Faith and Learning at Malone

A foundational promise of Christian higher education is that we teach courses and programs in ways that reflect the illumination of Christian faith and understanding. For that reason, all applicants to Malone University are required to compose a "statement of the integration of faith and learning in the academic discipline." If this is new language for you, or if your graduate training and teaching experience have not explicitly prepared you for this adventure, this packet of readings is designed as a brief introduction.

Integrative teaching reflects our belief that intellectual growth and spiritual growth cannot be compartmentalized from each other. Such teaching does not necessarily look the same from one discipline to another, or from one teacher to another, but it is unified by our determination to forge an academic pathway for students that is simultaneously true both to the foundational purposes of a discipline or practice, and to the witness of Christian faith. To join the Malone faculty is to accept this ongoing challenge as a foundation of your professional practice.

Issues of Christian faith integration have generated a wide-ranging scholarly discussion over the years, and we include several items in this link that you may find helpful as you prepare your application materials and begin imagining your work as a Malone professor. Included are:

- The Mission Statement of Malone University.
- The Foundational Principles of Malone University.
- The first chapter of David I Smith's book On Christian Teaching (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 2018).
- A review essay by Stephen Moroney entitled "Where Faith and Learning Intersect: Re-Mapping the Contemporary Terrain" Christian Scholars Review 43 (2014):

Our Mission

The mission of Malone University is to provide students with an education based on biblical faith in order to develop men and women in intellectual maturity, wisdom, and Christian faith who are committed to serving the church, community, and world.

Our Foundational Principles

A Christian university for the arts, sciences, and professions, Malone grounds its educational mission in the biblical call to seek Christ's Kingdom First in all things. As we work out our calling, we put into action foundational principles that reflect our Christian faith, our Evangelical Friends heritage, and our desire to seek truth. These foundational principles help guide our work over time in the face of changing external exigencies and are the means by which we articulate what is and has been intrinsically important to the institution.

We cultivate the life of the mind by pursuing and witnessing to the truth.

The academic life of Malone University falls under a broader goal of seeking truth in all areas, including the humanities, arts, sciences, social sciences, personal health, theology, and the professions. We value and foster intellectual breadth and virtue, believing that individuals who seek Christ's Kingdom First are called to embark on a lifelong process of learning. The quest for knowledge and truth enables us to be better stewards of God's creation. As people who are being transformed by Christ, we witness to the truth in many ways, such as engaging in research, scholarly inquiry, and professional endeavor; working for justice; and strengthening community life.

We are called to know Christ and make him known through the integration of learning and faith.

We believe that faith and knowledge are inextricably bound to one another and should not be compartmentalized or fragmented. Professors and students at Malone examine what the Christian faith has to say about a given discipline and what that discipline has to say about the Christian faith. These actions stem from our belief that Christ is known not only through Scripture, the workings of the Holy Spirit, and tradition, but also through the pursuit of knowledge. We are called to make Christ known through scholarship in our individual disciplines, evangelism to our community, and service to others. These actions reflect our conviction that a Malone education should equip students to fulfill their callings. Therefore, we nurture intellectual curiosity, creativity, critical thinking, compassion, and spiritual growth.

We are shaped by and draw upon our Christian and institutional heritage.

Our educational mission is rooted in our understanding of the historic Christian faith. This broad Christian tradition provides us with a Christocentric perspective of intellectual inquiry and engagement with the world. Consistent with evangelicalism, the college has maintained its concern for biblical faith, proclamation of the gospel, and service to local and international communities. Shaped by our holiness and Friends heritage, Malone is an institution that values piety, concern for ordinary people, and experiential activism. From its founding, Malone University has welcomed staff members from different Christian denominations and traditions, enriching the resources of the university. The dialectics that emerge from these diverse perspectives compel us to an ongoing process of communication with one another and the community at large. This variety of Christian experience offers a basis for openness in the learning process, critical examination of worldviews, and cultivation of individual spiritual journeys.

Because we are called to love our students, we intentionally focus our work on promoting their intellectual, spiritual, and social growth.

The congenial and collegial atmosphere at Malone reflects a theological and intellectual commitment by the faculty, staff, and administration to educate and disciple our students in ways that challenge their intellect, encourage their faith and develop their character. We hold that learning flourishes in a community where people draw upon Scripture, tradition, reason, experience, and inquiry through thoughtful conversation and active relationships with others. The relationships that are formed between members of our campus community and students foster a dialogical process that reflects this belief that learning is not a solitary activity, designed for self-interested ends.

We live and learn in a community that manifests and develops concern for others.

As a university community we are called to learn from one another, develop relationships, and work out our vocations in ways that demonstrate concern, accountability, respect, and humility. We extend these principles to the larger community and the world as we examine and endeavor to promote justice, civic responsibility, peace, and reconciliation. Through outreach, evangelism, and service we desire to witness to the love and grace of Christ. We emphasize corporate worship, prayer, study of Scripture, and other spiritual activities to prepare ourselves for learning and service, as well as to nurture and strengthen the spiritual life of the community. God's grace is evident in our communal life as we seek to live out this calling in a broken world.

On Christian Teaching

Practicing Faith in the Classroom

David I. Smith

1 The Pedagogy Gap

There is a line in a Bruce Cockburn song that describes the "wild-eyed dogs of day to day" nipping around our ankles.[1] The image has long stuck with me. It tugs my attention toward the gaps that doggedly persist between Christian statements of educational mission and the daily realities of educational practice. The soaring eagles' wings of Christian mission statements, philosophical perspectives, worldview declarations, and the like can raise our gaze and remind us that bigger things are at stake when we enter a classroom. Yet so much of what we do there is in the end decided closer to ankle level, closer to the place where the material pressures and quirks of our teaching contexts harry and herd our movements. Our declarations of faith strike up a stirring tune, but it is often the wild-eyed dogs of day-to-day that determine our dance steps. Amid the snapping and snarling, gaps appear between our aspirations and our practices.

"I Hate That Book."

When my son was in high school, he took an advanced science course. The book he brought home was a monumental slab of learning with small pictures, smaller print, and a section, it seemed, for every last species of fungus. Braving its heft, I borrowed it and began to browse.

I soon ran across passages that made me wonder how my son's teacher would handle them in class. One page outlined the evidence for large meteor strikes in the past history of planet Earth and their catastrophic ecological

effects. It noted that in terms of average historical intervals, we seem to be overdue for another large impact, and suggested that it is a statistical accident that anyone is still alive to read the book. On another page the quantities of various chemicals in the human body were enumerated and given a current market value in dollars. The process arrived at a rather modest value for a human being in chemical terms. My son's school was Christian. It does not take too much theology to lead one to wonder whether passages implying that the continuance of human life is a statistical accident or that a human body can be priced by weight and composition might at least require some qualification.

My immediate thought was that this could be an excellent text for a Christian classroom. In addition to the large expanse of solid information, there seemed to be moments where a naturalistic worldview leaked through, a picture of the world as *just* matter in motion. These could surely spark some interesting discussion. There were chances here for students to ponder big questions, to weigh rival stories about the meaning of human existence. I was curious about how my son's teacher would put it to use. Would students be helped to grapple with questions about faith and knowledge, about providence, worth, and wonder?

When I found an occasion to ask how the biology class was going, I learned that the class was going well but that my son, an excellent student, did not find the textbook particularly engaging. In fact, his verdict was succinct: "I hate that textbook. It's so boring." I asked how much of it he had read. He estimated maybe a few pages, and turned back to his homework.

I was a little puzzled. He was by now several weeks into the course. I knew that his homework was based on the textbook, and that the course had already progressed through several chapters. He claimed to have read only a few pages, yet was a diligent learner and seemed to be doing well academically. I began to watch more closely.

The homework tasks were pretty standard, the kind that I have assigned myself on many occasions. They typically asked him to read a particular chapter of the textbook and answer some questions to demonstrate comprehension. My son and his fellow students proved adept at finding more efficient paths to the desired product. Why read twenty or thirty pages of tedious text to extract information when you know how to use a search engine? Better still, work through the questions as a group via online chat, each student searching different science and general reference websites, and select the answers that

are consistent across multiple sources. The intended pedagogy of individual reading and written summarizing turned into a combination of search skills, online group collaboration, and fact checking. Using these strategies, students completed the worksheets quickly and with reasonable reliability. Apparently, this was quite effective in terms of meeting the teacher's requirements; my son received excellent grades. I wondered how many of my own assignments were like Cinderella coaches, turning into something quite different from what I imagined as soon as students left my classroom. I suspect this happens more often than I would like to think. After all, it happens often enough while students are still in the classroom and I am supposedly in charge.

I tell this story here to begin unpacking a question that is at the heart of this book. If we want to understand how faith informs education, in what ways does the teaching and learning process, rather than the perspectives conveyed by course content, require our attention?

