

VIEWING THE SCHOOL AS A COMMUNITY OF FAITH

Don C. Roy

This paper was first presented at the Scholarly Conference of the Institute of Christian Tertiary Education, convened at Avondale College, NSW, Australia 9-11 July, 1997.

It is here re-presented for collegial sharing at the International Conference on the Seventh-day Adventist Philosophy of Education, April 7-9, 2001, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA.

ABSTRACT

The paper takes the position that Christian schools function in a world that is essentially antagonistic to the principles and values of the Kingdom of God. Further, it sees that "world" as dynamically decadent and alienating. Even humanists acknowledge the dis-integrative, anti-communitarian spirit that pervades society. Many Christian teachers appear to be oblivious to these forces, and many schools unwittingly subscribe to popular policies and practices that are essentially contradictory to the spirit of Christian faith. It is argued further that many attempts to integrate faith, learning and practice induce dualism instead.

The paper asserts that it is the role and responsibility of the Christian school to confront these forces and provide a learning environment that, as part of the mission of the Church, is essentially redemptive and restorative, upbuilding both individuals and the community of faith they comprise.

The paper attempts first to describe the contemporary climate, then, second, to identify the link with disintegrative practices in the educational context, and, finally, to explore what might represent true integration and Christian distinctiveness in the face of such challenges.

INTRODUCTION - A CRY FOR 'CONNECTEDNESS'

Anxiety pervades our society reflecting a sense of disconnectedness, insecurity and lack of meaning. A century ago, the Western world faced the future with a sense of optimism. Today, hurtling relentlessly towards the next millennium, the Utopian bubble has burst, and the dream has become a nightmare. Nineteenth century optimism has dissipated with two world wars, a depression, countless skirmishes of major proportions such as in Rwanda, Bosnia and Somalia. We are perplexed constantly by general immorality and social decay in the form of increased crime, drug enslavement, sexual perversion, the erosion of the family and suicide, while in our personal lives we experience increased alienation from ourselves and one another. In his best-

selling account of Australia in the 90s, Hugh Mackay argues that we have entered an 'age of discontinuity'.¹ Dramatic change of countless dimensions appears to be shaking us to the core.

A chorus of voices reflect society-wide concern about the nature of change, the way it impacts upon us, and the way we might respond to it. As educators we recognise and acknowledge that the location and function of the school in society is significant and critical. In his discussion on change relative to education in the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's Book of the Year (1997), Hargreaves argued that:

more than ever today, schools cannot shut their gates and leave the troubles of the outside world on the doorstep...What matters is not *whether* teachers connect with what's 'out there' beyond their school, but how effectively they do so.²

In his review, Hargreaves claims that 'across much of the developed world, *people are experiencing a crisis of community, and schools provide one of our last and greatest hopes for resolving it*'.³ To Christians, it is ironic that Peter Berger, a sociologist of the humanist tradition, sees modern humanity's problems, including alienation, fragmentation, sense of 'homelessness' and the decline of community as a consequence of the loss of our 'sense of the transcendent'.⁴ It leaves what in Augustine's terms is 'a God-shaped vacuum' experienced both personally and corporately. From a Christian perspective, this 'crisis of community' is an inevitable outcome of the Fall in Eden when our first parents 'dethroned God and enthroned self'. It thus stands in direct relationship with the rampant 'rise of individualism' in contemporary society. In response, this paper puts the argument that the Christian school's primary purpose is 'the restoration of connectedness' that will be manifest in a renewed sense of community.

DEVELOPING A MODEL OF 'COMMUNITY'

Parker Palmer insists that 'the concept of community' is 'indispensable in describing the terrain that educators inhabit', and such community should be our goal.⁵ However it is important to this discussion first, to clarify the term 'community' as it is being used in this context, and second, to create a model to serve as a frame of reference.

'Community' may simply describe a collection of people with something in common — *a* community. However, life and interaction within a group may produce a *sense of community* that includes a sense of identity, solidarity and well-being. The latter term has more dynamic, holistic connotations, and this is the primary focus of this discussion and the literature relating to it.

¹ Hugh Mackay, *Reinventing Australia*, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1991.

