



NATIONAL INSTITUTE *for* CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

299A Castlereagh Rd, Agnes Banks NSW 2753 • PO Box 19, Richmond NSW 2753, Australia • ABN: 67 107 484 695
Tel: 02 4560 3000 • Fax: 02 4578 5499 • Email: admin@nice.edu.au • Website: www.nice.edu.au

NICE Body of Knowledge

This statement has been prepared by NICE staff to represent the position of NICE and to the secular academic establishment.

R Edlin, S Fowler, K Dickens, G Beech

Structural Foundations

It was long thought that the body of human knowledge, particularly academic knowledge, rested on universal foundations of human reason that were common to all rational persons. Academic knowledge gained its coherence from this universal reason. With the collapse in the mid-twentieth century of the logical positivist enterprise that attempted to provide compelling logical proof of the validity of this belief (Suppe, 1977), all this changed. The world of scholarship was forced to accept the conclusion that the structural foundations that give coherence to the diversity of our knowledge are a network of beliefs about the fundamental nature of the world.

This is appropriately termed a worldview—*Weltanschauung*—(Suppe, 1977, Nord & Haynes, 1998) but can be identified by other terms. Rorty (1989), for example, identifies it in cultural terms, likening a culture to a walled enclosure constituting a closed belief framework that shapes the way we understand all we experience. He argues that we can escape this closed world only by finding cracks in the walls that give us footholds to climb up to gain a view of the world that transcends our cultural beliefs. Kuhn (1996) uses the term “paradigm.” Polanyi (1962) talks about interpretive frameworks.

This revolution in the understanding of the structural foundations of the body of knowledge ushered in what we call the postmodern age, where it is acceptable to use different belief networks, or worldviews, as the basis for giving a structural coherence to the diversity of knowledge. Scientists may still use a positivist framework, but they can claim no rational basis for insisting that this is the only valid framework. To give but one example, astrophysicist Roger Penrose (1989) of Oxford University, recently knighted for his contributions to science, says that he can only make sense of his groundbreaking work in mathematics by founding his science in a Platonic view of the world.

Feyerabend (1978) makes the point in very strong terms when he says that there is no rational basis for preferring science to magic. He is quick to add that he himself does prefer science to magic, but that this preference cannot be decisively established by reason alone.

It is not surprising, then, that scholars from a wide range of backgrounds (Kok, 1998; Pearcey, 2004; Postman, 1995; Romanowski & Oldenski, 1998; Sergioivanni, 1999; Wolterstorff, 2002) remind us that even the ways we use words and phrases in educational activities reflect our beliefs about the nature and meaning of the world and its inhabitants. Definitions of the purpose of education that recognise its key task of nurturing and transferring or even transforming cultural norms also acknowledge that central to the nature of teaching and learning are the belief characteristics of teachers and education designers (Counts, 1952; Dewey, 1916; Spindler; 1987).

It has also been observed (Wentz, 1987; Nord & Haynes, 1998) that a fundamental religious conviction of some kind, whether explicit or implied, is the core of every worldview. This applies even to those who profess no religious faith since, as Wentz points out, the fundamental nature of religious faith is a conviction about the ultimate source of order and meaning in the world we experience. Hence, even the atheist will have some conviction about the nature of the world in which we live, albeit one that has no place for a divine being.

Many Christian educators welcome these developments (Edlin, 2003; Fowler, 1997; Greene, 1998; de Jong, 2001; Pazmiño, 1997; Plantinga, 2002; Smith & Shortt, 2002; van Dyk, 2000; van Brummelen, 2002; Vryhof, 2004; Belcher, 2005).

In line with these developments, NICE courses are not to be understood as courses in “Christian” education any more than the Action Research model developed and taught to education students at Deakin University should be labelled “Neomarxist” education merely because it is developed from Habermas’ Neomarxist worldview perspective (Habermas, 1973). A worldview is not a body of knowledge but a network of beliefs that provides a structural foundation for a body of knowledge that may draw on knowledge from a wide variety of sources. Though solidly rooted in, and deeply committed to, a Christian worldview, NICE programs have an intellectual rigour and integrity which, accompanied by the high level of academic attainment of NICE’s teaching and support staff, has given NICE widespread acceptance within the secular educational and regulatory communities.