There is enormous investment of effort, time, and resources worldwide in various forms of Christian education, by which I here mean not just the direct inculcation of Christian faith but also the broader endeavor of offering education on all topics from within a Christian frame of reference. More than a fifth of American degree-granting institutions of higher education describe themselves as "religiously affiliated,"[2] with that affiliation being, for the most part, Christian. A yet larger network of Christian elementary and secondary schools promises in various ways a distinctively Christian education. In many other countries, significant percentages of school-age youth attend faith-based institutions, and Christian schools and institutions of higher education are still multiplying in many locations around the world.[3] The existence of such schools both presupposes and sustains an ongoing conversation about what "Christian" has to do with "education," a conversation in which research vies with entrenched positions and assumptions for airtime.[4]

A great deal of the existing Protestant literature on this question has tended to imply that Christian teaching happens when the ideas that are taught are Christian. A course of study, on this view, is Christian if it teaches about things from a Christian perspective, or if it discusses how faith relates to the topic under study, or if the Bible is brought to bear on a topic, or if it communicates a Christian worldview. The formulations vary. Yet it is possible to find whole books on Christian education that barely mention the pedagogical process or the way students experience and interpret learning. The focus has more

often been on the philosophies framing the enterprise and the perspectives and worldviews on offer. It is easier to find writing that focuses on intellectual history and ideological prescription than writing that gets to grips with the meanings implicit in our actual teaching and learning practices.[5]

This common approach was at the back of my mind when my son's biology textbook caught my eye. I was wondering what perspective the book was purveying. At what points did it betray a worldview through its presentation of course content? Would there be thoughtful Christian engagement in class with the book's underlying assumptions? In the end, the learning practices of my son and his friends outflanked these questions. The design of the homework assignments, the availability of internet technologies, the social interactions of students outside of class, the uninviting prose of the textbook, the time pressures of a busy teenage life—factors such as these rendered the worldview of the textbook largely irrelevant in this instance. I have no idea whether the sections I noticed were ever discussed in class. Given my son's disavowal of having paid much attention to its pages, I find it doubtful. In this case, at least, it was not the perspective of the textbook—let alone the school's eloquent mission statement—that was shaping learning. This was not because of some failure of faith on the part of the teacher but simply because of the normal vicissitudes of teaching and learning, the ones I see in my own classroom. Another victory for the wild-eyed dogs.

Of course, textbooks can wield significant influence, and shaping course content responsibly surely matters. Yet the shape of the teaching and learning process affects how students access and experience that content, helping weave the web of values, relationships, and actions within which learning becomes meaningful. An account of Christian education that focuses only on the truth of what is taught, and fails to address the meanings molded through *how* it is taught and learned is at best incomplete. Yet that is the kind of account that we have most often generated, if one judges by the published literature on Christian education.[6] What happens if we shift focus and ask not just what Christian ideas are to be taught, but what might be Christian about the teaching and learning practices among which we invite students to live? This book will seek to answer that question. But first, let's turn our gaze back to ankle level.

"I Don't Need to Know It That Well."

Focusing on the teaching and learning process may call to mind another standard strategy for thinking about what makes education Christian. Perhaps teaching is Christian when it reflects a Christian spirit or ethos, when it is infused with love, or humility, or patience, or when we exhibit genuine care for students. Perhaps teaching is Christian when it is allowed to emerge from a Christian heart and loving relationship.[7] This all seems good as far as it goes, but before we reach too eagerly for this second strategy, permit me another brief story about my son's homework.

This time, the homework was from a religion class. The class was taught by a kind, dedicated, caring, and creative educator of fine Christian character. My son approached me one day and asked me to help him study for a test. He showed me an information sheet with two parallel columns. On the left was a list of about a dozen key theological terms; corresponding to each of these on the right was a paragraph-length definition. He needed to master these words and their definitions for the test the next day. We sat down in the living room and I began to probe his understanding with questions. Does ascension just mean going up in physical space? What is the difference between justification and sanctification? Can you think of a story or a Bible text to illustrate any of these? He tolerated this procedure for a few minutes before taking the sheet from me and exclaiming, with a note of slight exasperation, "But I don't need to know them that well! On the test they are only going to make me match the words with the definitions!"

Freeze the action at this moment and consider what is happening here. Notice that he is claiming to be able to predict the future; the test still lies ahead, yet he thinks he knows what it will look like. What gives him confidence that he can make this prediction? Put a bit more formally, I think he was really saying something like this: "Oh father of mine, you don't understand how this works. During my time in high school, I have noticed certain patterns in the behavior of my teachers. When they give me information formatted in this pattern, there is a stable correlation with the kind of test they assign. This correlation allows me to predict with some confidence that I will only need to match words with their definitions. Basic pattern recognition will suffice. Thinking about all the distinctions and implications is taking more of my time than is warranted by the nature of the task." Patterns in teacher behavior made

the nature of the test predictable, and the expected test required only recall, not understanding. I was making things too hard and wasting his time.

If this was indeed something like his underlying thought process, his conclusion was quite correct.[8] Imagine a similar information sheet laid out in the same manner but written in a language you don't speak, or in Wingdings. With the investment of ten minutes' effort (memorize the first few characters of each word and of its corresponding definition) you could score very well on any matching test and many multiple-choice tests. If regularities of format allow you to predict the testing procedure, and the test relies heavily on matching, comprehension is often optional. This suggests that his response was not simply lazy; as in biology, he was doing well in the religion class. It was the rational response of a busy person seeking the most efficient way to get a task completed. I wonder how many of my own testing strategies have invited student responses that focused on successful completion of the task but bypassed deep learning. Quite a few, I suspect. Designing the test is not always where my creative energies are most concentrated. The wild-eyed dogs are back.

As with the biology homework, the problem here is not the worldview suggested by the course content. The teacher would have been hard pressed to get more Christian ideas onto the page without using a smaller font. What if we point instead to heart and character, to how the teacher's faith shines through in his relational engagement with students? Does it help here if we think of Christian teaching not just in terms of ideas and perspectives but also in terms of living out Christian virtues? In this instance, no.

Surely virtues and relationships (like ideas and perspectives) matter, yet in this particular case the teacher's character was not the problem. What is doing the work here is not character or quality of relationship, but the design of the task, the structure of the learning resources, and the patterns of practice. My son was not saying that he mistrusted his teacher, but simply that he had a fairly precise idea of the amount of effort required by this particular kind of task set within the larger patterns of teachers' pedagogical behavior and the school's testing practices.

The result was an unintended learning outcome. I am confident that it was never announced in class that learning central concepts in theology is not terribly important. Yet it seems that the pattern created by the worksheet design and the testing procedures sent just that message. My son was looking at a page that listed the dozen or so most important theological concepts for understanding the New Testament and concluded: "I don't need to know them that well." This outcome seems a little more pointed than a choice to learn biological information more efficiently online. It has a more direct bearing on faith formation. Yet I suspect that if most of us were asked what our schools were doing about faith formation, we would point to chapel programs, student ministries, and syllabi for religion courses long before we would think to mention the patterns in our habitual worksheet layouts and testing procedures. We think of these as mechanical matters, somewhat distant from the concerns of faith. We rightly sense that there is no single God-ordained way to handle them, no "biblical" pattern for laying out information on worksheets. For the most part we make them just good enough to function as we juggle pressures on our time. And yet, if we are not able to engage thoughtfully with the meanings communicated in and through the specific patterns of teaching practices, it will be hard to claim an adequate account of how or whether the education we offer is Christian. For it is within these patterns that we invite students to live and learn.

"The Path of Least Resistance."

Let's shift focus a little and look at an incident from a higher education classroom. Some years ago, I received an email from a former student who was an unusually bright, thoughtful, and dedicated individual. He had gone on to undertake graduate study at a well-respected seminary. Partway through his graduate studies, he wrote the following to me:

> In a class on Anglo-American postmodernity I've been frustrated by how assignments are designed. We recently received our first paper back, and I was surprised and somewhat amused to find that almost all of the best students (i.e. those who have taken the most interest in the material, who have asked the most insightful questions, and whom I would just generally like to sit down and have a long talk with about the material) got rather crummy grades. Of about five of the students I have talked to, all students who I see as brighter than myself and who I would like to have look over my work, only one did well while several did miserably. After talking with different people, I've come to suspect that the reason is these students

were not content to simply regurgitate information. We realized that what the professor and TA want is basically a boat-load of citations to answer the relatively simple questions. I've been somewhat amused by the result of this, because it has made the last first and the first last—normally C students got mostly A's, while the normally A students got C's. But it is also frustrating, because the path of least resistance to an A is intellectual mediocrity. We all laughed at ourselves because we spent hours on a paper that was really an easy A to get B's and C's. What this does, however, is incentivize acquiescence and intellectual apathy. I've run into this now in a few classes, and am beginning to worry that I will not survive seminary with a shred of intellectual rigor left in me.[9]

The context is different, but again unintended outcomes arise from ordinary patterns of practice. The message that theological study and rigorous thought do not sit easily together was surely not intended by the professor teaching the class. As in the previous instances, I have no grounds for doubting the professor's character, the validity of their course content, or the professor's intent to offer a Christian perspective on that content. What is once again at issue is not content or character, but the way we arrange the pedagogical furniture. The pattern of pedagogical practice is sustaining a gap between intent and outcome. I do not offer the story as an instance of peculiarly bad teaching; I am confident that I have sent similar unintended messages. None of us, I hope, intend to affirm unthinking conformity or discourage careful thought. Yet the patterns of our practice send their own messages. Students find meanings in our teaching. They may not be meanings that we have intended, yet they are there to be found in the learning environment that we have provided. Once more, we feel a nipping at our heels.