² Andy Hargreaves, 'Rethinking Educational Change: Going Deeper and Wider in the Quest for Success', in A. Hargreaves (ed) *Rethinking Educational Change with Heart and Mind. (1997 Book of the Year)*, Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD, 1997, p.4.

³ A. Hargreaves, *op. cit.*, p.5

⁴ Peter Berger, *Facing up to Modernity*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977; Peter Berger, Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner, *The Homeless Mind*, New York: Random House, 1973.

⁵ Palmer, Parker *To Know as We Are Known: A Spirituality of Education*, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983, pp. xii, xiii.

A Sociological Profile

From a sociological perspective, *a* community may be understood in the following terms:

- it describes a group of interdependent people united for shared purpose and goals;
- life within the community is dynamic and sometimes produces and experiences stress;
- over time, it develops a distinct culture comprising beliefs, values and *mores* that become objectivated in customs and patterns of social organization and relationships ;⁶
- it often relates to a tradition associated with significant people, some of whom achieve charismatic status;
- a sense of individual belonging, identity and solidarity stems from interaction within the group.

New Testament 'Ekklesia' (Church)

Andersen's characterization of the Pauline *ekklesia*, or church of the New Testament not only fits this profile closely but defines a number of features that add a dynamic quality to the understanding of community in its richest sense.⁷

- Each *ekklesia* was diverse racially, culturally and socially, and was of a size to facilitate close personal relationships;
- their core notion was *upbuilding* or *edification* towards both individual and the corporate *maturity* ;
- this shared goal was underpinned by the core value of *agape* motivated by the historic reality of a Risen Christ who had manifested Himself in the person of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost;
- community matured through the exercise of spiritual gifts on the part of its members and attending to the welfare of other members of the community;
- this maintenance of psycho-social well-being provided a sense of personal identity, security and communal solidarity or 'unity in diversity';
- community was enhanced and strengthened through stress and persecution;
- the sense of community generated was termed *koinonia*. However, it became so distinctive that such groups were known as *koinonia* in the same way we speak of *a* fellowship.

REFLECTIONS ON CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

On reflection, a number of principles emanate from this model:

- These groups were spontaneous clusters of believers drawn together by circumstance and hearing the Gospel. They did not seek community as an end in itself, but rather it came as a by-product of active relationship characterized by a spirit of *agape*, that is, unselfish, disinterested concern for others. It modeled values that underpinned the 'upside-down kingdom' exemplified by and embodied in Jesus.

⁶ J. Clarke, S. Hall, T. Jefferson & B. Roberts, 'Sub-cultures, Cultures and Class', in T. Bennett, G. Martin, C. Mercer, and J. Woolacott, (eds), *Culture, Ideology and Social Process*. London: Open University Press, 1981, p.52.

⁷ William Andersen, 'From Gospel into Education: Exploring a Translation', Parts 1 & 2, *Journal of Christian Education*, Papers 79, April, 1984, pp. 26-37 and Papers 81, October, 1984, pp.11-19.

- Community is cyclic. It is an outcome of *agape* that has its Source in God as Creator, Saviour, Recreator and Sustainer, and is actuated in humans through relationship, first with God, and secondly with other humans. ‘We love (i.e. we practise *agape*) because God first loved us’.⁸ *Agape* is not a mere feeling or act of emotion, but rather is a commitment and an act of our will embodied in action.⁹ Participation in that action reinforces community. Further, individual reality is both objectively and subjectively defined — objectively, in terms of the metanarrative of the group, and subjectively in the interpersonal relations that are part of the life of the group.
- The development of community is often associated with stress, pain and misunderstandings as participants relate and respond to stimuli and pressures from both inside and outside the group. Community is not dependent on groups being homogeneous. Rather, it is stimulated and tested by variety and diversity. Such interaction enriches and matures the shared sense of community.¹⁰
- Community motivated by *agape* brings with it the indwelling of the Godhead, both personally and corporately. This theme of unity echoes throughout the New Testament, in the words of Jesus to His disciples in the upper room, and also in His prayer of intercession to His Father — that all might be one, even as He and the Father are One⁹. As the Body of Christ, cohesiveness is vested in Christ through whom ‘all things hold together’.¹¹
- Relationship and sociality should be seen as part of the essence of what it means to be truly human and, as such, a facet of the *imago Dei*. To deny others of it it is to de-humanize them. The Creator declared, ‘It is not good that man should be alone’.¹² It is noteworthy that after the Fall resulting in the alienation of our first parents from the Creator, God took the initiative to restore the lost relationship.
- Community has an orientation firmly grounded in what Middleton and Walsh define as a biblical ‘metanarrative’.¹³ This metanarrative provides a historical frame of reference that provides for an understanding and explanation of reality, origins, causes and effects, identity, authority, ethics and purpose.
- As a facet of *imago Dei*, community is a quality that God desires to be evident in His church as essence and testimony of His redemptive, restorative, sustaining power. As Bubna and Ricketts suggest, the church is ‘a portrait of love God wants the world to see’. However it is not simply a spectacle, but purposeful, to draw individuals into fellowship with the Godhead and other people.¹⁴