In its courses, NICE affirms that best practice is to be aware and make use of knowledge based on a wide variety of worldview positions (Nord & Haynes, 1998; Ozman & Craver, 2003) that provide insights into the same realities and vocational categories as would occur in a similar course at other tertiary institutions. A dogmatic attitude that assumes the superiority of educational ideas and practices endorsed by Christian authority, or by any other authority, is discouraged as exhibiting poor scholarship. This is, however, a course in education that deliberately encourages students to develop an awareness of how a Christian worldview develops and functions. For this reason, all students are required to complete two core units which acquaint students with the foundational literature from which a Christian worldview perspective is derived. The units also are designed to provide an understanding of the nature and role of worldviews together with encouraging a critical evaluation of worldviews and their role in education.

This critical evaluation functions in two directions. The first direction is critical evaluation of the students’ own worldviews to ensure consistency with their core faith. The second direction is the evaluation of educational theories and practices, including those endorsed as Christian, for consistency with the students’ worldviews. Students are encouraged to take on board this concept of critical evaluation as a continuing, life-long practice and not a once only exercise.

The Dynamic Character of Knowledge

The idea of a fixed, static body of knowledge is rejected as untenable in the light of current perceptions of reality. New insights require modifications and even reversals of earlier knowledge. A significant example of this has been seen during the last century with the attempts by physicists to discover a “theory of everything”—an endeavour that has led them to move from Newtonian physics to Einstein’s Relativity then to Quantum Mechanics and now, in some circles, towards String Theory.

Other equally important examples include the recent identification by two Nobel prize winning Australian scientists of a specific bacterium as a major factor in peptic ulcers, with implications for stomach cancer (Normark, 2005). Any satisfactory worldview, therefore, must be open to modification and change in the light of this dynamic character of the body of knowledge. The religious conviction that is the core of the worldview will govern the exact way in which this worldview modification takes place. However a worldview governed by a rigidly fixed body of dogma—religious or otherwise—is entirely unsatisfactory, generating an obscurantism that leaves us locked within a world of unreality. NICE encourage students to recognise the value of

a reformed critical realist approach (Edlin & Ireland, 2006) with its attendant perspective of epistemic humility (Langton, 2001).

The body of educational knowledge is no exception to this characteristic of dynamism. The recognition of the role of a Christian worldview by the NICE, therefore, is not to be understood as the endorsing of a religious dogmatism. On the contrary, NICE academic staff are continually exploring new insights into education that will throw fresh light on effective educational practice, regardless of the source of these insights. And students are encouraged to pursue a similar course, ready to modify their educational worldview as well as the wider worldview in ways that remain consistent with the core conviction that the God who is revealed in the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the focus and ultimate source of all order and meaning in the world of human experience.

On this basis, NICE has a distinctive position that does not distance it from, but positions it within, the educational mainstream engaged with the diversity of worldview positions within that world. When the role of worldviews is not recognised, educational discourse tends to be hindered by fruitless debate. When they are brought out into the open the possibility opens for productive dialogue between educators holding a diversity of worldview positions. It is this kind of dialogue that NICE seeks to generate, both in its own operations and in the professional lives of its students.

Learning and Teaching

Having laid the structural foundations in the core units, students have the opportunity to explore the body of educational knowledge, in terms of both educational theory and practice, within four related but distinct learning tracks. The relation between theory and practice is not seen as a one-way relationship in which theory governs practice. Rather it is seen as an interactive relationship with theory providing insights for more effective educational practice while practice provides important empirical data that can be used to refine and enhance educational theory.

Teaching is not seen as a mere process of knowledge transmission but as a process that facilitates learning in order to equip students for life-long learning. Given the dynamic nature of the body of knowledge, teaching in any field or discipline of knowledge can only be effective if the teacher is constantly keeping abreast of developments in that field of knowledge, as well as developments in the knowledge of educational practice.

An important component of this track is developing an understanding of the diversity of ways of learning. This includes the important issues of multiple intelligences and learning styles (Good & Brophy, 2002; Gardner, 1999; Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999; Ozmon & Craver, 2003, Silver, 2000). We do not want to encourage an educational elitism by educational practices favouring students with one set of abilities or gifts. Our aim is to equip teachers to teach in ways that will give all an equal opportunity to learn in accordance with their individual abilities, styles and personalities. This is a major challenge but the understanding that has developed over recent years about the diversity of ways of learning and types of knowledge makes it an achievable goal.