Faith and Pedagogy

So far, I have narrated three examples of teaching practices that were bent a little askew. Each of them looks ordinary to me, the kind of thing that happens all the time in my classroom and in classrooms everywhere. We could all add more stories of such gaps. I could add the time when a student rightly asked me why one particular skill that seemed centrally relevant to my course was

being neglected, and it had not occurred to me that I was creating such an absence. Or the time when I was full of glee at the creative and absorbing learning activity that I had designed for one class, only to have a student confide in me later that the group had found it entertaining but that none of them had been able to figure out what it was actually trying to teach. Gaps between intent and outcome are a basic fact of life, and none of us have taught the perfect class. Many of the processes in which we are involved are so complex that it is too much to expect that we will completely master the effects we have on others and on the world around us.

Yet there seems to be more going on in each of these examples than just random rough edges. The slippage in each instance is not just an accident. Each disconnect makes sense once we look at the pattern of pedagogical practice that led to it. The gap arises not *in spite of* the teacher's choices, but *because of* them. It is not like pouring water into a bucket and having a few drops accidentally miss. It is more like pouring familiar household chemicals into a drain and finding that I have damaged the local ecosystem. The issue is not just complexity or lack of mastery but the choice of medium and strategy. In each instance, in different ways, faith is somehow part of the mix, caught up in how teaching works. This again points us toward the central question of this book: how might Christian faith relate to the pedagogical process itself and not just to the topics and institutional contexts of learning?

As I have wrestled with this question, I have regularly run into colleagues who doubt that it is a useful one. Perhaps, they suggest, teaching is just the "how to," just a set of techniques and routines to be tested empirically and harnessed to larger goals and topics. Perhaps the intellectual heavy lifting is appropriately associated with those larger goals and topics rather than the mere means and practical strategies. Perhaps teaching is just a matter of matching teacher strategies to current neuroscience or student outcome data to optimize the intake capacity of students' brains.[10] Perhaps teaching, like riding a bicycle, is not the kind of thing that can have a Christian version—perhaps the pedals work the same way for everyone and the wheels turn in a manner indifferent to the faith of the rider.[11] Perhaps an effort to figure out what could be Christian about teaching and learning is bound to turn weird, prescribing some idiosyncratic "biblical" way of demonstrating chemical reactions or explaining poems and foisting it on everyone regardless of disciplinary needs, student differences, institutional contexts, personality strengths, or empirical

evidence. Perhaps the reason there has been relatively little discussion of how faith informs pedagogy is that there is not much there to discuss. Perhaps, as a Christian colleague once put it to me, this particular dog won't bark.

Perhaps. But I think not. In fact, I think that all of these suppositions are misguided. This book will offer a cumulative case for another view: faith can and should inform and help to shape pedagogy. I will draw examples from both higher education and K-12 classrooms and from several subject areas without attempting to cover every kind of teaching. I will not be offering tight prescriptions or perfected strategies but rather trying to model and describe a particular kind of reflection and conversation.[12] My goal is not a recipe for others to copy, but a more nuanced, supple capacity for fruitful engagement with Christian teaching and learning. The key claims that I hope to unpack and illustrate are as follows:

- There is a rich, interesting, and important conversation to be had about faith and pedagogy. It goes beyond questions of the worldview or perspective expressed in course content, and it is not reducible to questions of character or treating students kindly.
- Making headway with this conversation need not imply imposing a prescribed set of God-approved techniques. It needs to be a conversation because there is no simple formula for teaching Christianly, nor should there be one.
- This conversation is necessary to the ongoing health and future development of Christian education at all levels and to the flourishing of its students. It will involve a particular kind of attentiveness to embodied practice that does not let go of our more common focus on good thinking but expands its context.
- This particular conversation has tended to be neglected in Protestant discussions of education. We are currently not very skilled in pursuing it, and many of the intellectual tools developed for discussing the "integration of faith and learning" are not ideally suited to developing it further.

I will be drawing a number of the examples from my own teaching experiences simply because they offer me intimate access to the process of faith-informed reflection on teaching and learning. Examples are not general proofs, but they can illustrate, clarify, provoke, and suggest key questions. I hope, too,

that focusing on examples will get us further than general prescriptions and declarations of principle. Even if for theological reasons we want to say that faith must indeed make a difference to teaching, can we actually imagine what difference it would make to the pedagogical processes of a French class or a math course without resorting to just adding devotions or lapsing into the idiosyncratic? It is that concrete capacity to imagine how faith might affect pedagogy that I want to foster.

Home Making

An example drawn from the history of education might help orient our imaginations for what follows. The modern era has tended to imagine teaching in terms of the language of method and technique. A pedagogy has come to be thought of as a "routine of efficiency"[13] that offers convenient, repeatable steps for getting to pragmatic outcomes—a way of doing things detached from the ties of time, place, and commitment. A "method" is supposed to work for everyone, everywhere, without being muddied by our beliefs and loves. The fourteenth-century university of Paris offers a different cluster of images for teaching and learning, one that places technique within a bigger picture.[14]

Before more centrally organized colleges won the day in the fifteenth century, the basic options for students coming to study at the university were to rent private accommodation or to become part of a communal student house. Such a house was both a part of the university structure and a distinct place of learning. A master of the arts would oversee it and provide academic teaching while also being responsible for food, furniture, and the shared rules and routines of the community in exchange for a weekly fee. These houses went by various names. Such a house could be called a *hospicium*, or hospice, a term that, before its post-nineteenth-century association with care for the dying, meant a rest house for travelers. The students were *hospites*, guests, further evoking an image of hospitality to strangers. The house in which students lived and learned could also be called a *paedagogium*, a place of pedagogy.

I bring this up not to suggest a return to the teaching strategies or organization of the medieval university or to suggest that they were superior to those of today. I raise it simply because the choice of name is suggestive. After the seventeenth century, a *pedagogy* would become a method, a systematic set

of steps to follow. The image of the *paedagogium* hints that a pedagogy might rather be a house, a home, a shared dwelling space.

The economic and administrative structure of the medieval hostel system did not survive over the long haul. Yet there is a truth in the idea of a *hospicium* that is also a *paedagogium,* a truth that tends to remain hidden in talk of "teaching methods." To teach is to have some content and a plan and some strategies and skills, to be sure. But to teach is also to make choices about how time and space are used, what interactions will take place, what rules and rhythms will govern them, what will be offered as nourishment and used to build shared imagination, and what patterns will be laid out for students to move among. A pedagogy offers a temporary space to live in together while learning. It may be one in which there is much or little time for silent reflection, in which students learn to collaborate intensively or listen passively, in which the problems of the surrounding neighborhood are taken up or set aside for other matters, in which outside voices are welcomed or shunned, in which the focus is on utility or wonder. A pedagogy can include or exclude, can be hospitable or inhospitable, can energize or deaden.

We should step away from seeing teaching as a set of techniques, as something done *to* students by a teacher. When we teach, when we design learning, we offer a temporary home in which students will live for a while, and we shape the patterns of life together within which they will grow. A pedagogy is a home in which teachers and students can live together for a while, a place to which students are welcomed as guests and in which they can grow. Like any home, it involves resources for and patterns of interaction, both intended and unintended, that shape how those within it grow and imagine the world.[15] Beginning with the next chapter, we will visit some pedagogical homes and consider what it might be like to live and learn in them, and whether they might offer any help with the "wild-eyed dogs of day to day."

Where Faith and Learning Intersect: Re-Mapping the Contemporary Terrain

By Stephen Moroney

Introduction

In 1992 William Hasker noted that what was lacking in the faith-learning integration literature was "a systematic mapping" of "the general ways in which the worldview issues connect with the particular concerns of various disciplines."[1] So, Hasker set out "to map the territory between broadly global and narrowly disciplinary discussions of the integration of faith and learning."[2] When it came to strategies for integration, Hasker followed Ronald Nelson's earlier classification scheme (compatibilist, reconstructionalist, and transformationalist), endorsing it as a valuable contribution to Hasker's larger map-making project.[3]

Nelson's typology, published twenty-five years ago, was a useful guide when Hasker incorporated it into his map of faith-learning integration twenty years ago. In fact, Nelson's schema and Hasker's map continue to be cited because they still shed light on some of the ways that Christian scholars may approach their academic disciplines.[4] These earlier works have enduring value, much like the National Geographic United States Classic wall map still serves many classrooms and homes well in identifying essential places in the United States.

