarity of computation.
3. Since Korniejczuk used English as a second language, syntactical corrections were necessary. (Eckel 2009, 113)

The researcher did not test for validity since Korniejczuk’s original instrument was tested for validity (Morton 2004; Nwosu 1999).

Subsequent studies used Korniejczuk’s model of IFL or modified the instrument (Eckel 2009; Jang 2011; Morton 2004; Nwosu 1999). Constance Nwosu utilized Korniejczuk’s model in a study looking at the professional development of teachers and the implementation of IFL in the classroom in Christian higher education (Nwosu 1999). Charles Morton modified Korniejczuk’s model and concluded “however appropriate to primary and secondary education, was inadequate for use in higher education” (Morton 2004, 237) (Eckel 2009, 107). You Jung Jang used Korniejczuk’s instrument to examine proficiency level of the implementation of the integration of faith and learning in ACSI elementary teachers (Jang 2011, 8).

Mark Eckel used Korniejczuk’s model in ACSI schools to compare the practice of faith and learning integration between graduates of Christian and secular universities who teach in grades 6 through 12 at ACSI schools located in the Mid-America Region (Eckel 2009). Eckel used an expert panel in order to “judge the internal reliability” and “consistency” of Korniejczuk’s modified instrument by having four
individuals holding doctorates in the field of education to review the survey and demographics (Eckel 2009, 108).

In order to establish the feasibility of the instrument, Eckel conducted a pilot study in order to gain feedback and to help achieve optimum success (Eckel 2009, 109) (Leedy and Ormrod 2005, 110). The main goal of requesting feedback dialogue from the pilot group was to validate the instrument for its “content and precision to the questions of faith-learning integration implementation” (Eckel 2009, 109). Eckel’s pilot study used questions concerning the content and processes of the proposed research instrument, online delivery system, formatting, and participant perceptions of the study. Eckel gave the pilot group the modified Korniejczuk faith-learning integration questionnaire prior to the study. The pilot group received the questionnaire by way of online delivery system in order to mimic the conditions of Eckel’s full research. Eckel discovered “the research was helped by clarifications made by the pilot study” (Eckel 2009, 109). The expert panel and the individuals in the pilot study “confirmed that the survey and demographic questions were appropriate for the current research, and the survey wording was clear for teachers to take the survey” (Eckel 2009, 114).

The researcher used a slightly modified instrument from Eckel’s research instrument for the current study to measure the level of integration of faith and learning with the following four research subscales: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality (Table 4) (Appendix 1). In order to classify the mean scores for each of the research subscales, the researcher used specific criteria for the implementation of IFL based upon the range of the mean scores (Table 5). Other researchers used modified and varying models for the scoring of criteria for IFL implementation (Eckel 2009; Jang
The current researcher modified Eckel’s research instrument in order to fit the research questions and research design. The researcher’s only modification to Eckel’s instrument was an exclusion of “mediating variables” in the design of the research, and thus, excluded the mediating questions used in Eckel’s research instrument (Eckel 2009, 162). The researcher did not conduct a pilot study on the research instrument since Eckel operated a pilot study (Eckel 2009, 109).

Table 4. IFL items of four research subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscales</th>
<th>Related IFL survey questions</th>
<th>Total possible score range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Questions 1-7</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>Questions 8-14</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>Questions 15-21</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>Questions 22-28</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Criteria for IFL implementation levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria range for IFL implementation</th>
<th>Classification of IFL implementation</th>
<th>Correspondence to Korniejczuk’s classification of IFL implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Never/Seldom Score: 7.00-16.99</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Level 0: Non-use/Level 1: Orientation/Level 2: Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sometimes Score: 17.00-25.99</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Level 3: Irregular use/Level 4: Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Often/Always Score: 26.00-35.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Level 5: Refinement/Level 6: Dynamic integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Based on the mean scores from the Likert-scaled responses.
In order to seek permission for use of the research instrument, the researcher sent formal requests via electronic mail to Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk and Mark Eckel for permission to use the original instrument and modified version. The researcher received permission to use the original research instrument from Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk (Appendix 2) and the modified research instrument from Mark Eckel (Appendix 3) for the purpose of this study. After permission was received, the researcher sent the survey instrument to the Research Ethics Committee of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for approval (Appendix 4).

**Demographics**

A demographic questionnaire was included in the online survey, questions 29-38 (Appendix 1), and given to the participants. The researcher requested the following select demographic data: gender, Christian or non-Christian, teach at Christian or classical Christian school, years of experience in Christian schools, years of experience in classical Christian schools, attendance at a Christian school, attendance at a classical Christian school, and exposure to training in the integration of faith and learning (Appendix 1, Questions 29-38). The demographic factors were significant components in understanding the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools.

**Research Procedures**

Prior to the collection of data for this study, the researcher obtained permission from ACSI and ACCS by way of a phone call requesting permission to participate. After receiving initial verbal permission from ACSI and ACCS via
telephone, the researcher sent out letters via electronic mail to both ACSI (Appendix 5) and ACCS (Appendix 6) requesting permission to conduct the research. The researcher communicated that each association would receive a final copy of the dissertation and abstract. Following permission being granted to conduct the research by ACSI (Appendix 9) and ACCS (Appendix 7), the researcher sought approval to begin the research by The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary’s Dissertation Committee and Research Ethics Committee.

Once the researcher received formal permission to initiate the research from the Research Ethics Committee of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Appendix 4), the researcher sent a letter via electronic mail to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for ACSI (Appendix 8) giving specific instructions on sending the survey to ACSI school administrators to send to all K-12 teachers who have been teaching for three years or more. Since ACSI was sending the letter through their contact system, the Vice President of Academic Affairs made some modifications to the letter and sent the letter from ACSI. The letter (Appendix 9) was sent to all school administrators of accredited ACSI K-12 in the United States excluding the Southeast and Mid-America regions. In reaching the ACCS teachers, a letter (Appendix 10) was sent to all twenty accredited ACCS Heads of School through electronic mail sharing specific instructions on sending the survey to any teacher serving for three years or more.

The teachers from both associations had approximately three weeks from the time they received the request for participation to complete the survey with the predetermined deadline of October 28, 2011. When there was one week left to take the survey, the response rate from ACCS teachers was below the minimum of 169. In order
to encourage participation among ACCS teachers, the researcher sent a follow-up letter via electronic mail (Appendix 11) to the Heads of School of all twenty ACCS K-12 accredited schools in the United States.

After the pre-determined ending date expired, the data was exported into Excel format and SPSS and passed along to a statistician. Utilizing multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring between ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools was compared and analyzed. After the data compilation was completed, a final letter was sent to ACSI and ACCS thanking them for their participation in the study (Appendix 12). The researcher identified conclusions drawn from the research findings.

**Significance of the Study**

As noted earlier, there is a dearth of research conducted on Christian elementary and secondary schools in the integration of faith and learning. More specifically, there has been no research discovered in the integration of faith and learning in the classical Christian education movement. The classical Christian education movement practices education from the *Trivium* model seeking to integrate subjects and Scripture into the educational methods and process. This study, examining the level of integration of faith and learning in accredited ACSI and ACCS schools, may help shape and form the accreditation process for both of these educational associations in the future. This study may begin a new era for ACSI and ACCS to create new initiatives to train teachers on the integration of faith and learning.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The current study compares and analyzes the level of faith and learning integration being conducted in Christian schools and classical Christian schools. In order to investigate this objective properly, the researcher examined the level of faith and learning integration between ACSI accredited Christian schools and ACCS accredited classical Christian schools. The analysis of findings and statistical data is analyzed and summarized in this chapter in a clear, concise, and objective manner.

Compilation Protocols

The researcher compiled the data by sending an electronic mail to administrators serving in accredited ACSI and ACCS schools. The electronic mail gave specific instructions to the administrator concerning the research and asked them to disseminate the questionnaires to the teachers in each of the ACSI and ACCS accredited schools. The teachers from both associations had approximately three weeks from the time they received the request for participation to complete the survey with the predetermined deadline of October 28, 2011. When there was one week left to take the survey, the response rate from ACCS teachers was below the minimum of 169. In order to encourage participation among ACCS teachers, the researcher sent a follow-up letter via electronic mail (Appendix 11) to the Heads of School of all twenty ACCS K-12 accredited schools in the United States.
Once the pre-determined ending date of October 28, 2011, expired, the researcher began the process of categorizing the respondents into teachers at Christian schools and teachers at classical Christian schools. In total, 698 teachers from both ACSI and ACCS accredited schools started the survey. Of the 698 respondents, 88 either did not specify whether they teach at a Christian school or classical Christian school. Since this was critical to the study, these 88 respondents were discarded. Out of the 610 respondents remaining, there were 481 ACSI participants and 129 ACCS participants. Of the 481 ACSI participants, 23 respondents had taught for less than three years and 25 respondents did not indicate how long they had taught. These 48 respondents were discarded since the study was delimited to teachers who have taught for three years or more. Out of the 129 ACCS participants, eleven respondents had taught for less than three years, three participants stated they were not Christians, and two did not indicate how long they had taught for a total of sixteen. These sixteen ACCS participants were discarded based upon research assumption that all the teachers in this study were Christians and the study being delimited to teachers who have been teaching at a Christian school for at least three years.