⁸ David Bubna, and Sarah Ricketts, *Building People through a Caring Sharing Fellowship*, Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale, 1978, p.42.

⁹ 1 John 4:19

¹⁰ Dick Westly, *A Theology of Presence: The Search for Meaning in the American Catholic Experience*, Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1988, p.69.

¹¹ Colossians 1:17

¹² Genesis 2:18

¹³ J. Richard Middleton & Brian Walsh, *Truth Is Stranger Than It Used to Be: Biblical Faith in a Postmodern Age*, Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 1995, Ch. 5.

¹⁴ Bubna and Ricketts, *op. cit.*, pp.42, 43

- Community is evasive and unattainable if sought for its own sake, for the simple reason that such a quest is *self-centered*.¹⁵ On the other hand, the practice of disinterested love, or *agape*, is not only conducive to community, but is restorative in a fundamental personal sense. Out of his experiences in Nazi concentration camps, Victor Frankl testifies to the restorative power of a sense of purpose, meaning and a willingness to give unselfishly.¹⁶

INDIVIDUALISM AS ANTI-COMMUNITY

Individualism must be recognised as the antithesis of community. But it is not simply a phenomenon of the modern Western World. Individualism is the spirit underlying the original sin of ‘self-enthronement’ and notable instances occur through the biblical story. However, individualism with its emphasis on autonomy, self-reliance and self-determination reaches unashamed cultic proportions in modernity. Its consideration is important in the context of our discussion.

The dawn of *modernity* in the form of the Enlightenment was yet another historic manifestation of the desire to dethrone God and enthrone ‘rational’ man. In so doing, it publicly denigrated all that was spiritual, denying the reality of the supernatural and the miraculous. At the same time, it usurped Omniscient Authority by making man the measure of all things and the creator of a world in his own image. Traditional values, ethical standards and absolutes were seen as restrictive. Liberation, personal freedom and independence were seen as a key to self-actualization and fulfillment.

But instead of Utopia, the result was a stark objective, scientifically-defined, secularised and de-humanized world. Its reductionism has been not only antagonistic to holism, but it has relegated all knowledge relative to the senses, human relationships and behaviour to lower class and status. Instead of experiencing enlightenment, even the disciples of scientism have remained willfully blind to an ideology that is underpinned and driven by human bias. Its emphasis on the supposed value-neutrality of technical knowledge and the attempt to separate values from facts has ultimately proven violent and humanly destructive. Knowledge took on a utilitarian character and became a mere commodity as a means to an end — success measured in terms of selfish material gain. Furthermore, history shows evidence of the insensitive, inhumane way that such information has been used for death and destruction. In the final analysis, modernity has been antagonistic to the building and maintenance of community.

Although *postmodernity* is a reaction to modernity, it still perpetuates a culture of individuality and fragmentation by virtue of the asserted right of individuals to create their own worlds, and regard them as equally acceptable to any other. Consequently there is no single worldview. As Tarnas states, ‘The postmodern paradigm is by its nature fundamentally subversive of all paradigms, for at its core is the awareness of reality as being at once multiple, local and

¹⁵ Westly, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 70

¹⁶ Victor Frankl, *Man’s Search for Meaning: An Introduction to Logotherapy*, New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

temporary and without distinct foundation'.¹⁷ It therefore destabilises and removes moral and ethical anchors and reference points.¹⁸ Consequently there is no 'grand story' to provide the orientation, identity, motivation and purpose. Ultimately, as Walsh argues, it is a culture of fragmentation'.¹⁹