When there is little change in the terrain, older maps remain useful. A Rand McNally atlas from the 1980s will prove entirely adequate to GPS-less travelers today who stick to the main highway as they cross the state of North Dakota (just stay on I-94!). On the other hand, maps of Eastern Europe from the 1980s are

In this essay Stephen Moroney provides an updated map to help readers grasp several ways that faith and learning intersect for professors and for students, in the academy and in the classroom, in the curriculum, and in lived experience. Integration approaches often focus on relating the content of the Christian faith to the content of the discipline being studied. Worldview approaches typically emphasize thinking about the subject matter from a Christian perspective. Practice and formation approaches normally stress the development of faithful disciples through classroom activities and assignments. Mapping the recent literature on faith and learning provides an orientation to the contemporary terrain and reveals that each of the map "locations" has something valuable to contribute. Mr. Moroney teaches theology at Malone University in Canton, Ohio.

woefully out of date because of substantial changes in the geo-political landscape of the former USSR and nearby territories. This essay contends that in the past few decades there have been significant developments in how Christian scholars conceive of their academic tasks, so that it is time for an updated map. While recognizing that there have been helpful maps produced since the work of Nelson and Hasker,[5] this essay asserts that a new map is warranted, one that can help scholars navigate the contemporary terrain.

The purpose of this essay, then, is to re-map the current state of how Christian scholars approach the intersection of faith and learning. Just as most maps are covered with small print that identifies important geographic sites, this essay is dotted with many footnotes that cite important works on the intersection of faith and learning. And just as most maps use larger and bolder print to designate especially prominent places, this essay gives special attention to three "locations" or approaches that have been prominent in the faith and learning literature, especially within the past decade. Though each of the three "locations" is marked by distinctive characteristics, they are not mutually exclusive. That is to say, many Christian scholars find it enriching to draw on helpful aspects of several of the approaches described below.

Location #1: Faith-Learning Integration Approaches

The first location on our map has some affinities to Washington, D.C. Just as the United States' capital is a place where conventional paradigms are heralded by some and criticized by others, faith-learning integration has been an "establishment approach" over the past few decades, but it also has come under attack by those who find it inadequate. The language and concept of faith-learning integration has been utilized by many, but it has not commanded the consent of all, with dissenters challenging this traditional way of doing business.

Though the meaning of the phrase "faith-learning integration" is contested,[6]

it is commonly explained in the following way. Most university scholars receive their doctoral education (and often their earlier bachelors and masters degrees) at secular universities where they are typically taught, whether explicitly or tacitly, that their religious views are best kept private. Often Christians in such settings have not had the opportunity to bring together their advanced academic training ("the secular") with their cherished religious beliefs ("the sacred"). The project of faith-learning integration, then, is really an effort to "reintegrate" spheres of truth that have been artificially disconnected in most scholars' graduate school experience and perhaps more broadly disconnected in academic circles since the Enlightenment.

Faith-learning integration assumes that "all truth is God's truth," that "there is no conflict between God's truth and other truth," and that by itself "secular learning is incomplete and often distorted."[7] Thus the integration of faith and learning attempts to join together what humans should never have separated, fusing biblical truth with truth from all other disciplines in pursuit of a unified, coherent understanding of all the truth which a person may encounter. As one champion of the integration paradigm put it, "what Christians seek is nothing less than the unification of knowledge, bringing together into one Christ-centered, reintegrated whole all we can know from God's revelation and all we can discover through the exercise of our faculties. This is what we mean by 'the integration of faith and learning.'"[8]

Most proponents of faith-learning integration insist that while chapel programming, required theology courses, dorm Bible studies, opening class devotions, and personal faculty-student relationships are good things, "in themselves they fall short of the basic task of integrating faith and learning, which is the acquisition, organization, and presentation of knowledge informed by a Christian worldview."[9] So, what its proponents most often mean by faith-learning integration is something like "the development of interconnections, relationships, and mutual

---

[1]William Hasker, "Faith-Learning Integration: An Overview," *Christian Scholar's Review* 21 (1992): 234.

[2]Ibid., abstract.

[3]Ibid., 239-243. See Ronald R. Nelson, "Faith-Discipline Integration: Compatibilist, Reconstructionalist and Transformationalist Strategies," in *The Reality of Christian Learning: Strategies for Faith-Discipline Integration*, eds. Harold Heie and David L Wolfe (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian University Press, 1987), 317-339.

[4]Stephen Beers and Jane Beers, "Integration of Faith and Learning," in *The Soul of a Christian University: A Field Guide for Educators*, ed. Stephen T. Beers (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2008), 51-73.

[5]See Ken Badley, "The Faith/Learning Integration Movement in Christian Higher Education: Slogan or Substance?" *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 3 (1994): 13-33 and Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, *Scholarship and Christian Faith: Enlarging the Conversation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), especially 151-169.

[6]The phrase "integration of faith and learning" may be traced to Frank Gaebelein in the 1950s, later popularized by Arthur Holmes in the 1970s (Badley, "The Faith/Learning Integration Movement," 16-17). Badley observes that "Faith can mean 'life of faith' or 'body

[6] (cont.) of doctrine.' Learning can mean 'process of learning' or 'body of knowledge.' Integration of faith and learning could imply any four combinations of these elements" (28). Badley further differentiates between fusion integration, incorporation integration, correlation integration, dialogical integration, and perspectival integration (24-25). Semantic and conceptual disagreements notwithstanding, Badley concludes later that "the phrase has a sort of core meaning roughly related to making or seeing connections between Christian faith and scholarship or education." See Ken Badley, "Clarifying 'Faith-Learning Integration': Essentially Contested Concepts and the Concept-Conception Distinction," *Journal of Education & Christian Belief* 13 (2009): 12.

[7]Robert A. Harris, *The Integration of Faith and Learning: A Worldview Approach* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2004), 4. On the relationship between the title and subtitle of this book, see the comments concerning location #2 on our map below.

[8]Duane Litfin, *Conceiving the Christian College* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 195. See also 168, 173, and 203.

[9]Beers and Beers, "Integration of Faith and Learning," 55. This formulation blends elements from location #1 and location #2 on our map, as highlighted in comments on location #2 below.

clarifications between Christian truth and academic content."[10] By deliberately reflecting on the relationships between theological knowledge and disciplinary knowledge, no matter what the field of study, scholars are able to uncover the connections that already exist.[11]

This approach is nicely illustrated by two series of books that promote faith-learning integration for undergraduate students. The first series was published by Harper for the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) in order to examine psychology, history, biology, literature, business, sociology, music, and mathematics "through the eyes of faith."[12] More recently, InterVarsity Press has published a "Christian Worldview Integration Series" which pursues a variety of integrative tasks and addresses several integrative problems in education, communication, psychology, politics, literature, philosophy, and business.[13]

The 116 member campuses of the CCCU and its 54 affiliate campuses have been key sites for faith-learning integration approaches. As the president of a CCCU institution observed, "the integration of faith and knowledge is the most distinctive task of Christian higher education—always was, is now, always will be."[14] Support for this observation may be found in recent survey data from both faculty and students at CCCU schools.