The minimum response rate from teachers serving at accredited ACSI schools was 358. The minimum response rate from teachers serving at accredited ACCS schools was 169. In summary, there were 546 total usable surveys remaining (N = 546), with 433 (79.3%) in an ACSI school and 113 (20.7%) in an ACCS school (Figure 4). The response rate from ACSI schools was met with 433 participants, but the researcher did not meet the minimum response rate of 169 from ACCS schools with 113 participants.
The researcher has identified several reasons for the low response rate from ACCS schools. First, the Head of School from one of the key schools in ACCS wrote the researcher stating the school would not be participating in the study based on the teachers not having the same critical understanding of the implicit assumptions or definitions to be able to fill out the survey. The Head of School questioned the researcher on whether or not it is helpful to compare two rather divergent schools of thought on Christian education when the practices between the two (ACSI and ACCS) are so different. This particular situation may or may not have influenced other ACCS schools in their participation of the study. Second, in surveying the literature base, there has been little research conducted on ACCS schools, particularly accredited ACCS schools. There are a plethora of reasons for this, but perhaps one may be the fact that the movement of ACCS is a young movement being a formalized association since 1991. A third reason for the low response rate is the population number is small at approximately 300, which means
that over one-third of the population responded. A reason for the low population number was the delimitation of teachers serving for three years or more to reduce factors related to inexperience. Also, there may be something about the classical Christian model of education that is attracting younger teachers, which leads to less experience and the possibility of being eliminated from participating in the study since a key delimitation was teaching for at least three years or more. The researcher checked with the dissertation committee, and was advised to move forward with the data analysis based upon the number of respondents.

After the completion of data entry and categorization, a variety of statistical measures were used to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between the level of faith and learning integration between teachers serving in Christian schools and classical Christian schools. The results of the statistical analysis are presented in this chapter through various figures and tables as needed.

**Demographic and Sample Data**

The demographic and sample included teachers serving in K-12 accredited ACSI and ACCS schools in the United States. The researcher gathered the following demographic information: gender, Christian or non-Christian, teach at Christian or classical Christian school, years of experience in Christian schools, years of experience in classical Christian schools, attendance at a Christian school, attendance at a classical Christian school, and exposure to training in the integration of faith and learning (Appendix 1, Questions 29-38).

Most of the participants were female (402, 73.6%). Most of the participants did not attend a Christian school (415, 76.9%) or a classical Christian school (524,
97.6%) growing up. The majority of the participants have had training in the area of integration of faith and learning (383, 70.7%). Frequencies and percentages for participant demographics are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Frequency and percentages for participant demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N = 546</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian school (ACSI)</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Christian School (ACCS)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a Christian school growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a classical Christian school growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in the area of the integration of faith and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years a participant has taught in a Christian school (ACSI or ACCS) ranged from 3 years to 40 years ($M = 13.24, SD = 8.90$). The mean for number of years teaching of participants serving in ACCS schools was lower (3.57) than the mean for participants serving in ACSI schools (12.98). The mean for the number of years teaching for all participants (N = 546) in the study was 13.24. Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations for years taught at Christian schools, classical Christian schools, and within their group teaching years.
Table 7. Number of years teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Christian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group (ACSI or ACCS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings and Displays

The proposed research questions for the current study assessed and compared the level of faith and learning integration occurring between Christian schools (ACSI) and classical Christian schools (ACCS). After the data was compiled and transferred into SPSS, the data was analyzed using the four research questions guiding this study. The researcher divided each of the four research questions and addressed a summary of the findings for each of the four research questions. The research questions were as follows:

1. To what degree, if any, are Christian educators integrating faith and learning in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI?

2. To what degree, if any, are classical Christian educators integrating faith and learning in classical Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACCS?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools?

4. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?

Research questions 1 and 2 were descriptive research questions using the average responses from the Likert-type scaled questions based on the following research subscales: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality. Research question 3 compared the level of integration of faith and learning between ACSI and ACCS schools.
Research question 4 explored the relationship between demographic factors and the level of the integration of faith and learning. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run on questions three and four in order to compare the means of the two groups based on several dependent variables (research subscales: *level*, *equipped*, *ability to do*, and *intentionality*) simultaneously (Stevens 2009, 170). If the MANOVA was significant, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted to see where the differences lie using the research subscales and the two different populations (Triola 2006, 636). Table 8 provides a summary of the statistical tools used for the data analysis in relation to the research questions.

Table 8. Overview of statistical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Statistical Tools</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Sample</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Demographic questions, questions 29-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 1</td>
<td>Cronbach alpha, means, and standard deviations</td>
<td>ACSI only: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 2</td>
<td>Cronbach alpha, means, and standard deviations</td>
<td>ACCS only: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 3</td>
<td>MANOVA, one-way ANOVA, and assess assumptions: normality and equality of covariance</td>
<td>Dependent variables: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality Independent variables: ACSI vs. ACCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 4</td>
<td>Pearson correlations</td>
<td>Years taught non-classical, years taught classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 4</td>
<td>MANOVA, one-way ANOVA, and assess assumptions: normality and equality of covariance</td>
<td>Dependent variables: level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality Independent variables: gender, attended non-classical school, attended classical school, and received IFL training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General descriptive statistics were applied to the demographic data in order to measure central tendency. The following descriptive statistics were used: frequency, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The descriptive statistics provided an overview of the general characteristics of the samples.

**Research Subscales**

The following four research subscales were created from the sum of the survey questions: *level* (questions 1-7), *equipped* (questions 8-14), *ability to do* (questions 15-21), and *intentionality* (22-28) (Appendix 1). Reliability ranged from acceptable (level, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.73$) to good (ability to do, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.85$) according to the guidelines set forth by David George and Paul Mallery in *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference* (George and Mallery 2003, 231) (Table 9). Table 10 shows the reliability, mean, and standard deviation for all four of the research subscales for the integration of faith and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.9$</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.8$</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.7$</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.6$</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.5$</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.5$</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Reliability, mean, and standard deviation for research subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales of IFL</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>22-28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 1: Level of IFL in ACSI Accredited Schools**

Research question 1 asked, “To what degree, if any, are Christian educators integrating faith and learning in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI?”

To examine research question 1, exploratory descriptive statistics were conducted on the research subscales for the ACSI participants only. Each of the subscales had a potential that ranged from 7 to 35 (after reverse coding the appropriate questions), with higher scores suggesting the participant had more integration of faith and learning in terms of the subscale. Reverse coding was applied to the Likert-scaled questions because some of the questions were worded negatively. On average, the lowest subscale was intentionality ($M = 23.23$, $SD = 5.15$). However, intentionality also had the highest standard deviation of the subscales, meaning the scores for intentionality varied the most. The highest subscale, on average, was level ($M = 27.99$, $SD = 4.35$). Level was also the subscale with the lowest standard deviation, indicating scores for level varied the least. Table 11 presents the means and standard deviations for the research subscales for ACSI participants only.
Research Question 2: Level of IFL in ACCS Accredited Schools

Research question 2 asked, “To what degree, if any, are classical Christian educators integrating faith and learning in classical Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACCS?”

To examine research question 2, exploratory descriptive statistics were conducted on the research subscales for the ACCS participants only. Each of the subscales had a potential score that ranged from 7 to 35 (after reverse coding the appropriate questions), with higher scores suggesting the participant had a higher level of integration of faith and learning in terms of the subscale. Reverse coding was applied to the Likert-scaled questions because some of the questions were worded in a negative manner. The lowest subscale, on average, was intentionality ($M = 24.04, SD = 5.01$). However, intentionality also had the highest standard deviation of the subscales, meaning the scores for intentionality also varied the most. On average, the highest subscale was level ($M = 29.44, SD = 3.88$). Level was also the subscale with the lowest standard deviation, meaning the scores for level varied the least. Table 12 presents means and standard deviations for the research subscales for ACCS participants only.

### Table 11. Means and standard deviations for research subscales for ACSI participants ($N = 433$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Means and standard deviations for research subscales for ACCS participants (N = 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 3: Relationship between ACSI and ACCS Accredited Schools**

Research question 3 asked, “What relationship, if any, exists between the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools?”

To examine research question 3, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess if there were simultaneous differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by the school (ACSI vs. ACCS). Prior to the analysis, the assumption of normality was assessed with four Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests to test for multivariate normality (Stephens 2009, 223). Results of the test were significant for level, equipped, and ability to do, violating the assumption. However, normality has little effect on Type I error (Stevens 2009, 222). The assumption for equality of covariance was assessed with Box’s M test to determine whether the covariance matrices are equal (Stevens 2009, 230). The results of the test were not significant less than 0.001, and thus meeting the assumption.

The results of the MANOVA were significant, $F (4, 538) = 3.29, p = 0.011$, suggesting there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by
school (ACSI vs. ACCS). ANOVAs were conducted on level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality to see where the differences lie. The ANOVA for level was significant, $F(1, 541) = 10.23, p = 0.001$. The ANOVA for ability to do was significant, $F(1, 541) = 8.83, p = 0.003$. Since the ANOVAs were significant, pairwise comparisons were run to go further in examining where the differences lie between the two groups. The pairwise comparisons showed that ACCS participants had higher level of IFL and ability to do IFL scores than the ACSI participants. Results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 13. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality from ACSI participants and ACCS participants are presented in Table 14.

Table 13. Results for MANOVA for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANOVA $F (4,538)$</th>
<th>ANOVA $F (1, 541)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ value</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant = $p < 0.05$. **Very significant = $p < 0.01$.

Table 14. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>ACSI</th>
<th>ACCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4: Relationship between Select Demographic Factors and Teachers in ACSI and ACCS Accredited Schools

Research question 4 asked, “What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?”

To examine research question 4, eight Pearson correlations and four MANOVAS were conducted to assess if there were relationships in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality with the following select demographic factors: years taught in Christian school, years taught in classical Christian school, gender, attended a Christian school growing up, attended a classical Christian school growing up, and received training in the area of integration of faith and learning.