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The disturbing thing about this is that we all appear to have been socialised thoroughly in a culture that is fundamentally antagonistic to biblical Christianity, and this has translated into much of our educational practice. Despite our attempts to cultivate a positive school ethos, many current practices promote individuality and fragmentation. Paul's counsel is still relevant:

See to it that no one takes you captive through hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.²⁰
Do not conform any longer to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of you mind, that you may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.²¹

It is ironic that even critical theorists have responded from a humanistic perspective to deplore the dehumanising, anti-communitarian effects of much educational practice. Their call for *praxis*, that is, the bringing together of theory and practice with a view to change, is sobering. It is equally applicable to us and cannot be ignored. We must be prepared to engage in open, honest critique to ensure that we are fulfilling our God-given responsibility authentically and effectively.

Many of our efforts in the past to integrate faith and learning have been superficial and dualistic. Regrettably, many so-called Christian schools, particularly at secondary level, have adopted practices conducive to individualism and fragmentation. For example, many are preoccupied with 'this world' interests, and function primarily as information brokers particularly for career and employment and, consequently, the enhancement of personal life chances and material gain. Its association with a public examination system belittles much of such knowledge to a mere device to sort individuals. The relative worth and status of the different subject fields has become socially determined in terms of their 'buying power'. The integrity of knowledge and its intrinsic worth as 'wisdom' appears to be minimised and violated. An unselfish service ethic is often minimal, if present at all. The term 'integration of faith, learning and practice' has only superficial understanding and has become a cliché to the point that it is sometimes viewed with cynicism.

The emphasis on 'academic excellence' in many Christian schools has unfortunate connotations of elitism and thus, exclusiveness. To whom are the rewards given at the annual speech night? What is the hidden 'message' that such practice carries? If *academic* excellence, then what about

¹⁷ Richard Tarnas, *The Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas That Have Shaped Our World*, New York: Ballantyne Books, 1991, pp. 395-413.

¹⁸ Brian Walsh, 'Education in Precarious Times' in *The Crumbling Walls of Certainty: Towards a Christian Critique of Postmodernity & Education*, Sydney: Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity, 1997, pp. 8-23.

¹⁹ Brian Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp.18, 19

²⁰ Colossians 2:8

²¹ Romans 12:2

moral, social or creative excellence? And if such categories are being acknowledged and rewarded, what is their relative status in the eyes of teachers, parents and students?

The spirit of aggressive competition pervades society. The argument that we need to provide competitive activity in the school to teach students how to survive in such a world has dubious justification and support. There is no denying it is a difficult issue that calls for careful study. What needs to be considered are such questions as, To what extent do these activities highlight the difference between winners and losers; success and failure; selfishness and self sacrifice? What is the 'hidden curriculum' underpinning all that is occurring? Is there a disparity between what we articulate as our aims and objectives and what we are likely to achieve — between theory and practice, if you like? How conducive are such activities to harmony and *koinonia*? Parker Palmer's words are thought provoking:

[T]he rules and relationships of a school comprise a 'hidden curriculum' which can exert greater formative power over the lives of learners than the curriculum advertised in the catalogue. A business school may offer courses in team management and collective work styles, but if the culture of that school requires students to survive those courses through competition, then competition and not cooperation is the real lesson taught and learned. In a thousand ways, the relationships of the academic community form the hearts and minds of students, shaping their sense of self and their relation to the world.²²

This raises a number of questions. First, it raises the issue of authenticity of such schools and whether they are truly Christian. Second, it raises questions about the kind of life preparation we are providing when so many of our present generation face the distinct possibility of permanent unemployment. There is no denying that one of the functions of the school is, indeed, to provide knowledge, understanding and skills in order for individuals to find their way into useful work. However, this paper insists that this is not the primary function of the Christian school. It only speaks to 'this-world' needs. Third, it raises the question of how likely is the achievement of genuine *koinonia* going to be in such a self-centred, competitive and materialistic environment.