When asked their reasons for taking the job at a CCCU school, the two most

[10]Harris, *The Integration of Faith and Learning*, 24.
[11]Harry L. Poe, *Christianity in the Academy: Teaching at the Intersections of Faith and Learning* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004).
[12]David G. Myers and Malcolm A. Jeeves, *Psychology Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); Ronald A. Wells, *History Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989); Richard T. Wright, *Biology Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989); Susan V. Gallagher and Roger Lundin, *Literature Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989); Richard C. Chewning, John W. Eby, and Shirley J. Roels, *Business Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990); David A. Fraser and Tony Campolo, *Sociology Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992); Harold M. Best, *Music Through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993); James Bradley and Russell Howell, *Mathematics Through the Eyes of Faith* (New York: HarperOne, 2011).
[13]Paul D. Spears and Steven R. Loomis, *Education for Human Flourishing: A Christian Perspective* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009); Tim Muehlhoff and Todd V. Lewis, *Authentic Communication: Christian Speech Engaging Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010); John H. Coe and Todd W. Hall, *Psychology in the Spirit: Contours of a Transformational Psychology* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010); Francis J. Beckwith, *Politics for Christians: Statecraft as Soulcraft* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2010); David Lyle Jeffrey and Gregory Maillet, *Christianity and Literature: Philosophical Foundations and Critical Practice* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011); Garrett J. DeWeese, *Doing Philosophy as a Christian* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011); Kenman L. Wong and Scott B. Rae, *Business for the Common Good: a Christian Vision for the Marketplace* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011). As a "Christian Worldview Integration Series," these books draw on aspects of location #2 from our current map, but they are even more strongly grounded in location #1 (abundantly evident in the series preface penned by series editors Francis J. Beckwith and J. P. Moreland), and hence are included here in our map.
[14]David S. Dockery, *Renewing Minds: Serving Church and Society through Christian Higher Education* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2007), 114. See also 111, 115.

frequent reasons given by nearly 2,000 faculty were "commitment to Christian higher education" (45%) and "opportunity for me to integrate faith and learning" (30%).[15] Once they got the job, 95% of the faculty at these schools agreed that they "have a good idea of what is meant by the phrase, 'the integration of faith and learning'"[16] and 84% of them reported that "it is not difficult for me to integrate faith and learning in my discipline."[17] This perception is shared by students at CCCU schools, with 93% of the students agreeing that they "have a good idea of what is meant by the phrase, 'the integration of faith and learning,'"[18] and 82% of students reporting that "the faculty at this college/university have enhanced my faith."[19]

Of course, as analysts have pointed out, "these results, which are essentially a request for self-evaluation, do not necessarily imply that the integration of faith and learning has a common understanding among CCCU faculty members or is successfully practiced across disciplines."[20] On the flipside, others believe that though it may be a bit vague at times, affirming the language and concept of faith-learning integration, even if only in principle, is nonetheless positive.[21]

So, the "faith-learning integration" paradigm is widely employed and defended, but critics continue to see problems with it. One criticism is that despite the rhetoric of "integration" being a two-way street, in the practice of many Christian scholars the traffic flows in only one direction. When this is the case, the integration model has functionally "meant that faith has the right, and indeed the duty, to critique learning but that learning has no authority to critique faith."[22] This stance is problematic, say critics, because it fails to acknowledge that Christians' understanding of the faith is imperfect and subject to correction, rather than being an immovable point from which to pronounce judgments on contemporary scholarship. The critics here call for more epistemological humility in allowing a mutually enriching conversation between faith and learning rather than insisting that our current understanding of the faith always trump our current

[15]Samuel Joeckel and Thomas Chesnes, eds., *The Christian College Phenomenon: Inside America's Fastest Growing Institutions of Higher Learning* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2012), 357, FSQ 21. Interestingly, the more years faculty had taught at their college/university, the more likely they were to answer "commitment to Christian higher education" and the less likely they were to answer "opportunity for me to integrate faith and learning" though the aggregate total between the two was fairly steady (71, Table 9).
[16]Ibid., 356, FSQ 18. Not surprisingly, the longer faculty taught at their college/university, the more likely they were to "strongly agree" with this item (71, Table 7).
[17]Ibid., 357, FSQ 19. Similarly 86% report that "my approach to my discipline is shaped by my religious beliefs" (362, FSQ 42).
[18]Ibid., 382, SSQ 17.
[19]Ibid., 382, SSQ 15.
[20]David L. Weeks and Donald G. Isaak, "A Coda on Faith, Learning, and Scholarly Rigor," in Ibid., 62.
[21]See Badley, "The Faith/Learning Integration Movement in Christian Higher Education," 27-28 and George M. Marsden, "Moving Up the Slippery Slope," in Ibid., 336.
[22]Jacobsen and Jacobsen, *Christian Scholarship and Christian Faith*, 23.

scholarly ideas. Besides faith-informed scholarship, the critics insist, we also need academically-shaped faith in which "Christian scholars turn the issues around and use their disciplinary knowledge as a fixed point of reference to critique or tweak their own Christian faith."[23]

A second criticism is that because the integration model is grounded in the Calvinistic tradition it is not a natural fit for Christian scholars whose roots are in other streams of the Church. Those hailing from "the Catholic, Wesleyan, Lutheran, Pentecostal, Anabaptist, or any other non-Reformed tradition," say the critics, "will probably feel they are speaking a second language of sorts if they try to adopt the integration model in its entirety" because "some of the core theological concerns of non-Reformed Christian traditions simply do not translate into integration-speak."[24] On a related note, critics believe the integration model works well with disciplines that are philosophically-driven and theory-conscious but that it is not an especially helpful paradigm for disciplines that are oriented in more pragmatic directions.[25]

A third criticism is that the language and concept of "'integration' reflects modernist sensibilities, valorizing the autonomy of the individual, who within himself melds faith and scholarship into a unified, almost monumental, form—like modernist architecture."[26] Critics find the integration model to be rational, argumentative, and competitive rather than contemplative, conversational, and cooperative.[27] While the former has its place, critics believe it also has severe limitations since "abstract, logical thinking by itself is 'too simple to offer us the type of self-understanding we need' because it cannot 'grapple with the messy material of grief, love, anger and fear' that so profoundly shapes our lives."[28] Beyond the abstract analysis of the integration model, critics say that full-orbed Christian scholarship needs to give more attention to "shared mystery at the wonder of life," more emphasis on "the questions one feels compelled to ask than the answers one provides," and more recognition that "interactions between faith and learning are at best complex, convoluted, and unpredictable."[29]

Of course these criticisms have met with responses. In reply to the first criticism, advocates of the faith-learning integration model have insisted that while traffic should run both ways down the street of faith and learning, when impasses are reached there are good biblical, epistemological, and historical reasons for most

[23]Ibid., 154.
[24]Ibid., 26. See also the related suggestion that the Christian Church has at least six spiritual traditions (not just the evangelical tradition, let alone the Calvinist stream within evangelicalism) and that each of these traditions has valuable insights for our lives as academics (93).
[25]Ibid., 27.
[26]Crystal L. Downing, "Imbricating Faith and Learning: The Architectonics of Christian Scholarship," in Ibid., 40.
[27]Ibid., 47.
[28]Ibid., 47. Here Jacobsen and Jacobsen cite Martha Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1-3.
[29]Ibid., 48, 58.

often granting the right of way to faith (the apprehension of special revelation) and most often expecting human learning (the apprehension of general revelation) to yield.[30] In response to the second criticism, proponents acknowledge that the integration model has been effectively championed by those in the Reformed tradition but they believe that pursuing a "biblical, Christ-centered vision of integration" is not uniquely Calvinist but instead "rises out of a *biblical* rationale, one that belongs to all Christians everywhere," whether they choose to use the language of "integration" or not.[31] In reply to the third criticism, advocates have insisted that while the integrative task pursues a common goal of "a unified, Christ-centered understanding of the world," this in no way implies "a cookie-cutter approach to Christian scholarship" but rather affirms "a wide variety of useful approaches across the several academic divisions, across the many disciplines, even within each discipline."[32]

The dialogue between "integrators" and their critics will undoubtedly continue. Even sympathizers may question the helpfulness of "faith-learning integration" language.[33] For the cartographic purposes of this essay what is noteworthy is that while the language and concept of faith-learning integration remains a mainstay among Christian scholars, it is only one among many approaches. In earlier decades the language of faith-learning integration could be found in the mission statement of the Christian College Consortium.[34] Now the mission of the larger sister institution, the CCCU, has been recast "to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and to help our institutions transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to biblical truth."[35] When Hasker wrote two decades ago, "faith-learning integration" was the overarching title for his whole map. In the contemporary terrain, faith-learning integration approaches are still prominent, as is Washington, D.C., but they exist alongside other important approaches, including their nearest neighbor, Christian worldview approaches.