Years Taught at Christian Schools and Classical Christian Schools

The first analyses were eight Pearson correlations between level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality with the years taught at classical Christian schools and Christian schools. Results showed the number of years taught at Christian schools was positively significantly correlated with level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality of IFL (Table 15). As the number of years taught at Christian schools increased, level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality of IFL also tended to increase. The number of years taught at classical Christian schools was also significantly correlated with level of IFL and ability to do IFL (Table 15), suggesting that as the number of years taught at a classical Christian school increased, the level and ability to do IFL also tended to increase.
Table 15. Pearson correlations between level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality with years taught at Christian and classical Christian schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>Years taught Christian school (Pearson r value)</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Years taught classical Christian school (Pearson r value)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant = p < 0.05. **Very significant = p < 0.01.

Gender

Out of the 546 participants, the majority of the participants were female (402, 73.6%) in relation to male (144, 26.4%) (Figure 5). The gender of the teacher was a select demographic in understanding the level of integration of faith and learning.

Figure 5. Gender of participants
Next, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess if there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by gender (male vs. female). The result of the MANOVA were not significant, $F (4, 538) = 0.59$, $p = 0.670$, suggesting there were not differences in the level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality of IFL by gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 16. Means and standard deviations for gender are presented in Table 17.

Table 16. Results for MANOVA for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>MANOVA $F (4, 538)$</th>
<th>ANOVA $F (1, 541)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Equipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ value</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant = $p < 0.05$. **Very significant = $p < 0.01$.

Table 17. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do and intentionality by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attended Christian School Growing Up

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess if there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by whether or not the participant attended a Christian school growing up (attended vs. not attended). The results of the MANOVA were significant, $F(4, 538) = 3.40, p = 0.009$, suggesting there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by whether or not the participant attended Christian school growing up (attended vs. not attended). The ANOVAs were significant for ability to do IFL, $F(1, 541) = 4.57, p = 0.033$. Pairwise comparisons showed those that did not attend a Christian school growing up had higher ability to do IFL scores than the participants that did attend a Christian school growing up did. Results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 18. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by participants attended a Christian school growing up are presented in Table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attended Christian School Growing Up</th>
<th>MANOVA $F(4, 538)$</th>
<th>ANOVA $F(1, 541)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Equipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Christian School Growing Up</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant = $p < 0.05$. **Very significant = $p < 0.01$. 

Note: *Significant = $p < 0.05$. **Very significant = $p < 0.01$. 

Table 18. Results for MANOVA for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by attended Christian school growing up
Table 19. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do and intentionality by attended Christian school growing up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Attended</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attended Classical Christian School Growing Up**

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess if there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by whether or not the participant attended a classical Christian school growing up (attended vs. not attended). The results of the MANOVA were significant, $F(4, 538) = 5.52, p < 0.001$, suggesting there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by whether or not the participant attended a classical Christian school growing up (attended vs. not attended). The ANOVAs were significant for equipped for IFL, $F(1, 541) = 5.83$, $p = 0.016$. Pairwise comparisons showed those that did not attend a classical Christian school growing up had higher equipped IFL scores than the participants that did attend a classical Christian school growing up did. Results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 20. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by participants attended a classical Christian school growing up are presented in Table 21.
Table 20. Results for MANOVA for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by attended classical Christian school growing up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANOVA $F (4, 538)$</th>
<th>ANOVA $F (1, 541)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended Classical School Growing Up</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ value</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant = $p < 0.05$. **Very significant = $p < 0.01$.

Table 21. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do and intentionality by attended classical Christian school growing up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>Attended Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Not Attended Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Received Training in the Area IFL

Lastly, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess if there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by those that received training in the area of IFL (received vs. not received). Prior to the analysis, the assumption of normality was assessed with four Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. Results of the tests were significant for level, equipped, and ability to do, violating the assumption. However, according to James Stevens, normality has little effect on Type I error (Stevens 2009, 222). The assumption for equality of covariance was assessed with
the Box’s M test. The results of the test were significant, thus the Wilks’ Λ correction was examined for MANOVA significance. The Wilks’ Λ is a correction to the degrees of freedom that makes the MANOVA robust against violations of equality of covariance (Stevens 2009, 51).

The results of the MANOVA were significant, \( F (4, 538) = 26.48, p < 0.001 \), suggesting there were differences in level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by those that received training in the area of IFL (received vs. not received). The ANOVAs were significant for all research subscales – level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality for IFL. Pairwise comparisons showed those that had received training in the area of IFL had higher level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality scores than the participants that had not received training in the area of IFL. Results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 22. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by participants attended a classical Christian school growing up are presented in Table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANOVA F (4, 538)</th>
<th>ANOVA F (1, 541)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Equipped</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received training</td>
<td>26.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p value</strong></td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant = \( p < 0.05 \). **Very significant = \( p < 0.01 \).
Table 23. Means and standard deviations for level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality by received training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subscale</th>
<th>Received Training</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of the Research Design**

An evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of this research is presented in this section. The evaluation of the research design consists of an honest assessment of the strengths and weaknesses that surfaced during the journey of this research. Overall, the researcher was pleased with the design of the research.

**Strengths of the Research Design**

The strengths of the research design were in three specific areas. First, the research instrument was an established, valid, and reliable instrument for studying the integration of faith and learning. The instrument had been used in a number of studies in the area of integration of faith and learning in K-12 educational institutions (Eckel 2009; Jang 2011; Morton 2004; Nwosu 1999). The instrument was built upon Arthur Holmes’ philosophy of integration and The Concern-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) of Hall and Loucks to provide the educational scaffolding (Korniejczuk 1994, 65). The survey itself was quick to take and only required participants to go to one website. The approximate time to take the survey was 10 minutes based upon verbal feedback given to the
researcher. The demographic portion of the survey added great value to the research and aided in providing further insight into the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in K-12 Christian and classical Christian schools.

The second strength of the research design was in the use of the Internet for communication and data collection. Electronic mail provided an efficient and cost effective communication medium to reach the desired population. The researcher was able to thank both ACSI and ACCS for their willingness to encourage participation in the research (Appendix 12). The use of the survey host site, SurveyMonkey, was critical for the collection of data and ability to export into Excel and SPSS in an ideal manner.

Lastly, the timing of the study for the educators involved was well timed. Originally, the researcher was going to launch the study in May, and after further consultation, decided to wait until October in order to be sensitive to the teachers. The end of a school year (May-June) and the beginning of a school year (August-September) can be frenetic and heavy with added responsibilities given to the teachers. The time of year for the data collection was good since the school year had begun and the three-week response period was distanced from a long break for the teachers.

Weaknesses of the Research Design

In relation to the weaknesses of the research design, there are five areas the researcher retrospectively observed. First, the anonymity of the survey did not allow the researcher to send a thank you to the individual participants. The anonymity of the survey also limited the researcher in being able to conduct any follow-up research with the participants in this study.
The second discovered weakness of the research design, was some of the content and specific wording of some of the survey questions. In relation to the content of the research questions, the researcher believed the demographic questions were limited in scope. After reflective deliberation, the researcher would have expanded the demographic portion of the survey to include denominational affiliation, serve as a part-time or full-time teachers, and self-reported teaching style with a list of specific options. These specific demographic components would have added value and enriched the study. As for the specific wording of the survey questions, some of the Likert-questions were worded in a negative manner causing the researcher to reverse code these specific questions so the data would not be skewed (Appendix 1 - Questions 1, 8, 9, 17, 19, 20, and 23). The researcher could have worded the questions in a different way in order to maintain consistency with Likert responses.

A third area of weakness of the research design is the limitation of garnering responses from the teachers alone. The self-report method may have distorted the results since it is possible for participants to have wrong perceptions of themselves in relation to the praxis of the integration of faith and learning. Also, the researcher should mention the bias of teachers feeling as if they need to respond in a certain way, even though it may not be occurring in the classroom. Surveying their administrators as well may have given more accuracy to the results of the data.

A fourth area of discovered weakness of the research design is the researcher should have created a different host website within SurveyMonkey for ACSI and ACCS teachers. This would have saved time during the phase of analyzing the data. It would
have separated the data between ACSI and ACCS teachers and streamlined the process in a more concise and efficient way.

Lastly, the researcher had difficulty in locating the specific size of the population since a delimitation of the study was teachers serving in Christian schools or classical Christian schools for at least three years or more. The intention of this stated delimitation was to reduce various factors that could distort the collected data such as inexperience in Christian education, unfamiliarity with subject being taught, and lack of commitment to Christian education. However, it was impossible for the researcher to determine the exact amount of teachers serving in ACSI and ACCS accredited schools teaching for at least three years or more. The 113 ACCS respondents was not the needed 300 in order for the researcher to meet an adequate sample size in educational research with a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of plus or minus five. However, the 113 ACCS respondents was over one-third of the estimated population of teachers serving for three years or more at ACCS accredited schools.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This research examined and compared the level of faith and learning integration occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools. In this final chapter, the researcher summarizes the potential significance of these findings for Christian schools and classical Christian schools based on the analysis of the collected data. In addition to communicating the research implications from the research questions, a proposal for future research is shared for researchers interested in the integration of faith and learning in Christian education.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this descriptive quantitative study was to conduct a comparative analysis between ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools to measure the degree to which Christian school teachers and classical Christian school teachers practice the integration of faith and learning at the K-12 level. In order to accomplish this stated objective, the researcher investigated the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in accredited K-12 ACSI Christian schools and accredited K-12 ACCS classical Christian schools.
**Research Questions**

The following questions directed the collection and analysis of data for the current research study in the area of faith and learning integration:

1. To what degree, if any, are Christian educators integrating faith and learning in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI?

