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Teachers often get asked, “What do you teach?” That question is often answered with a focus on curriculum (e.g., reading, math, or nuclear physics). But many other teachers answer, “I teach students” (e.g., 3rd grade, middle school, or college). I think there’s been a shift in the field of education toward an increasing focus on the student over the last few generations. Instead of focusing first on what to cover in our classes, we’re shifting toward what students need to learn. This general shift is reflected in the different secular views as well as the different Christian views discussed below.

Secular View #1

This approach to students focuses on what is good for “the group” – what the group needs students to know and be able to do. The business community weighs in with its expectations for basic unskilled workers as well as its hopes regarding a spectrum of future employee skill levels in terms of communication skills, people skills, and problem-solving skills. Civic leaders weigh in, wanting informed voters, community volunteers, and future civic leaders. And families weigh in with what they want their kids to know and be able to do (and value). The more powerful families may reinforce their expectations with tuition dollars for non-public schools or with political clout regarding magnet or charter schools to help address their specific needs. So the student for all these constituencies is viewed as part of a larger group (family, community, society) that wants something to be provided by the school.

Secular View #2

This view focuses more on the individual student rather than the student as part of a group that needs something from the school. So this view looks at what the school can provide to the *individual student*. With the rise of progressivism, the view puts more emphasis on curricular options such as athletics, the arts, foreign languages, and different levels of math and science that students with different interests and abilities can opt into or out of. Choice, learning styles, interests, electives, special needs, and extra challenges – these concepts are more at home with this second view of the student. This view tends to downplay society and group needs just as much as the first group seems quiet on individual students’ needs.

Christian Views of the Student

The shift mentioned above from focusing more on the curriculum to focusing more on the student is overall a good development in education, but the underlying philosophies associated with this shift can have decidedly unbiblical assumptions.[[1]](#footnote-1) On the other hand, some of the *curriculum*-centered *-isms* aren’t all that biblically-based either[[2]](#footnote-2). Because we are very influenced by the philosophies of our age, we need to critically examine these –*isms* through a biblical lens and decide with the Spirit’s leading what our view of the student should be.

Christians don’t all agree on the best way to frame a specifically Christian view of the student that doesn’t just blindly accept some of these cultural assumptions. Drawing on Niebuhr’s idea that there are various ways Christians have conceptualized the relationship between Christ and culture, let me outline three biblically-informed ways that Christians have come to view the young humans sitting in our classrooms.

Christian View #1

First, there’s the *Christianity-against-Culture* frame. This framework may view the student primarily as a sinner in need of correction. This framework also views the wider culture as mostly dangerous and fraught with sin. So educational decisions about adolescent literature, for example, or school dances, self-esteem teaching, and even block scheduling may all raise objections for people using this frame. This sin-focused tendency shows up in early Puritan education in the colonies and puts a large emphasis on the total depravity of humans. Rules and punishments back then were pretty harsh by today’s standards because they were seen as ways to put a needed box around students’ natural depravity, but there is still a sense among many educators that since humans are prone to sin, students should be tightly controlled.

Teachers thinking in this frame may see their primary role as an enforcer of needed rules. Some Christian parenting and teaching experts in recent generations (e.g., James Dobson) have emphasized the need for adults to stand quite firm when children and adolescents go through their flailing-around stages. Others have labeled this more authoritarian approach “the brick wall” approach.[[3]](#footnote-3)

More recently, Christian parents using this kind of framework might ask their children to excuse themselves from reading certain novels in class or they may opt to homeschool their children in order to avoid the cultural depravity they perceive in the schools. This shifts the focus to the sinfulness of the culture and the educational establishment more than the sinfulness of the child, but it’s still a very sin-focused approach to education.

Christian View #2

On the other side of the spectrum is a kind of *Christianity-Embracing-Culture* framework. This perspective may start with the concept of the student as made in the image of God and therefore full of creativity and potential. For example, since the wider culture offers so much inspiration and opportunity to kids today – “the world’s your oyster”—the school should be doing whatever it can to expose kids to wonderful new areas of knowledge and creative expression. This perspective may emphasize sweeping away any impediments to creativity (like boring textbooks and stifling educational structures) and awakening in each child the wonder of creation and the various opportunities available to young people today. Some recent innovations in curriculum and teaching methods, school schedules, and assessment of student learning seem to fit tidily with this framework. However, this embracing-culture approach may tend toward a permissiveness in teachers, or what Coloroso calls the “jelly-fish” approach.

Christian View #3

Finally, a third framework can be generated from a *Christ-Transforming-Culture* framework. This frame may acknowledge *both* the sinful nature and the boundless God-given potential of the young student and seek ways to design the curriculum in ways that provide structure to maximize growth.[[4]](#footnote-4) This frame focuses on providing positive motivation and opportunity for application of learning (which is a type of “higher level thinking” on Bloom’s Taxonomy). By providing such structure and motivation (through an authoritative stance that Coloroso calls “backbone”), this kind of learning design can help move a student toward freedom from the bondage of sinful tendencies (such as lack of self-discipline) and provide an opportunity to work toward personal responsibility-building and cultural Shalom-building.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The Christian teacher does not know exactly what the Lord has in store for each student, but a teacher with this third frame of reference views each student as someone with a God-ordained transformative purpose, still to be realized, but awesome and important in the kingdom. Educational goals such as teaching for justice, teaching for Shalom, responsibility teaching, citizenship training, vocational training, even self-actualization – these can all be *aspects* of the educational task when it’s framed this way. As James K.A. Smith (2009) says, we’re not just informing students, we’re helping to form them.[[6]](#footnote-6) So the main point, it seems to me, is to focus on each student as a divine work in progress and to help all students unleash their God-ordained calling through thorough preparation of their minds, hearts, and hands (in fact, all aspects of their selfhood, including the: “intellectual, moral, and creative,”[[7]](#footnote-7) according to Beversluis, 1971).

This final frame, in my mind, provides the most thoroughly biblical framework for helping the student discover, hone, and use the Spirit’s gifts and callings. This view acknowledges the diversity of persons and callings in God’s world and points the way toward the freeing of the mind and spirit to be what God has created each student to be. What we’re describing here is really part of the process of sanctification, which is a life-long process. But if we can see students as God’s team players embarking on the process, then we’ll also help them see themselves that way too.

With what do you agree? Disagree? Questions?
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2. For example, perennialism and essentialism; see G. Knight, *Philosophy and education: An introduction in Christian perspective*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2006. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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