Location #2: Christian Worldview Approaches

Those who fly through the southern part of the central United States often find

[30]Litfin, *Conceiving the Christian College*, 196-202.
[31]Ibid., 138. Litfin believes that "the impulse to a Christ-centered integration is anchored in premises so basic to Christian thought that it transcends such sectarian differences" (140), italics in the original.
[32]Ibid., 147.
[33]Perry L. Glanzer, "Why We Should Discard 'the Integration of Faith and Learning': Rearticulating the Mission of the Christian Scholar," *Journal of Education & Christian Belief* 12 (2008): 41-51. Glanzer's initial proposed alternative was the "creation and redemption of scholarship" (43). Later Glanzer and Todd Ream proposed a nuanced alternative of the "redemptive development of humans and human creations." See Perry L. Glanzer and Todd C. Ream, *Christianity and Moral Identity in Higher Education* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 183.
[34]http://www.ccconsortium.org. See also Todd C. Ream and Perry L. Glanzer, *Christian Faith and Scholarship: An Exploration of Contemporary Developments* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2007), 68.
[35]http://www.cccu.org.

themselves routed through the Dallas-Fort Worth airport, a crucial part of the DFW "metroplex." Their counterparts flying through the northern part of the central United States often pass through the Minneapolis-St. Paul airport, found near the borderland of the "twin cities." In the northeast, many people today likewise see Baltimore-Washington as constituting a metroplex, twin cities, or a megalopolis. The cities can be distinguished, for instance, in the rivalry between their major league baseball teams, but they are also intricately intertwined, as with their use of the Baltimore-Washington airport and Baltimore-Washington parkway. If we think of faith-learning integration approaches as location #1, akin to Washington, D.C., we might think of Christian worldview approaches as location #2, akin to Baltimore, Maryland. Though distinguishable, they are very close neighbors with residents traveling freely between the two.[36]

The second "location" has a long history.[37] The basic argument here is that, whether they realize it or not, all people have worldviews—sets of lenses through which they view the world. As Abraham Kuyper observed, human knowing is shaped by prior human commitments, including religious commitments.[38] Those sympathetic to worldview approaches insist that Max Weber's fact-value distinction is mistaken. Rather, they say, our worldviews guide both what we believe the world is like and what we believe the world should be like. Our worldviews are necessarily religious, so the claim goes, and it is impossible for scholars to be religiously neutral.[39] Inevitably, then, proponents of this approach argue that "one's interpretations of phenomena or data will be influenced by one's worldview."[40] This being the case, it seems best for a scholar to test and examine his or her worldview alongside competing worldviews.[41]

Worldview approaches focus on the intellectual framework that Christianity provides for its adherents. Those worldview thinkers within the Reformed tradition especially emphasize the value of a creation-fall-redemption scheme for interpreting the world.[42] Proponents frequently argue that because a Christian worldview more closely approximates reality than secular approaches, it provides its followers with an advantage in the pursuit of knowledge, allowing them to see truths that their unbelieving counterparts may miss.[43] Although human limitations and sin should inculcate epistemological humility in all of us, believers and

unbelievers alike, advocates of a Christian worldview often assert that it should be adopted because it is "superior rationally, morally, and existentially to any alternative system of belief" be that naturalism, atheistic existentialism, pantheism, or other "street versions" of those competing perspectives.[44]

A Christian worldview is said to offer us a coherent, meaningful way of seeing life, which provides Christians with distinctive perspectives on technology, sexuality and marriage, the environment, the arts and recreation, science, and vocation, among other areas.[45] In this way, it is claimed, "a Christian worldview provides the framework for Christian scholarship in any and every field," be it literature, music, social science, health care, social work, or business.[46] On this approach, then, Christian scholars and students are called to engage in "distinctively Christian thinking" or "to think in Christian categories" about every possible subject matter so that we can show how "Christian thinking is applicable across the educational curriculum."[47]

Because Christian worldview approaches have a long history, their continuing presence as a prominent location on our updated map is no surprise. What is really new at this second location is the recent criticism it has received. Some of the criticism comes from those who say they are weary from sitting through too many youth group talks on the subject or those who believe they have seen worldview language used simplistically and reductionistically to bash various non-Christian -isms that are not treated with intellectual integrity.[48] Another corrective asserts that besides helping believers develop a Christian worldview, we must also help them identify and intentionally resist the often subtle but extremely powerful influences of other culturally-embedded worldviews such as individualism, consumerism, nationalism, moral relativism, and salvation by therapy.[49] These popular-level worldviews purportedly have been overlooked because "they usually fly under the radar of conscious thought" and influence us as "the cultural air we breathe."[50]

A related worry is that worldview discussions too often remain on the cerebral level without connecting integrally to how we actually live. Critics say that worldview approaches are limited by their faulty anthropology which leads them to believe that "the site of contestation between worldviews or ground-motives

---

[36]On this close but distinct relationship, see earlier observations in footnotes 7, 9, and 13.
[37]David K. Naugle, *Worldview: The History of a Concept* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002).
[38]Abraham Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994). Lectures originally given in 1898.
[39]Roy A. Clouser, *The Myth of Religious Neutrality: An Essay on the Hidden Role of Religious Belief in Theories*, Revised Edition (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005).
[40]Ream and Glanzer, *Christian Faith and Scholarship*, 52.
[41]Mark P. Cosgrove, *Foundations of Christian Thought: Faith, Learning, and the Christian Worldview* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2006).
[42]Cornelius Plantinga Jr., *Engaging God's World: A Christian Vision of Faith, Learning, and Living* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002).
[43]Gene Edward Veith, *Loving God with All Your Mind: Thinking as a Christian in the Postmodern World*, Revised Edition (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2003).

[44]Cosgrove, *Foundations of Christian Thought*, 26 and *passim*.
[45]David S. Dockery and Gregory Alan Thornbury, eds., *Shaping a Christian Worldview: The Foundations of Christian Higher Education* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2002), 10-11.
[46]Ibid., 12 and *passim*.
[47]Dockery, *Renewing Minds*, 51, 62. See also, David S. Dockery, ed., *Faith and Learning: A Handbook for Christian Higher Education* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2012).
[48]J. Mark Bertrand, *(Re)Thinking Worldview: Learning to Think, Live, and Speak in this World* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2007), 14-15.
[49]Steve Wilkens and Mark L. Sanford, *Hidden Worldviews: Eight Cultural Stories that Shape Our Lives* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009).
[50]Ibid., 13, 24.

is located in the realm of ideas."[51] Consequently worldview proponents tend to neglect the ways in which people's hearts and imaginations are oriented to the world not just by their mental beliefs but also by habit-forming bodily practices that shape their desires and loves—watching television advertisements, shopping at the mall, and so on.[52] It is a mistake, say these critics, to view people primarily as thinking beings who need to be informed by a Christian worldview rather than primarily as desiring beings who need to be formed by Christian liturgies.[53] Put bluntly, this criticism is that "worldview-talk has misconstrued the nature and task of Christian education because the operative notion of worldview at work there has been tied to a stunted, rationalist picture of the human person."[54]

Proponents of Christian worldview approaches sometimes assert that people's worldviews drive their values which drive their choices which cumulatively constitute the broader culture. Therefore, so goes the argument, as we change the common person's worldview we change his or her values which change his or her choices which change the culture.[55] Critics of the worldview approach assert, by contrast, that such a perspective is naively idealistic, ignores the ways culture is embedded in institutions and power structures, and cannot account for the disproportionate cultural influence exercised by groups that do not represent the majority or mainstream perspective.[56] There is little hope for changing the culture by changing ordinary people's worldviews because, say the critics, cultural change is usually initiated by overlapping networks of elites and their institutions.[57]

In response to such concerns, advocates of Christian worldview approaches have acknowledged that a person's worldview must be understood as much more than a set of mental beliefs, and rather is a broader "fundamental orientation of the heart" which is "the central operating chamber of every human being."[58] Recent worldview proponents have also been more careful to tie our thinking to our living by insisting that "if worldview thinking is to prove valuable in our lives, it must help make us better believers and doers of the truth. Otherwise it becomes a mental exercise that breeds arrogance and shores up the false security of intellectual elites."[59] Revisionists who want to hold onto this paradigm claim

---

[51]James K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009), 24.
[52]Ibid., 25.
[53]Ibid., *passim*.
[54]Ibid., 32.
[55]For example, see Charles Colson and Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1999).
[56]James Davison Hunter, *To Change the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), especially 18-31.
[57]Ibid., 41-43.
[58]James W. Sire, *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 122-124.
[59]Bertrand, *(Re)Thinking Worldview*, 13-14. For a recent attempt to address these concerns, though still with a focus on developing minds to think Christianly about specific academic disciplines, see Deane E. D. Downey and Stanley E. Porter, eds., *Christian Worldview and the Academic Disciplines: Crossing the Academy* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009).

---

that if Christian worldview approaches give more attention to contextualization within postmodern culture, they have the exciting potential to be missional, ecumenical, and incarnational.[60]

So, to sum up this second location on our updated map, Christian worldview approaches are a bit like Baltimore. They are closely related to the faith-learning integration approaches of their D.C. neighbors. It is not uncommon for academicians to lean on the construct of a Christian worldview to explain how they "think from a Christian perspective," which in turn shapes how they integrate their faith selectively with current ideas in their discipline. These two approaches have significant overlap. Many scholars would happily identify themselves as drawing equally on the worldview and integration paradigms (residents of the greater Baltimore-Washington megalopolis), while others might prefer to use an address that reflects their primary allegiance to the integration paradigm (Washington) or the worldview paradigm (Baltimore). Both the integration and worldview approaches have long-established histories, are slowly changing in response to their critics, and remain major "sites" where faith and learning intersect.

Location #3: Practice and Formation Approaches

The third location on our updated map is more like Austin, Texas, a smaller but rapidly growing city that would have warranted little attention on big-picture maps a few decades ago. Some of those who reside in this new location have deliberately moved away from integration and worldview approaches, while others see no problem in traveling back and forth between the locales, allowing their time in Austin to enrich what they do in Baltimore-Washington and vice-versa. In any case, it is clear that just as the capital of Texas is a far cry from the capital of the United States, practice and formation approaches to the intersection of faith and learning are not the same as the integration and worldview approaches described earlier.