2. To what degree, if any, are classical Christian educators integrating faith and learning in classical Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACCS?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools?

4. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?

**Research Implications**

Based upon the precedent literature review, the researcher discovered a dearth of research in the area of faith and learning integration among primary and secondary Christian schools. Further, the researcher found little empirical research in the young movement of classical Christian schools during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The purpose of this section is to integrate the research findings with the existing literature on the integration of faith and learning in K-12 education and articulate some specific research implications. After evaluation of the data, the following is a list of research implications the researcher discovered:

1. Most ACSI teachers self-reported a high level of integrating faith and learning.

2. Most ACCS teachers self-reported a high level of integrating faith and learning.

3. ACCS teachers self-reported a higher level of integrating faith and learning than the ACSI teachers self-reported.
4. The number of years teaching correlates positively and significantly with the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in the classroom.

5. The gender of a teacher does not impact the level of the integration of faith and learning in the classroom.

6. Teachers who did not attend a Christian school growing up self-reported a higher level of ability to engage in the integration of faith and learning than teachers who did attend a Christian school growing up.

7. Teachers receiving training in the area of the integration of faith and learning practice integrating on a higher level than teachers that had not received training.

**Level of IFL among ACSI Teachers**

*Research Implication 1: Most ACSI teachers self-reported a high level of integrating faith and learning.* This research implication answered the first research question, “To what degree, if any, are Christian educators integrating faith and learning in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI?” A key component of this descriptive study was to inventory what level of integration of faith and learning is occurring in K-12 Christian schools. Overall, teachers serving at K-12 ACSI accredited schools in the United States are integrating faith and learning on a high level. In this study, 433 or 79.3% of the total respondents (N = 546) were from ACSI (Table 6), and indicated a high level of the integration of faith and learning.

The score totals for the integration of faith and learning had the potential to range from 7 to 35, with 7 being a minimal score for IFL and 35 being the maximum score for IFL. The following were the means for the subscales of IFL: level (27.99), equipped (24.10), ability to do (27.65), and intentionality (23.23) (Table 11). The totals for the research subscales of IFL indicate ACSI teachers practice a relatively high level of IFL in the classroom (Table 5). Although across the board the scores were high, the
lower scores were in the areas of equipped for IFL and intentionality in IFL. The lower score for equipped for IFL suggests teachers may not be receiving adequate training in the area of IFL. The lower score for intentionality in IFL implies teachers may not be making a deliberate effort to hone their skills in the area of IFL.

The high scores for each of the research subscales denotes most teachers self-reported a high level of integration of faith and learning occurring in their pedagogy. This suggests that teachers are seeking to teach students how to see knowledge as a unified whole as opposed to a more compartmentalized view (Eckel 2003; Gaebelein 1954; Gangel 2001; Holmes 1987). The definition of the integration of faith and learning given to the teacher respondents on the research survey was “the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54). One of the primary missions of K-12 Christian schools is to equip students with a biblical worldview. A crucial practice in the formation of a biblical worldview is to conduct faith and learning integration and to model for students how to integrate faith and learning. Generally, a Christian teacher views this as important in being able to train and equip students for application of the Christian faith in all aspects of life.

**Level of IFL among ACCS Teachers**

*Research Implication 2: Most ACCS teachers self-reported a high level of integrating faith and learning.* Research question two asked, “To what degree, if any, are classical Christian educators integrating faith and learning in classical Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACCS?” A chief impetus of the study was to describe what level of integration of faith and learning is occurring in K-12 classical Christian schools. In
answering the question, the study revealed teachers serving in K-12 accredited ACCS schools indicated a high level of integration of faith and learning. In this study, 113 of the 546 participants (20.7%) were from K-12 ACCS accredited schools (Table 6).

The total scores for the integration of faith and learning had the potential to range from 7 to 35, with 7 being a minimal score for IFL and 35 being the maximum score for IFL. The following were the means for the research subscales of IFL: level (29.44), equipped (25.03), ability to do (29.12), and intentionality (24.04) (Table 12). These high IFL scores indicate that ACCS teachers do view the praxis of the integration of faith and learning in the classroom as important (Table 5).

As with the ACSI teachers, the ACCS teachers received the following definition for the integration of faith and learning: “the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54). The response of the ACCS teachers indicates that the teachers understand the value of the integration of faith and learning on a practical level in the classroom. A vital mission of ACCS is to “equip member schools to integrate all their teaching around the revealed Word of God” (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). According to the results, this integration distinctive is being achieved at a high level among experienced teachers serving in accredited ACCS schools.
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Research Implication 3: ACCS teachers self-reported a higher level of integrating faith and learning than the ACSI teachers self-reported. In seeking to compare and analyze the integration of faith and learning between ACSI and ACCS
schools, research question three asked, “What relationship, if any, exists between the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI accredited schools and ACCS accredited schools?” As shown in Table 13, the results of the MANOVA were significant, $p = 0.011$. This is statistically significant since $p < 0.05$, indicating there were differences in the level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality of IFL between ACSI and ACCS schools. The ANOVAs for each of the research subscales indicated level of IFL, $p = 0.001$, and ability to do IFL, $p = 0.003$, were significantly different between ACSI and ACCS teachers. The ANOVAs for equipped for IFL, $p = 0.075$, and intentionality of IFL, $p = 0.136$, were not significantly different between ACSI and ACCS teachers. The level of IFL and ability to do IFL was higher among ACCS participants than ACSI participants.

Integration is a key distinctive for both ACSI and ACCS accredited schools (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org; Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). A stated objective among Christian school educators and classical Christian school educators is that worldview formation and character development are critical dimensions of the kind of education offered and achieved through integration of faith and learning (Eckel 2003; Graham 2003; Littlejohn and Evans 2006; Perrin 2004; Wilson 1991). In reflecting upon God’s created order in relation to Christian education, Douglas Wilson states, “Christian education must therefore present all subjects as parts of an integrated whole with the Scriptures at the center. Without this integration, the curriculum will be nothing more than a dumping ground for unrelated facts” (Wilson 1991, 59).
The data indicates differences in the integration of faith and learning between teachers serving in ACSI and ACCS accredited schools. The unity-and-coherence approach to knowledge by the ACCS teachers may contribute to the teachers self-reporting a higher level and ability to do IFL than ACSI teachers. For the classical Christian educator, integration extends beyond just integrating Scripture into subjects. There is an *inter-connectivity of subjects*, as noted in chapter two, where biblical truth is the fixed point of reference as the educator models the connections discovered in every subject studied. Even though differences were noted in the data, there needs to be further research conducted in order to understand the phenomenon. The scope of this descriptive study was meant to be a foundational study for other researchers to conduct more exhaustive research on the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools.

*Impact of Number of Years Teaching on IFL*

*Research Implication 4: The number of years teaching correlates positively and significantly with the level of the integration of faith and learning occurring in the classroom.* The last research question, question four, asked, “What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?” As part of exploring this research question, the researcher examined the impact of the number of years teaching upon the level of integration of faith and learning.

The result of the eight Pearson correlations between level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality with years taught at Christian schools and classical Christian
schools indicated two findings. First, in Christian schools, as the number of years taught increased, the overall level of IFL increased very significantly, where \( p < 0.01 \) (Table 15). Second, there was a statistically significant correlation between the level of IFL and ability to do IFL and the number of years taught at classical Christian schools, when \( p < 0.05 \) (Table 15).

This finding suggests the more experience a teacher gains the greater the level of integration of faith and learning. Longevity in teaching a particular subject may greatly benefit students’ biblical worldview formation as the integration of faith and learning is practiced at a higher level with a more experienced teacher. It is important to note in a recent study in measuring the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI elementary schools, Jang discovered “educational experience in Christian schools did not make a significant difference in teachers’ implementation level and did not influence it” (Jang 2011, 150). A possible explanation for the difference in the results may be explained by the two different populations being studied since Jang’s population was ACSI elementary teachers and this research explored K-12 teachers in both ACSI and ACCS accredited schools. Subsequent research needs to be explored in relation to the level of integration of faith and learning and its correlation with educational experience.

**Impact of Gender on IFL**

*Research Implication 5: The gender of a teacher does not impact the level of the integration of faith and learning in the classroom.* As part of research question four, “What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools
accredited with ACSI or ACCS?,” the gender of a teacher was examined in relation to the level of IFL.

The results of the MANOVA were not significant ($p = 0.769$), suggesting there were not differences in the level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality of IFL based on whether a teacher is male or female (Table 16). Other research on elementary Christian school education, suggested that gender was not a factor in a teacher’s implementation of faith and learning integration (Jang 2011, 135). As noted in Chapter 2, human beings are created in the image of God (Gen 1:26-27), and both male and female reflect God in their design (Hoekema 1986; Pearcey 2004). Human beings have been given a cultural mandate (Gen 1:28-19), and Christian educators are called to engage in applying biblical stewardship within the walls of Christian schools to encourage students to fulfill their God-given responsibilities (Baumann 2010; Pazmiño 1997). The initiative to integrate faith and learning is a call for Christian educators to develop their students’ minds and impact the culture as image-bearers of God (Baumann 2010). Christian educators should acknowledge differences between males and females both as teachers and as students.

**Impact of Attendance at Christian School on IFL**

*Research Implication 6: Teachers who did not attend a Christian school growing up self-reported a higher level of ability to engage in the integration of faith and learning than teachers who did attend a Christian school growing up.* As part of the demographic portion of the study, the researcher sought to examine whether or not attendance at a Christian school growing up had an impact upon the level of IFL. As part
of research question four, which asked, “What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?”