While many Christian schools appear to have had a positive impact on the lives of children and young people, evidence also indicates that we expose our students to detrimental effects by virtue of questionable philosophies that we adopt without adequate scrutiny, or we stumble ignorantly into practices that are 'out of harmony with biblical Christianity'. As Knight argues, the resulting smorgasbord is likely to constitute a disjointed eclecticism that produces destructive inconsistencies.²³ In terms of the theme of this paper, such practice is *antagonistic to the restoration of connectedness* and thus a denial of Christian education's mandate.

MAKING THE CONNECTION

How might the Christian school address Hargreaves' challenge at the outset of this discussion? Like the church model discussed earlier, the Christian school should be committed to 'upbuilding'. In recognition of this fact, some Christian schools adopt as their ultimate aim, 'The restoration of the image of God in man'. Such an aim is a response to the 'inward groaning' of

²² Parker Palmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 20.

²³ George Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1980, pp.142, 143.

all creation and our eager hope for ‘adoption as sons and the redemption of our bodies’ as described by the Apostle Paul.²⁴ ‘Upbuilding’ as we have discussed it, is understood as ‘restoration’ and stands in the context of a ‘Creation-Fall-Redemption-Consummation’ framework.²⁵ The Christian school is an agent in that restoration process, alongside the church and the family. Relatedness and unity — *koinonia* — is integral to that process. Paul’s words are relevant and illuminating:

It was [Christ] who gave some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, some to be pastors, some to be teachers, to *prepare* God’s people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God, and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ... From him the whole body, joined and held together by every supporting ligament, grows and builds itself up in love, as each part does its work.²⁶

The word translated ‘prepare’ has significant connotations. The word is *katartismōn* from the verb *katartizein*. It implies *healing*, for example in the setting of a broken limb, or restoring a dislocated joint. It also has significance in the political sense of bringing together alienated parties to enable government to continue.²⁷ In essence, this process represents a reversal of the alienation resulting from the sin of our first parents. Christian schools adopting such a vision and mission truly emulate the redemptive, restorative ministry of Jesus Himself.

That ministry of restoration also has salvific implications. ‘Salvation’ is reconciliation in the most comprehensive sense. As Westly explains:

Salvation in the biblical sense cannot be understood in one-dimensionally, narrow, reductionist, parochial ways. The salvation the Scriptures speak of offers a comprehensive wholeness in this fragmented and alienated life. Salvation in the biblical sense is a newness of life, the unfolding of true humanity in the fullness of God (Colossians 2:9), it is salvation of the soul and the body, of the individual and society, of humankind and the whole of creation (Romans 8:19).²⁸

It is for such reasons that George Knight also argues that Christian education is true ministry and each teacher, an ‘agent of salvation’.²⁹ It is also ‘religion’ in essence (Latin *religare* = ‘to bind together again’). But, returning to Paul and the word *katartismōn*, it is important to note that the purpose of restoration is to facilitate ‘works of service’. In other words, *koinonia* is an **outcome** of unselfish activity, not as an end to be sought simply for its own sake. Nevertheless, it is an indicator that something significant, dynamic and fundamental is happening. At the same time, it is by no means of lesser importance.

²⁴ Romans 8:22, 23

²⁵ A. M. Wolters, *Creation Regained, Biblical Basics for a Reformational Worldview*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans; John Stott, *Issues Facing Christian Today*, Basingstoke, Hants: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1984, pp.33-35.

²⁶ Ephesians 4:11-13, 15, 16

²⁷ William Barclay, *Daily Study Bible: Letters to the Galatians & Ephesians (2nd Edn)*, Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1958, pp. 176, 177.

²⁸ Dick Westley, *op. cit.*, p.46.

²⁹ George Knight, *op. cit.*, pp. 186, 187.

Koinonia emerging from ‘works of service’ motivated by *agape* also provides for what the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, describes as ‘theophanies’, that is, points at which humanity experiences ‘a meeting and encounter with the living God,... incarnately, in the concrete places of this life’.³⁰ Following after Buber, Westley describes such ‘theophanies’ as

rare and privileged moments when without warning Love (God) breaks through and makes its presence felt, revealing as it does the real meaning of salvation/reconciliation, and calling each one of us out of our individual concerns, out beyond even our own small communities to a world that awaits ‘salvation’.