Whereas CCCU schools have long been bastions of integration and worldview approaches (locations #1 and #2), church-related colleges and universities have been key institutional sites for the growth of practice and formation approaches (location #3).[61] In the mid-twentieth century, many church-related institutions seemed to believe that they had to choose between retaining their Christian dis-

---

[60]Michael W. Goheen and Craig G. Bartholomew, *Living at the Crossroads: An Introduction to Christian Worldview* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008). The emphasis on incarnational humanism can also be found in Norman Klassen and Jens Zimmerman, *The Passionate Intellect: Incarnational Humanism and the Future of University Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008).
[61]As noted throughout this essay, many scholars draw on what they believe to be helpful aspects of several approaches, so these observations about CCCU- and church-related colleges are broad generalizations which admit of numerous exceptions. See William C. Ringenberg, *The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 2006).

tinctiveness and attaining secular academic respectability. The landmark Danforth Study "indicated that by the middle of the 1960s the prospect of secularization had become the central focus for advocates of the church-related college."[62] The course toward secularization in many church-related institutions seemed irreversible as they eliminated many of their key markers such as "mandatory chapel services, clergy presidents, major financial support from sponsoring churches, chaplains with faculty appointment, and the capstone course in 'moral philosophy.'"[63]

In recent years, however, analysts have turned the tables by arguing that

rather than seeing religious colleges as backward institutions trying to catch up—as was common during the heyday of progressive scientific humanism—it may make more sense to see religious colleges as having preserved something valuable that has been largely lost elsewhere.[64]

The secularity of secular universities may be their major weakness.[65] Within this counter-narrative then, "the imperious hegemony of liberal, scientistic, objectivist, progressive secularism turns out to have been not the end of educational history, but only an episode," so that the start of the twenty-first century is in fact "an era where more and better self-consciously Christian learning is taking place than at any previous period in American higher education since the seventeenth century."[66]

According to one survey of the literature, over the past forty years less than 5% of the articles published in Christian scholarly journals address how faith intersects with teaching and learning, rather than how faith intersects with disciplinary research and scholarship.[67] Practice and formation approaches are, in part, a response to the way that, "theoretical discourse on church-related higher education, as instructive as it has been, has overshadowed its practical pedagogical implications in the literature."[68] So, within those church-related colleges and universities that have embraced the distinctively Christian nature of their mission there has been an increasing interest in how faith and learning intersect concretely

[62]Stephen R. Haynes, "A Review of Research on Church-Related Higher Education," in *Professing in the Postmodern Academy: Faculty and the Future of Church-Related Colleges*, ed. Stephen R. Haynes (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2002), 15. See also the historical account in Arlin C. Migliazzo, "Introduction: An Odyssey of the Mind and Spirit" in *Teaching as an Act of Faith: Theory and Practice in Church-Related Higher Education*, ed. Arlin C. Migliazzo (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), xxviii-xxxi.
[63]Stephen R. Haynes, "Preface," in *Professing in the Postmodern Academy*, xv.
[64]George M. Marsden, "Beyond Progressive Scientific Humanism," in *The Future of Religious Colleges*, ed. Paul J. Dovre (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 40.
[65]John C. Sommerville, *The Decline of the Secular University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). See also John C. Sommerville, *Religious Ideas for Secular Universities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009).
[66]Mark A. Noll, "The Future of the Religious College: Looking Ahead by Looking Back," in *The Future of Religious Colleges*, ed. Paul J. Dovre (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 85, 87.
[67]David I. Smith and James K. A. Smith, "Introduction: Practices, Faith, and Pedagogy," in *Teaching and Christian Practices: Reshaping Faith and Learning*, eds. David I. Smith and James K. A. Smith (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 3.
[68]Migliazzo, "Introduction," in *Teaching as an Act of Faith*, xxxviii.

for students in the classroom.

Academicians working within this paradigm aim intentionally at the formation of particular sorts of students. Some say Christian colleges and universities unabashedly "should teach students to understand themselves first and foremost as Christians," with all other self-identities (national, ethnic, professional) understood as less fundamental.[69] Others assert that, "the graduate whom we seek to produce must be one who *practices* justice" so that a crucial question Christian educators must ask themselves is "how can we cultivate in students the disposition to work and pray for shalom, savoring its presence and mourning its absence?"[70] One answer is self-evident: "to develop in students the disposition to act justly and to struggle for justice, it helps for us and our institutions to teach justly, to live justly, and to struggle for justice. It helps to be models."[71] Beyond the power of role modeling, proponents of this approach also pursue student formation via a wide variety of classroom practices and course-related activities.

An economics professor at a Catholic institution has his students engage in a computer-simulated attempt to balance the federal budget, with an accompanying paper in which they are "encouraged to discuss explicitly if and how matters of personal religious faith guide their decisions."[72] A Calvinist psychology professor has her students write a comparative analysis of the competing visions of life found in two startlingly different novels from the late 1940s: B. F. Skinner's behaviorist *Walden Two* and C. S. Lewis' Christian *That Hideous Strength*.[73] A political science professor at a Nazarene college takes his students to meet refugees from a war-torn nation, such as Sudan (including Darfur), before having students explore how rebuilding programs can be means of God's grace and having students investigate programs that might promote reconciliation and healing.[74] A sociologist at a Presbyterian college has the students work with a group in the community to define a research project, gather data, and produce a pro-bono report of their research findings.[75] These examples, all taken from the social sciences, are illustrative of approaches which seek not just to educate the mind but also to transform students' character and disposition through engagement in particular practices.

The natural sciences, professions, arts, humanities, and theology provide further illustrations of pedagogical practices and course activities steeped in the Christian faith. A Quaker physicist has her students research scientists' religious and cultural backgrounds to show how biographical factors often influence how

[69]Glanzer and Ream, *Christianity and Moral Identity in Higher Education*, 196.
[70]Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 24, 144. Italics in the original.
[71]Ibid., 150.
[72]Charles K. Wilber, "Teaching Economics While Keeping the Faith," in *Teaching as an Act of Faith*, 18.
[73]Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, "Scuttling the Schizophrenic Student Mind: On Teaching the Unity of Faith and Learning in Psychology," in Ibid., 31.
[74]Ron Kirkemo, "At the Lectern Between Jerusalem and Sarajevo: A Christian Approach to Teaching Political Science," in Ibid., 59-62.
[75]Robert A. Clark, "Sociology and Faith: Inviting Students into the Conversation," in Ibid., 91.

people interpret scientific findings.[76] An ecology professor at a Presbyterian college requires students to write an "essay on three current environmental issues you are interested in, but your name is Jesus Christ."[77] At a Lutheran university a theater group prays and celebrates communion together, while also engaging in specific drama exercises designed to cultivate generosity in actors and actresses by shifting their focus away from self to others.[78] In one philosophy class at a Reformed college, students must practice not talking about themselves for a week as they study the vice of vainglory,[79] while another philosophy class at the same school observes the liturgical calendar and practices midday prayer as alternatives that resist other culturally-dominant sorts of time-keeping.[80] An ethics professor at a Baptist college has students fast prior to a classroom discussion on poverty.[81] A Catholic theologian has students serve 20 hours in the community (county nursing facilities, under-resourced schools, and social agencies serving the poor) before convening with other students in a base learning community to process and reflect on their work.[82]

Proponents of location #3 assert that when students engage in these practices they do not merely do something, but something is done to them because practices have a formative power, particularly because Christian practices can function as places "where a habitation of the Spirit is able to occur."[83] The argument of this approach is that practices constitute "structures that when *indwelt* bring their own forms of learning and growth that may not be accessible outside of that indwelling."[84] The point of all these practices is to shape students into virtuous persons—whether more cooperative learners who support each other,[85] musicians who play to the glory of God,[86] persons who read Scripture both critically and

confessionally,[87] humble learners who are cognizant of their limited perspectives,[88] humans who are motivated to know more by the virtue of studiousness rather than the vice of curiosity,[89] people with re-ordered loves who desire God's kingdom,[90] or reflective thinkers who are committed to serving others.[91]

It is often noted that Christians from the Anabaptist and Catholic traditions place a special emphasis on faith, learning, and living.[92] Head, heart, and hands must all be involved. Christian practices do not merely teach individuals to think in certain ways but also to live faithfully as a collective people who bear witness to the kingdom of God, in part by resisting nationalistic ideologies and instead engaging in local and global peace-building, reconciliation, and service to others.[93] As one university president put it, "Catholicity is a lived reality, not just a learned subject."[94] Or, for a simple contrast, "if the Reformed model is fundamentally cerebral and transforms living by thinking, the Mennonite model transforms thinking by living."[95] Common themes here include "the importance of community, a commitment to lived discipleship, the centrality of reconciliation, an incarnational epistemology, and concern for society's most vulnerable members."[96] Ideally within practice and formation approaches, especially in the Anabaptist and Catholic traditions, practical discipleship and communal ethics are intertwined with collegiate studies that are collaborative, interdisciplinary, and focused on our connection to all fellow humans.