Out of the 546 total participants, only 125 (23.1%) had attended a Christian school growing up (Table 6). The results of the MANOVA were very significant \( (p = 0.009) \) suggesting there were differences in the research subscales of IFL - level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality. ANOVAS were run on each of the subscales, and the ANOVA for ability to do IFL was significant \( (p = 0.033) \) (Table 18). The data revealed teachers who did not attend a Christian school growing up had a higher ability to do IFL than the teachers that did attend a Christian school growing up.

An implication of this result indicates teachers do not necessarily need to have a Christian school education in their past to be successful in practicing the integration of faith and learning as a professional teacher. A key limitation in this finding is that there was no way to determine the amount of time spent attending the Christian school based upon the garnered data from the instrument.

Other research conducted by You Jung Jang showed a teacher’s attendance at a Christian school growing up was not significant in the teacher’s proficiency to implement the integration of faith and learning (Jang 2011, 132). The distribution of teachers who had attended a Christian school in Jang’s study was high with 122 of the 220 respondents stating (55.5%) they had attended a Christian school (Jang 2011, 125). In relation to the current study, only 23.1% of the participants indicated they had attended a Christian school growing up and only 2.4% of the participants responded they had attended a classical Christian school growing up (Table 6). A primary implication of this finding is
there should be follow-up studies in relation to the level of integration of faith and learning and the attendance at a Christian school growing up to examine the correlation between the number of years a teacher attended a Christian school or classical Christian school and the level of IFL. The current study simply did not have a large enough sample to be able to make definitive claims regarding the data.

**Impact of Training in IFL on Level of IFL**

*Research Implication 7: Teachers receiving training in the area of the integration of faith and learning practice integrating on a higher level than teachers that had not received training.* Lastly, the researcher explored the select demographic of training received in the area of IFL as part of answering research question four: “What relationship, if any, exists between select demographic factors and the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by educators in Christian K-12 schools accredited with ACSI or ACCS?”

The results of the MANOVA were very significant, $p < 0.001$, indicating there were differences in the level of IFL of the participants in relation to whether or not the participants had received training in the area of IFL (Table 22). The ANOVAS were very significant for *all research subscales* – level, equipped, ability to do, and intentionality for IFL, since $p < 0.001$ for each subscale (Table 22).

The research implication for this result is that training in the integration of faith and learning is foundational to ensure a high level of IFL among teachers in Christian schools. Other research in the area of IFL among ACSI schools has corroborated this finding. In comparing the practice of faith-learning integration among teachers who
graduate from Christian and secular universities within ACSI, Mark Eckel discovered “the need for faith-learning integration at both the Christian collegiate level and continuing education in classroom environments” (Eckel 2009, 147). As part of Eckel’s study, the need for theological training for Christian school educators was a key research implication (Eckel 2009, 148-49). In a study analyzing the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in ACSI elementary school, You Jung Jang concluded teachers who have had theological training in the past tended to reach higher levels of faith and learning integration (Jang 2011, 154). The results of these three quantitative studies indicate IFL training should be a staple in the training regimen for teachers serving in Christian schools. In Table 24, the various studies related to integration of faith and learning are summarized using the following categories: year, author, IFL instrument, study, participants, and findings.

In the book of Colossians, the apostle Paul communicates the following prayer for the “saints and faithful brothers” in Colossae to progress in the knowledge of God’s will:

And so, from the day we heard, we have not ceased to pray for you, asking that you may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding, so as to walk in a manner worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing to him, bearing fruit in every good work and increasing in the knowledge of God. (Col 1:9-10)

For a Christian, and especially Christian teachers, there is a sense in which there is a progression of growth in knowledge of God that leads to transformation of the heart and mind. Later, in the same book of Colossians, the apostle Paul warns against false teaching counter to Christ in Colossians 2:8, “See to it that no one takes you captive by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elemental
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>IFL Instrument</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Korniejczuk/Eckel modified</td>
<td>Level of IFL between ACSI and ACCS</td>
<td>Teachers in K-12 accredited ACSI and ACCS schools</td>
<td>ACSI and ACCS high IFL, ACCS higher IFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jang</td>
<td>Korniejczuk’s survey</td>
<td>Examine proficiency of IFL in elementary school teachers</td>
<td>ACSI elementary school teachers</td>
<td>ACSI elementary teachers high IFL, theology and training higher IFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Eckel</td>
<td>Modified Korniejczuk’s survey</td>
<td>Compare IFL of Christian and secular university graduates</td>
<td>ACSI teachers of grades 6-12</td>
<td>Christian university graduates better in knowledge and equipping of IFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>Factors of IFL (qualitative)/ IFL learning factors survey (quantitative)</td>
<td>Relationship between student learning factors and institutional learning factors in IFL process</td>
<td>ACSI secondary school administrators</td>
<td>Hiring Christian faculty essential in IFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Korniejczuk</td>
<td>Validation of IFL instrument</td>
<td>Validate instrument for IFL</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>Reliability level of 0.84 alpha level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
spirits of the world, and not according to Christ” (Col 2:8). Biblical and theological training is critical in a teacher’s ability to effectively practice the integration of faith and learning that leads to students adopting a biblical worldview where they think and act in a manner that brings glory to God.

**Research Applications**

The level of integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools is important to measure how effective schools are in their mission to equip students for biblical worldview thinking in all aspects of life. According to Nancy Pearcey, the strategy of many Christian schools is to inject some religious elements into the classroom and continue to teach the same content as secular schools (Pearcey 2004, 37). For Christian education to be truly Christian, Scripture must be the essential ingredient for the delivery of a Christian education to the next generation of students. The present study suggests, in the context of Christian schools and classical Christian schools, the integration of faith and learning is occurring on a high level. In light of the research analysis and findings, six applications are warranted and include, but are not necessarily limited to the following: factor of accreditation, hiring tendencies, value of training, importance of experience, former attendance at Christian schools, and integration of classical Christian schools.

**Factor of Accreditation**

The data for both ACSI and ACCS teachers serving in K-12 accredited schools indicated there is a high level of IFL occurring throughout both associations. As noted in chapter two, a key distinctive for ACSI and ACCS schools is to show that
integration is occurring as part of the self-study during the accreditation process. The integration process for both ACSI and ACCS include a rigorous process of self-study guided by set standards set forth by both of these Christian school associations. The accreditation process culminates with an accreditation committee to conduct a peer review.

As part of the initial accreditation process and ongoing accountability of accreditation, there are standards a school must meet and continue to meet and improve upon in order to maintain accreditation. Since the teachers from both ACSI and ACCS self-reported high levels of overall IFL (Table 5) (Table 14), the standards of accreditation may or may not have been a factor in this result. However, it is important to note the study indicated teachers serving in accredited schools from both the Christian schools accredited with ACSI and classical Christian schools accredited with ACCS responded with high levels of IFL. An application from the data is that teachers who serve at accredited schools significantly practice the integration of faith and learning. A future application for both Christian school associations is to increase public relations both locally and nationally in regards to schools receiving accreditation and their level of integrating faith and learning. There is data to support communicating to the public that ACSI and ACCS accredited schools have a high level of integrating of faith and learning (Table 5) (Table 14).

**Hiring Tendencies**

A key application garnered from the results of the data is related to hiring tendencies for Christian schools and classical Christian schools. The first application of experience being significant in the level of integrating faith and learning is that a teacher
practices IFL on a daily basis. The data revealed the more experience the teacher has the greater level of integration of faith and learning a teacher practices (Table 15). This finding is of practical significance for Christian school administrators and classical Christian school administrators. A teacher’s years of experience is of great value in relation to the teacher’s comfort level in teaching a subject that has the potential to produce greater levels of integration. This result may be related to the notion that the more a teacher serves the more exposure to training they attain. The teacher’s comfort level in a particular discipline increases with longevity.

The second application is that gender is not relevant in the level of integration of faith and learning. Scripture indicates both male and females are created in the image of God (Gen 1:27), and yet, there are key differences between male and female teachers. However, according to the findings in this study, gender was not a significant factor in the level of integration of faith and learning as self-reported by the participants. Gender should not be a factor in hiring decisions when a school administrator seeks to assemble a team to integrate faith and learning.

Value of Training

The data revealed the majority of the teachers surveyed at accredited Christian and classical Christian schools had received training in integrating faith and learning (383, 70.7%) (Table 6). The highest levels of IFL in both ACSI and ACCS schools were discovered in teachers who had received training. This is a significant finding for both the Christian school movement and the classical Christian school movement to create more initiatives for the training and evaluation of integration of faith and learning in the
classroom. This training initiative may occur at several different levels in the context of a school.

One level of training may occur on the national level as both associations have national conferences on an annual basis. ACSI, as the larger Christian school movement, has several different formats for training. The one-day enabler training series are purposed to equip Christian school administrators and faculty with “highly specialized training in very defined areas” (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org). Training in the area of integration would qualify as “highly specialized training in very defined areas.” ACSI also provides conferences and workshops for professional development throughout the world focused on practical aspects of Christian school leadership for administrators, board members, and educators. Another training format ACSI offers is two-day regional conventions, designed to equip Christian school leaders for their roles and give educators continuing education units to maintain ACSI teacher certification (Association of Christian Schools International [2011], acsi.org).