The notion of ‘concrete places of this life’ is not limited to the material domain. These ‘meetings and encounters with the living God’ are incarnate in an interpersonal sense. It is in ministering to our neighbour that we meet our Lord Jesus in verity: as Jesus Himself pronounced, ‘Inasmuch as you have done it to one of the least of these, my brethren, you did it to me’.³¹

Talk of meeting and encountering God in ‘the concrete places of this life’ is also reminiscent of the experience of Brother Lawrence, the Carmelite brother who practiced the presence of God in the washing of pots and pans and ministering to his fellows.³² Such practice is in the domain of the mundane and ordinary things of life, in the context of interpersonal relationship. Huebner argues likewise that ‘to be religious is to be with God in the world with others’.³³ Gaebelein’s notion of ‘the integration of faith and learning’ also provides a way of seeing this translated into Christian education.³⁴ Consequently, religious education is not reduced to a discrete cognitive exercise.

[I]t is not only a pointer to places, times, techniques, materials, organizations or activities. It is also a pointer to a way of thinking about what we do and how we are with God and others in this world... It must be a way of speaking that enables us to see our individualism and our separation from each other as a breakdown in our acknowledgment of God’s grace, of the love that binds us to each other in and through God.³⁵

What we have been speaking about is a way of beginning to restore and live wholeness in every way possible — in the ‘places, techniques, materials, organizations and activities’. What implications might this have for our everyday lives in schools? In short, there will be a genuine attempt:

- To restore the integrity of knowledge by helping the teachers and students:
 - to make connections between the knower and the known, between the head and the heart, instead of ‘subject matter in isolated, cognitively-framed, meaningless pieces’;

³⁰ Westly, *op. cit.*, p.64

³¹ Matthew 25:40

³² Brother Lawrence, *Practicing the Presence of God*, Springdale, PA: Whitaker House, 1982.

³³ Huebner, Dwayne, ‘Religious Education: Practicing the Presence of God’ 1987 (Source unknown.)

³⁴ Frank Gaebelein, *God’s Pattern of Truth: Problems of Integration in Christian Education*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1968.

³⁵ Huebner, Dwayne. *op. cit.*, p.570.

- to 'create sophisticated maps in their whole being'³⁶ enriched with 'the symbolic and metaphoric richness of biblical faith';³⁷
- to restore an awareness of a biblical metanarrative or 'grand story' and its capacity to answer the ultimate questions of life;³⁸
- to acknowledge and affirm the diversity of intelligences and gifts shared between the learners³⁹, and provide a pedagogy that encourages
 - multisensory engagement and application;
 - personal reflection, feelings, identification and application for each student;
 - peer sharing;
 - collaborative, cooperative learning.⁴⁰
- to develop a diversity of approaches and criteria for assessment and evaluation that motivate and support constructive learning and the achievement of goals rather than interpersonal competitiveness and the ranking of individuals;⁴¹
- to promote and nurture social relationships that are sensitive, accepting, inclusive, affirming and supportive of all members of the school community;
- to support individuals as they 'indwell' the culture of the community and live out its story tacitly, actively and confidently;⁴²
- to promote unselfish sharing and service through active learning and application in a wide range of activities, both within and beyond the school.

Education of these dimensions would begin to meet the deepest needs for connectedness in the lives of our students. It would also have the potential to grow beyond each individual and the school communities they indwell to the world beyond. In this sense, it represents an embodiment of the Spirit's work of restoration and recreation of a lost, fragmented world. In this way, Christian schools can truly begin to be communities of faith and part of the ministry of salvation and reconciliation.

³⁶ Ian Lambert, 'Thinking with the Heart: Educating Emotional Intelligence in Children', in Ian Lambert and Suzanne Mitchell (eds), *op. cit.*, pp.165-167.

³⁷ Brian Walsh, *op. cit.*, p.19

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Stuart Fowler, 'Unearthing Gifts with Multiple Intelligences and Other Tools', in Ian Lambert and Suzanne Mitchell (eds), *op. cit.*, pp.136-153. pp.136-153.

⁴⁰ Ian Lambert, *op. cit.*, pp.163, 164.

⁴¹ Stuart Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp.150, 151.

⁴² Harry Fernhout, *Christian Schooling: Telling a World View Story*, in Ian Lambert and Suzanne Mitchell (eds), *op. cit.* pp.75-98.