[76]Lois Kieffaber, "Christian Theism: Alive and Well in the Physics and Astronomy Classroom," in Ibid., 125.

[77]Lee Anne Chaney, "A Careful Convergence: Integrating Biology and Faith in the Church-Related College," in Ibid., 149.

[78]John Steven Paul, "'I Love to Tell the Story:' Teaching Theater at a Church-Related College," in Ibid., 174-181.

[79]Rebecca Konyndyk DeYoung, "Pedagogical Rhythms: Practices and Reflections on Practice," in *Teaching and Christian Practices*, 32-34.

[80]James K. A. Smith, "Keeping Time in the Social Sciences: An Experiment with Fixed Hour Prayer and the Liturgical Calendar," in Ibid., 145-149.

[81]Bradford S. Hadaway, "Preparing the Way for Justice: Strategic Dispositional Formation through the Spiritual Disciplines," in *Spirituality, Justice, and Pedagogy*, eds. David I. Smith, John Shortt, and John Sullivan (Nottingham, England: The Stapleford Centre, 2006), 143-165.

[82]Dominic P. Scibilia, "A Pedagogy of Eucharistic Accompaniment," in *Professing in the Postmodern Academy*, 195-214.

[83]Craig Dykstra, *Growing in the Life of Faith: Education and Christian Practices*, 2nd edition (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2005), 64.

[84]David I. Smith, "Recruiting Students' Imaginations: Prospects and Pitfalls of Practices," in *Teaching and Christian Practices*, 218. Italics in the original.

[85]Julie A. P. Walton and Matthew Walters, "Eat This Class: Breaking Bread in the Undergraduate Classroom," in Ibid., 80-101.

[86]Charlotte Y. Kroeker, "Music Pedagogy and the Christian Faith: A Twenty-Year Journey of Discovery," in *Teaching as an Act of Faith*, 210-230.

[87]Julia M. O'Brien, "'Academic' vs. 'Confessional' Study of the Bible in the Postmodern Classroom: A Class Response to Philip Davies and David Clines," in *Professing in the Postmodern Academy*, 169-182.

[88]Stephen K. Moroney, Matthew P. Phelps, and Scott T. Waalkes, "Cultivating Humility," in *The Schooled Heart: Moral Formation in American Higher Education*, eds. Michael D. Beaty and Douglas V. Henry (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 171-190.

[89]Paul J. Griffiths, *The Vice of Curiosity: An Essay on Intellectual Appetite* (Winnipeg, Manitoba: CMU Press, 2006). See also Paul J. Griffiths, *Intellectual Appetite: A Theological Grammar* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009) and Paul J. Griffiths, "From Curiosity to Studiousness: Catechizing the Appetite for Learning," in *Teaching and Christian Practices*, 102-122.

[90]Glenn E. Sanders, "How Christian Practices Help to Engage Students Morally and Spiritually: Testimony from a Western Civilization Course," in *Teaching and Christian Practices*, 157-176.

[91]Elizabeth Murray Morelli, "An Ignatian Approach to Teaching Philosophy," in *Teaching as an Act of Faith*, 233-352.

[92]David L. Weaver-Zercher, *Minding the Church: Scholarship in the Anabaptist Tradition: Essays in Honor of E. Morris Sider* (Telford, PA: Pandora Press, 2002); George Dennis O'Brien, *The Idea of a Catholic University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Mark W. Roche, *The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

[93]David L. Weaver-Zercher, "A Modest (Though not Particularly Humble) Claim for Scholarship in the Anabaptist Tradition," in *Scholarship and Christian Faith*, 103-117.

[94]Melanie M. Morey and John J. Piderit, *Catholic Higher Education: A Culture in Crisis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 181.

[95]Richard T. Hughes, *The Vocation of the Christian Scholar: How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind*, Revised Edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 55.

[96]David L. Weaver-Zercher, "Preface," *Minding the Church*, 14.

Several analysts have documented, and in some cases lamented, the fact that many secular colleges and universities have abdicated any constructive role in students' moral formation.[97] Those inhabiting the third approach on our updated map, however, argue that church-related colleges and universities have unique opportunities, perhaps even a *raison d'être*, to engage in particular pedagogical practices that form students who image God more fully. Church-related universities may hold the greatest promise for true intellectual community.[98]

Whereas integrative approaches often focus on relating the content of the Christian faith to the content of the discipline being studied, and worldview approaches often focus on thinking about the subject matter from a Christian perspective, practice and formation approaches often focus on forming faithful disciples through particular classroom activities and assignments. As we leave this third location on the map, we are reminded that practice and formation approaches to Christian teaching and learning represent a comparatively small but growing population (akin to Austin, Texas) of those intentionally exploring the intersection of faith and learning.

Caveat

Many proponents of integration and worldview approaches dialogue primarily within the believing community, whether it is with Christian faculty in journals such as *Christian Scholar's Review* or with students who attend the broadly evangelical colleges and universities at which they teach. Many proponents of practice and formation approaches focus their efforts on shaping the students at their church-related colleges and universities, including the spiritual formation of those students. At all three of these locations most of the talk about integration, worldview, and formative practices is an intra-family discussion within Christian higher education.

By contrast, other Christian academicians find themselves teaching students and writing to scholars at secular universities who come from a wide range of religious backgrounds. In these settings, Christian scholars still draw on aspects of the three approaches delineated on our map, but given the dialogue partners, "sensitivity to the biases, beliefs, and values of our audience are critical in deciding how we ought to communicate."[99] At the same time Christian scholars in secular

settings find ample motivation from the desire to avoid intellectual ghettoization within a Christian subculture[100] and the knowledge that "scholarship has the potential to reach a much larger audience and greatly increase the impact that you can make for the kingdom."[101]

The rich texture of approaches employed by different Christian scholars in different settings cannot be captured exhaustively by any map, including the one offered here. All maps are exercises in approximation, mostly two- or three-dimensional representations of complex realities. As they reflect on their lived experience, some Christian scholars will resonate with words attributed to Herman Melville: "it's not down in any map; true places never are." The imprecision of maps notwithstanding, whether of the old paper variety or newer electronic versions, they still provide helpful guidance to travelers, especially to those who are new to an area. In this spirit, the present essay serves as an updated map to help readers grasp several distinct but overlapping ways that faith and learning intersect today for students and for professors, in the classroom and in the academy, in the curriculum and in lived experience.

Conclusion

All of the locations described in this essay have their attractions. At their best, integration and worldview approaches can help both scholars and students "think Christianly" about issues that otherwise might be analyzed from purely secular perspectives, taking every thought captive to obey Christ. When done well, practice and formation approaches invite students to engage in activities which can assist them in becoming the people God created them to be, shaping not just their minds but the whole of their lives. When empowered by the Spirit, in accordance with scholars' diverse vocational callings, each of the locations on our map has something valuable to contribute. While the three approaches "occupy different places," by God's grace each can serve as a signpost that points people toward a common "destination," the kingdom of God.[102]

[97]Harry Lewis, *Excellence without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006); Sommerville, *The Decline of the Secular University*; Glanzer and Ream, *Christianity and Moral Identity in Higher Education*. As a counter-point to these more pessimistic analyses, one reviewer of this essay observed that on many secular campuses there are thriving instances of positive student formation through service learning. Here we are reminded that Christians need not always be distinctive but rather must always be faithful, while happily celebrating manifestations of "common grace" in all who bear the image of God.
[98]Douglas V. Henry and Michael D. Beaty, eds., *Christianity and the Soul of the University: Faith as a Foundation for Intellectual Community* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006).
[99]Paul M. Gould, "The Two Tasks Introduced: The Fully Integrated Life of the Christian Scholar," in *The Two Tasks of the Christian Scholar*, eds. William Lane Craig and Paul M. Gould (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2007), 52.
[100]C. Stephan Evans, "The Calling of the Christian Scholar-Teacher," in *Faithful Learning and the Christian Scholarly Vocation*, eds. Douglas V. Henry and Bob R. Agee (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 36.
[101]Walter L. Bradley, "On Being a Christian Professor in the Secular Academy," in *The Two Tasks of the Christian Scholar*, 121.
[102]Thanks to Malone University for a summer grant supporting the research for this essay. Thanks also to David Entwistle, Steve Jensen, Sue Moroney, Matt Phelps, Scott Waalkes, and an anonymous *CSR* reviewer for remarkably prompt and helpful comments on earlier drafts.