In relation to ACCS training, there is a national conference drawing approximately 1,000 classical Christian educators annually. The intent of the national conference is to provide encouragement and training on classical Christian school education for ACCS member schools. ACCS also has regional teacher training events intended for first year teachers, those who are just beginning in the field of classical and Christian education, or those who desire a refresher course (Association of Classical and Christian Schools [2011], accsedu.org). A focal point for application for both organizations is to make a point to train and equip teachers on what IFL is and how to practice IFL in the classroom on a daily basis.
Importance of Experience

The overall mean for the number of years teaching for all the participants in the study, both Christian schools and classical Christian schools, was 13.24 (N = 546) (Table 7). As a breakdown, the mean for teachers at Christian schools was 12.98 and the mean for teachers at classical Christian schools was 3.57 (Table 7). As noted above, the data revealed that years experience and training are significant factors for the degree to which teachers practice the integration of faith and learning.

The ability to do IFL increased the longer a teacher teaches. The practical result of this finding is the years of experience of a teacher is a significant indicator of whether or not a teacher will conduct IFL at a high level. An explanation for this finding may be that as a teacher garners experience in a particular subject and grade level, the teacher becomes more knowledgeable of ways to integrate on a daily basis, thus becoming more confident in their ability to do IFL. Another possible explanation for the data is that the more experience a teacher accumulates, the more training the teacher is exposed to in either ACSI or ACCS schools. An experienced teacher should be valued and given opportunities to train and equip inexperienced teachers in the area of IFL.

Former Attendance at Christian or Classical Christian School Does Not Increase Level of IFL

An interesting and unexpected discovery in the data analysis indicated teachers who did not attend a Christian school or classical Christian school self-reported higher level of IFL. In relation to Christian schools, the ability to do IFL was higher for teachers who had not attended Christian schools. An application of this finding suggests former attendance at a Christian school does not necessarily mean an enhancement of the
teacher’s ability to do IFL in the classroom. This may affect hiring and/or selection of teachers who train other teachers in IFL. In relation to classical Christian schools, teachers not attending a classical Christian school, 97.6% of the total respondents (Table 6), indicated being better equipped to do IFL than teachers who did attend classical Christian school (Table 20). The data was too limited to draw any significant implications or applications from this finding since the researcher did not collect data on years attended at a Christian school or classical Christian school. Out of the 546 participants, only 13 (2.4%) of the teachers responded they had attended a classical Christian school growing up (Table 6).

A possible explanation for the difference may be the teachers who had attended a Christian school may not have been exposed to secular curriculum or thought based upon the philosophy of the school. Within K-12 Christian schools, there are different philosophies related to how much to expose students to secular culture and thought. This finding needs more in depth research in order to explore the differences between a teacher’s level of integrating faith and learning and former attendance at a Christian school or classical Christian school.

**Classical Christian Schools Integrate**

While the level of integration among ACSI and ACCS teachers was high, ACCS teachers may have had higher level and ability to do IFL than ACSI teachers. This is an interesting discovery in light of the other findings related to training received and years of experience both being factors that increase the level of IFL. A larger population would be helpful in further explaining this phenomenon. The mean for years teaching among ACCS teachers was 3.57 years and the mean for years teaching among
ACSI teachers was 12.98 (Table 7). This indicates there may be other factors that increase the level and ability to do IFL among ACCS.

A key distinction between ACSI and ACCS is the application of the *Trivium* in the teaching pedagogy. It is difficult to compare Christian school teachers to classical Christian school teachers in the level of integration of faith and learning because of so many other factors that may contribute other than teaching methodology and educational philosophical differences. Some of these factors may be but are not necessarily limited to administrative training, ACSI more mature movement, curriculum, and number of schools. However, a practical application of this result is that classical Christian educators are to be noted for their praxis of IFL. This research was intended to be descriptive and foundational in comparing the level of integration of faith and learning between ACSI and ACCS schools. Further research is needed to discover specific factors related to the differences in IFL between these school associations.

ACCS teachers self-reported less teacher years ($M = 3.24$) than ACSI teachers ($M = 12.98$), and yet ACCS teachers indicated higher levels of IFL (Table 5) (Table 14). This suggests there may be other factors affecting the level of IFL other than longevity in teaching such as curriculum, teaching methods, philosophy of education, and/or an individual school’s emphasis of IFL. Also, there may be a possibility that the nature and philosophy of classical Christian schools attracts teachers more prone to practice the integration of faith and learning.

**Research Limitations**

There are several limitations of the current research that need to be addressed. The first limitation was the research was unable to study all ACSI accredited schools and
ACCS accredited schools. This study focused upon accredited institutions of ACSI and ACCS, and thus, the study is not applicable to membership schools of these associations. Also, since the research was limited to accredited schools with ACSI and ACCS, the results are not applicable to other Christian school associations.

There may be varying levels that various institutions practice the integration of faith and learning that depend on a plethora of factors. For example, other research has shown that school administrators’ emphasis upon faith and learning integration is a key factor in the teacher’s understanding and implementation of faith and learning integration (Welch 2008). Another factor is whether or not the teacher has received training in theology (Jang 2011) or graduated from a Christian college or university (Eckel 2009). A limitation of the current study was the number of years the teacher has taught in Christian schools since this research was delimited to teachers who have been teaching for three years or more.

Another research limitation of the study was the research was unable to determine the emphasis each individual school places upon the integration of faith and learning. There are many schools that claim to be Christian, but it is the leadership of the school that creates an ethos of integrating faith and learning in and throughout all aspects of the school.

This study was unable to determine the factors that impact the application of faith and learning integration for teachers. The research was descriptive in nature as to the level of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools and classical Christian schools. It was difficult from the data collected to determine the various individual factors that stimulate the integration of faith and learning.
Further Research

The research was a pioneer effort that investigated and analyzed the integration of faith and learning occurring between Christian schools and classical Christian schools. The researcher hopes this research serves as a stimulant for other research to be conducted in the area of faith and learning integration within ACSI and ACCS and in other Christian school associations. The following areas may be a possibility for future research conducted on the integration of faith and learning in the Christian school movement:

1. Is there a relationship between a teacher’s denominational affiliation and the level of integration of faith and learning? This may prove to be interesting in determining whether or not a particular denomination equips teachers to integrate on higher level.

2. A qualitative study or mixed methods study to determine the specific training a teacher has received in the area of integrating faith and learning that may enhance or encourage the Christian school movement to make the integration of faith and learning an area of concentration.

3. A study to determine how the impact of ACSI and ACCS school graduates and their understanding of the integration of faith and learning in their particular field may aid in determining the success of Christian schools to accomplish the formation of a biblical worldview.

4. A study to determine whether or not theological orientation is a significant factor in the integration of faith and learning. This may reveal some other Christian movements that may be conducting the integration of faith and learning in a deliberate way.

5. A study to determine whether or not accreditation is a significant factor in the integration of faith and learning. This research may reveal some key distinctives of accreditation that may change the accreditation process to increase the integration of faith and learning.

6. A study to determine whether or not intentionality in training teachers in the integration of faith and learning within ACCS schools impacts the level of integration that occurs.
7. A study to determine whether or not ACCS schools without *intentional training* in the integration of faith and learning differ from ACSI schools in the level of integration of faith and learning that occurs.

8. A study to determine how *years of experience* teaching may influence the degree teachers integrate faith and learning.

9. A study to determine how *curriculum* used in the classroom impacts the level of the integration of faith and learning that occurs.

**Summary of Conclusions**

As stated at the beginning of chapter 2, the heart of Christian education is to manifest wisdom, knowledge, and understanding by *integrating* learning under the reality and Lordship of Jesus Christ (Lockerbie 2007, xxv). In essence, the paramount function of the integration of faith and learning is to take every thought captive to Jesus Christ (2 Cor 10:5). For the Christian educator, a way to teach and train students to *think* and *act* from a biblical worldview is to model the integration of faith and learning in the classroom.

The stated purpose of this research was to fill a void in the literature gap by analyzing and comparing the integration of faith and learning being conducted in K-12 Christian schools that are accredited by the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) and by the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS). Based upon the data collected in this study, the integration of faith and learning is occurring at a high level at accredited Christian schools and accredited classical Christian schools. The research indicates *training* and *experience* are significant factors in enhancing a teacher’s ability to integrate faith and learning.
In conclusion, perhaps the best way to articulate the paramount importance of the redemptive activity in the task of integrating faith and learning within Christian education is to note Christ’s preeminence in all endeavors in Colossians 1:16-17:

For by *him* all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities – all things were created through *him* and for *him*. And *he* is before all things, and in *him* all things hold together.
APPENDIX 1

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING SURVEY

The following survey was administered online at SurveyMonkey:

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING SURVEY

Agreement to Participate

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to assess the practice of the integration of faith and learning in the Christian school classroom. Dan Peterson, a Ph.D. student at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY, and headmaster of Cornerstone Academy in Morristown, Tennessee, is conducting this research for purposes of comparing the integration of faith and learning practices between the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) and the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) accredited schools. In this research, you will be asked questions concerning the integration of faith and learning (IFL). 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 on the integration of faith and learning, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

Definition of the Integration of Faith and Learning (IFL): The integration of faith and learning “means the relating of one’s biblical worldview to the learning that is taking place in the academic or cultural arenas” (Cosgrove 2006, 54).

INSTRUCTIONS

How much does each statement below describe you or your situation relating to the integration of faith and learning?

1 = Never
2 = Seldom
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Always
LEVEL

1. I do not know what the integration of faith and learning (IFL) is 1 2 3 4 5
2. I know what IFL is 1 2 3 4 5
3. I know how to integrate faith and learning in my classes 1 2 3 4 5
4. I know how deliberate IFL will affect classroom content 1 2 3 4 5
5. I was prepared to do IFL before teaching at my school 1 2 3 4 5
6. I am sufficiently prepared to help other faculty with IFL 1 2 3 4 5
7. School administration trains me in IFL 1 2 3 4 5

EQUIPPED

8. I am concerned about my skills to manage IFL in my classroom 1 2 3 4 5
9. It is very difficult or impossible to do IFL with the subject I teach 1 2 3 4 5
10. I have revised my instructional approaches to practice IFL 1 2 3 4 5
11. I am self-reflective in my application of IFL 1 2 3 4 5
12. I meet regularly with other faculty to plan IFL 1 2 3 4 5
13. I know where resources are available for IFL 1 2 3 4 5
14. Institutional leadership at my school equip me for IFL 1 2 3 4 5

ABILITY TO DO

15. I actively practice IFL in my classroom 1 2 3 4 5
16. I am able to do IFL in my classroom 1 2 3 4 5
17. I am overwhelmed with other things that I have little time for IFL 1 2 3 4 5
18. I monitor the affect IFL has on my students 1 2 3 4 5
19. There is a conflict between IFL and my responsibilities 1 2 3 4 5
20. I do not have enough time to organize IFL myself 1 2 3 4 5
21. My school administration enables me to do IFL in my classroom 1 2 3 4 5

INTENTIONALITY

22. I implement IFL in my classroom based on student feedback 1 2 3 4 5
23. I am not concerned about IFL 1 2 3 4 5
24. I deliberately decided to implement IFL this year 1 2 3 4 5
25. I have examined ways to improve IFL in my classes 1 2 3 4 5
26. I coordinated IFL with other teachers to maximize the impact 1 2 3 4 5
27. I would like to tell other departments about the benefit of IFL 1 2 3 4 5
28. Administration at my school actively reviews my practice of IFL 1 2 3 4 5
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

You are finished with the classroom practice survey. Your answers below will add value toward the completion of the survey.

29. Are you male or female? _____ Male _____ Female

30. Do you consider yourself a Christian? ___ Yes ___ No

31. How many years have you taught in Christian schools? ______

32. Do you teach at a Christian school (not a classical Christian school)?
   ___ Yes ___ No

33. How many years have you taught at a Christian school (not a classical Christian school)? ______

34. Do you teach at a classical Christian school? ___ Yes ___ No

35. How many years have you taught in classical Christian schools? ______

36. Did you attend a Christian school (not a classical Christian school) growing up? ___ Yes ___ No

37. Did you attend a classical Christian school growing up? ___ Yes ___ No

38. Have you received training specifically in the area of the integration of faith and learning? ___ Yes ___ No
APPENDIX 2
PERMISSION FOR ORIGINAL RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The following electronic mail was received granting permission to use the original research instrument for the purpose of this study:

From: Raquel Korniejczuk <rkorniej@um.edu.mx>
Date: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 3:38 PM
To: Daniel Peterson <dpeterson@camtn.com>
Subject: Integration of Faith and Learning Instrument

Dear Mr. Peterson,

I am glad to know that you are interested in research on integration of faith and learning in Christian schools.

I grant you my permission to use and modify the model I developed years ago in my dissertation. I hope the model and instruments are helpful in your work. The model and the instrument has been used in several other thesis and dissertations in different areas of the world. I will be happy to provide to you feedback on the instrument you modified. Currently I am the Academic VP in a Christian University in Mexico. I had the opportunity to develop a faith integrative model at university level.

Let us keep in touch,

Raquel Korniejczuk, Ph.D.
Academic Vice President
Universidad de Montemorelos
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PERMISSION FOR MODIFIED RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The following electronic mail was received granting permission to use the modified research instrument for the purpose of this study:

From: "mark.eckel@att.net" <mark.eckel@att.net>
To: dpeterson <dpeterson@cornerstoneacademymorristown.com>
Sent: Mon, September 6, 2010 8:19:57 AM
Subject: Raquel Korniejczuk

Hi Dan. Please note that the date of this email was March, 2007. But I hope it helps!

I would be happy to serve on your expert panel and yes, you may modify my instrument for your dissertation.

I hope that your path toward completion is made level. Continue the good work you've been given to do.

Mark

Mark Eckel, ThM PhD
warpandwoof.org
Dean, School of Undergraduate Studies
Professor of Old Testament, Crossroads Bible College
11150 Plum Hollow Circle, Fishers, IN 46037
317.352.8736 x239 (O) 317.577.1417 (H) 630.303.4891 (C)
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SBTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

The following electronic mail was received from the STBS Research Ethics Committee communicating approval of the research:

From: Michael Wilder <mwilder@sbts.edu>
To: Dan Peterson <danpeterson18@yahoo.com>; Hal Pettegrew <hpettegrew@sbts.edu>
Sent: Mon, September 19, 2011 11:51 AM
Subject: Research Ethics Committee

Dan,

Your research has been approved by the ethics committee. Work with Dr. Pettegrew as you move forward.

Michael
Michael S. Wilder, Ph.D. Associate Dean of Doctoral Studies
School of Church Ministries

SOUTHERN SEMINARY 2825 Lexington Road Louisville, KY 40280
Phone: (502) 897-4418 mwilder@sbts.edu
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CORRESPONDENCE WITH ACSI

The following letter was sent via electronic mail to the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) to obtain their permission to conduct research on ACSI accredited schools:

Dan Peterson  
479 Lochmere Dr.  
Morristown, TN 37814  
423-258-1558  
danpeterson18@yahoo.com  

September 22, 2011  
Association of Christian Schools International  
ATTN: Dr. Derek Keenan  
P.O. Box 65130  
Colorado Springs, CO 80962-5130

Dear Dr. Keenan,

My name is Dan Peterson and I am seeking to conduct research on the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in accredited K-12 Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) in the United States. I serve as the headmaster for Cornerstone Academy in Morristown, TN, an ACSI accredited K-11 school. This letter serves as a formal request for your permission to undertake my research, as well as a request for ACSI accredited schools to participate. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of faith and learning integration occurring in accredited schools within your association.

I have enclosed the survey questionnaire I am sending the participants. If you approve of this research, I am requesting for you to send me the email addresses of all head administrators serving at K-12 ACSI accredited schools within the United States. I appreciate your involvement in this important research and will send you a copy of the conclusions of my study once completed.
Thanks again for your cooperation and interest in my research. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at 423-258-1558.

Blessings,

Dan Peterson
Ph.D. Candidate
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
APPENDIX 6
CORRESPONDENCE WITH ACCS

The following letter was sent via electronic mail to the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) to obtain their permission to conduct research on ACCS accredited schools:

Dan Peterson
479 Lochmere Dr.
Morristown, TN 37814
423-258-1558
danpeteron18@yahoo.com

September 22, 2011
Association of Classical and Christian Schools
ATTN: Patch Blakey
P.O. Box 9741
205 East 5th Street
Moscow, ID 83843

Dear Mr. Blakey,

My name is Dan Peterson and I am seeking to conduct research on the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in accredited K-12 Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) in the United States. I serve as the headmaster for Cornerstone Academy in Morristown, TN, an ACCS membership school serving grades K-11. This letter serves as a formal request for your permission to undertake my research, as well as a request for your accredited schools. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of faith and learning integration occurring in accredited schools within your association.

I have enclosed the survey questionnaire I am sending the participants. If you approve of this research, I am requesting for you to send me the email addresses of all head administrators serving at K-12 ACCS accredited schools within the United States. I appreciate your involvement in this important research and will send you a copy of the conclusions of my study once completed.
Thanks again for your cooperation and interest in my research. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at 423-258-1558.

Blessings,

Dan Peterson
Ph.D. Candidate
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
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ACCS PERMISSION

The following letter was mailed via electronic mail to the researcher granting permission to conduct the research and providing contact information for school administrators of ACCS accredited schools:

From: Patch Blakey <execdirector@accsedu.org>
To: Daniel Peterson <dpeterson@camtn.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 2:00 PM
Subject: ACCS Accredited Schools

Dan,

Thanks for your phone call this morning and for your diligent labors to promote and provide classical Christian education.

I’ve attached the list of the currently accredited ACCS schools, their headmasters, and their contact info.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Yours in Christ,

Patch

Patch Blakey
Executive Director
Association of Classical & Christian Schools
P.O. Box 9741
Moscow, Idaho 83843
208-882-6101
www.accsedu.org
This letter was sent from the researcher to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for ACSI giving instructions on the research:

From: Daniel Peterson [mailto:dpeterson@camtn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 05, 2011 8:42 PM
To: Keenan, Derek
Cc: Daniel Peterson; Daniel Peterson; Daniel Peterson
Subject: Doctoral Research on ACSI Accredited Schools

Dr. Keenan,

This is Dan Peterson, and I am emailing you from my school account. I have included (below my signature) the email to send to the school administrators of K-12 accredited schools in ACSI. Please send the email to the appropriate school administrators and they can send the email to teachers that have been teaching for three years or more. If you can send this email to all K-12 accredited schools within the United States only and also exclude the Southeast and Mid-America regions. The reason to exclude these specific regions is because other research is being conducted in these regions on the integration of faith and learning. The deadline for submitting will be Friday, October 28, and the required statement of confidentiality and conformity to standards is included on the survey link. I have also attached the approval to conduct the research from my committee at Southern Seminary.

I appreciate your willingness to allow me to conduct this research. I am thankful for your leadership within ACSI and Christian education. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Soli Deo Gloria,

Dan Peterson
Headmaster, Cornerstone Academy
“Training a generation in biblical worldview and academic excellence...”
www.camtn.com
dpeterson@camtn.com
Dear School Administrator,

My name is Dan Peterson and I am seeking to conduct research on the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in accredited K-12 Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) in the United States. I serve as the headmaster for Cornerstone Academy in Morristown, Tennessee, an accredited ACSI school serving grades K-11. I have received permission from the Vice President of ACSI, Dr. Derek Keenan, to conduct this research within ACSI. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of faith and learning integration occurring in accredited schools within your association. If you would please copy and paste the below text (under the email signature) and send via email to all of your teachers that have been teaching for three years or more. The deadline for submission by the teachers will be Friday, October 28, 2011. Thank you for your assistance in this research.

Soli Deo Gloria,

Dan Peterson
Headmaster, Cornerstone Academy
“Training a generation in biblical worldview and academic excellence...”
www.camtn.com
dpeterson@camtn.com
(w) 423-307-1189

Dear Teacher,

The integration of faith and learning is often discussed in educational literature today. There are various factors mentioned that promote or facilitate the integration process. Much of the research has been devoted to the collegiate level of education. The Internet link below directs you to a research survey designed to identify the level of the integration faith and learning occurring within Christian K-12 education.

As a teacher, you are involved with the implementation faith and learning integration. With your school being accredited with the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI), your insights of Christian education are valued. These insights provided through the following survey will be used for doctoral research purposes at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

I recognize this is a busy time of the year. I would appreciate you taking approximately ten minutes to click the following link to read the Agreement to Participate and complete the survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L2BHPC9. Please complete and submit the survey by Friday, October 28, 2011. 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 voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your prompt response is greatly appreciated.
Blessings,

Dan Peterson  
Ph.D. Candidate  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
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LETTER TO ACSI SCHOOLS

This letter was sent from the Vice President for Academic Affairs of ACSI to ACSI school administrators encouraging them to send the research instrument to teachers on staff who have been teaching for three or more years in any grade or subject K-12:

Office of the Vice President, Academic Affairs
October 2011
RE: Dan Peterson-Integration of Faith and Learning Research
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L2BHPC9

Dear School Administrator,

This letter is to urge your positive response to the request for participation in a research study on the level of faith integration in accredited ACSI schools. Dan Peterson is conducting this study to complete the requirements for his doctoral studies at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The integration of all subjects with God’s truth is the distinctive of Christian schools, and we need additional information which studies such as this will provide to become even more effective. Dan is the headmaster at Cornerstone Academy, Morristown, TN.

Please forward this letter with the survey link to the teachers on your staff who have been teaching for three or more years in any grade or subject K-12.

I am well assured of the professional standards and confidential manner in which this research will be conducted. The collection of data and the reporting of such data will meet the standards for academic research.

I would encourage you to participate in this study as a great value to your school; your own professional development, as well as making a significant contribution to the research base for the Christian school movement. ACSI heartily endorses this research project and we appreciate you giving it serious consideration.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Derek J. Keenan Ed.D.
Vice President, Academic Affairs
APPENDIX 10

LETTER TO ACCS SCHOOLS

The following letter was mailed via electronic mail to the Heads of School of accredited ACCS K-12 schools requesting their permission to conduct this research effort, and asking them to send to teachers on staff who have been teaching for three or more years in any grade or subject K-12:

October 6, 2011

Dear Head of School,

My name is Dan Peterson and I am seeking to conduct research on the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in accredited K-12 Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) in the United States. I serve as the headmaster for Cornerstone Academy in Morristown, TN, an ACCS membership school serving grades K-11. I have received permission from the Executive Director of ACCS, Mr. Patch Blakey, to conduct this research within ACCS. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of faith and learning integration occurring in accredited schools within your association. If you would please copy and paste the below text (under the email signature) and send via email to any of your teachers that have been teaching for three years or more. Thank you for your assistance in this research.

Soli Deo Gloria,

Dan Peterson
Headmaster, Cornerstone Academy
“Training a generation in biblical worldview and academic excellence...”
www.camtn.com
dpeterson@camtn.com
(w) 423-307-1189
Dear Teacher,

The integration of faith and learning is often discussed in educational literature today. There are various factors mentioned that promote or facilitate the integration process. Much of the research has been devoted to the collegiate level of education. The Internet link below directs you to a research survey designed to identify the level of the integration faith and learning occurring within Christian K-12 education.

As a teacher, you are involved with the implementation faith and learning integration. With your school being accredited with the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS), your insights of Christian education are valued. These insights provided through the following survey will be used for doctoral research purposes at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

I recognize this is a busy time of the year. I would appreciate you taking approximately ten minutes to click the following link to read the Agreement to Participate and complete the survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L2BHPC9. Please complete and submit the survey by Friday, October 28, 2011. Your prompt response is greatly appreciated.

Blessings,

Dan Peterson  
Ph.D. Candidate  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
This letter was sent via electronic mail to ACCS Heads of Schools encouraging participation in the study:

Dear Head of School,

This is a reminder of the research on the integration of faith and learning occurring in ACCS accredited schools. I believe this research is timely as the latest version of the Journal of ACCS, Classis, was on integration. If you have not already done so, please take the time to read the email below my signature and follow instructions for sending this email to all of your teachers who have been teaching for three years or more. If you have already sent it to the teachers via email, please follow up with your teachers to encourage them to take it. The amount of participation is critical to the results, especially since the sample size is smaller. The deadline to participate is next Friday, October 28.

My name is Dan Peterson and I am seeking to conduct research on the level of integration of faith and learning occurring in accredited K-12 Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS) in the United States. I serve as the headmaster for Cornerstone Academy in Morristown, Tennessee, an ACCS membership school serving grades K-11. I have received permission from the Executive Director of ACCS, Mr. Patch Blakey, to conduct this research within ACCS. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of faith and learning integration occurring in accredited schools within your association. If you would please copy and paste the below text (under the email signature) and send via email to all of your teachers that have been teaching for three years or more. Thank you for your assistance in this research.

Soli Deo Gloria,

Dan Peterson
Headmaster, Cornerstone Academy
“Training a generation in biblical worldview and academic excellence...”
www.camtn.com
dpeterson@camtn.com
(w) 423-307-1189
Dear Teacher,

The integration of faith and learning is often discussed in educational literature today. There are various factors mentioned that promote or facilitate the integration process. Much of the research has been devoted to the collegiate level of education. The Internet link below directs you to a research survey designed to identify the level of the integration faith and learning occurring within Christian K-12 education.

As a teacher, you are involved with the implementation faith and learning integration. With your school being accredited with the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS), your insights of Christian education are valued. These insights provided through the following survey will be used for doctoral research purposes at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

I recognize this is a busy time of the year. I would appreciate you taking approximately ten minutes to click the following link to read the Agreement to Participate and complete the survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L2BHPC9. Please complete and submit the survey by Friday, October 28, 2011. 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 voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your prompt response is greatly appreciated.

Blessings,

Dan Peterson
Ph.D. Candidate
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
APPENDIX 12
THANK YOU LETTER TO ACSI/ACCS

The following letter was mailed via electronic mail to ACSI and ACCS thanking them for encouraging participation in this study:

Dan Peterson
479 Lochmere Dr.
Morristown, TN 37814
423-258-1558
danpeterson18@yahoo.com

December 21, 2011

Dear Association of Christian Schools International/Association of Classical and Christian Schools,

I want to sincerely thank you for taking the time to aid in this research on the integration of faith and learning. I truly believe this effort to better understand the level of integration occurring in Christian schools in relation to classical Christian schools is of vital importance for the future direction of the Christian school movement seeking to help students adopt a biblical worldview. This research is just the beginning of being able to understand the various factors surrounding the integration of faith and learning in the Christian school and classical Christian school movement.

My research will be finished soon and results will be available in the summer of 2012. Please feel free to contact me with any further suggestions or comments. Again, thank you for your willingness to encourage participation in this research.

Blessings,

Dan Peterson
Ph.D. Candidate
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY
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ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING BETWEEN ACSI AND ACCS ACCREDITED SCHOOLS

Daniel Carl Peterson, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012
Chair: Dr. Hal K. Pettegrew

The purpose of this descriptive quantitative study was to analyze and compare the integration of faith and learning occurring in Christian schools accredited by the Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) and classical Christian schools accredited by the Association of Classical and Christian Schools (ACCS). ACSI represents the larger Christian school movement while ACCS represents the larger classical Christian school movement.

The biblical metanarrative of the Christian faith – creation, fall, redemption, and consummation – set the biblical and theological framework for the integration of faith and learning in this study. A precedent literature review pointed to a gap in the literature base regarding the integration of faith and learning occurring between ACSI and ACCS schools.

Essentially, the study sought to describe the degree to which accredited K-12 ACSI and ACCS schools integrate faith and learning and then compare the level of integration of faith and learning between ACSI and ACCS accredited schools. The
research design for the study was a one-phase quantitative study utilizing both descriptive and inferential statistics. The research instrument was originally developed and used by Raquel Bouvert de Korniejczuk and later modified by Mark Eckel to determine the level of integration of faith and learning teachers are practicing in ACSI and ACCS schools.

Overall, the data indicated teachers were practicing a high level of integration of faith and learning in their pedagogy in both ACSI and ACCS accredited schools. The data indicated that as the years taught at Christian schools and classical Christian schools increased the level of integration of faith and learning increased. Gender was not a factor in the level of integration of faith and learning. Teachers that did not attend a Christian school growing up self-reported a higher level of integration of faith and learning than teachers who did attend a Christian school growing up. Teachers, both in Christian schools and classical Christian schools, receiving training in the area of the integration of faith and learning indicated a higher overall level of integration of faith and learning.
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