Students are directed to and expected to demonstrate an understanding of contemporary educational trends in a way that critically reflects on their own teaching in the light of those trends and a Christian worldview position (Giles, 2005; Hull, 2003). For example, in the subject Issues in Teaching Mathematics, contemporary perspectives on mathematics are explored and applied in educational settings that resonate with a range of philosophical approaches to this aspect of reality, including Christian, empirical constructivist, and critical realist paradigms (Nickel, 1990; Good & Brophy, 2002; Howell & Bradley, 2001).

In this case, as in other disciplines, it is seen as important to anchor learning in the student's own concrete experience of the world in order to avoid the impression that the material being learned is mere abstractions detached from the concrete realities of daily life. Situated cognition is supported by sound research such as that of Saxe (1988) in mathematics and van Reeuwijk (1995) even in the more abstract field of algebra. The work of van Reeuwijk and his colleagues at

the prestigious Freudenthal Institute provides a wealth of other material in this area, including their curriculum package "Mathematics in Context."

In all units, students are expected to demonstrate ICT competency, as well as recognising the inherent benefits and dangers of a reliance on technology in teaching and learning (Schultze, 2002; Wells, 1994, Woolsey, 1996). As with all NICE perspectives, these insights are of value for all educational communities, whatever their philosophical or worldview foundations.

Curriculum Evaluation and Construction

In order to ensure coherence in the body of knowledge, the studies in this track see curriculum as the structuring of learning programs that facilitate learning in contexts that recognise the diverse ways in which students learn and make room for different styles of learning.

Again, the studies draw on a wide range of sources for insights that are given coherence by the worldview foundations developed by students around the core of their religious convictions. Key sources in this area include Brady & Kennedy (1999); Kemmis & McTaggart (1997); van Brummelen (2002); Worthen, Sanders & Fitzgerald (1997). Students are also expected to do their own literature search to locate additional materials other than set readings, and the NICE Resource Centres provide special services to facilitate this. For this purpose, NICE provides students with electronic access to full-text journal databases such as ProQuest.

Leadership

This track traces the philosophical presuppositions that have affected school leadership and administration over time and critiques the positivistic scientism and pragmatism particularly inherent in these presuppositions (Maxcy, 2001). It affirms the need for coherence of value and practice (Bottery, 1990; Lakomski, 1985; West, 1993; Postman, 1996).

The track asserts that coherence is achieved in a biblical worldview but students are encouraged to critique this assertion along with the inconsistencies that are observed in the application of this worldview to educational leadership (Stronks & Blomberg, 1993; Ormell, 1980).

Implicit with the discussion of values and practice is the notion of vision. This calls for a recognition of the communal ownership of vision that is consistent with the beliefs to which the community is committed (Sergiovanni, 2000; Lambert, 2004). At the same time, it encourages discernment of the dangers of an artificially imposed vision upon a community (Barnett, McCormick & Conners, 2001; Fullan, 1992).

The leader of a Christian school is located within the broader context of the educational landscape that is marked by notions of standards, efficiency and accountability and the sometimes conflicting calls for cultural leadership, value commitment and care (Sergiovanni, 2000; Noddings, 2005; Grace, 1993; Holmes & Wynne, 1989).

In the light of these demands the students are encouraged to consider the distinctives of biblical leadership with application to the context of schools. Themes include: servant leadership; accountability; nurture, supervision, example and vision-setting.

Along with educational commentators of various persuasions, the unit sounds a warning (from its biblical worldview perspective) against the prevailing trends of pragmatism, eclecticism and economic rationalism and calls for leadership that does more than maintaining what schools do but leadership that inspires what they ought to do, consistent with a coherent vision of and for life.

Research

Students are required to engage in small research tasks throughout the NICE programs. Most commonly, they are action research projects that involve systematic investigation into the effectiveness of their own teaching practice. In addition to drawing on the Deakin action research model, students are encouraged to explore wider views of action research such as those presented by McNiff and Whitehead (2002).

For those who exhibit the inclination and aptitude for more intensive professional research, two research tracks, involving a minor and major research project, are offered. For this, students are expected to become familiar with a broad range of research approaches and strategies, both qualitative and quantitative and to show the ability to determine the strategy best suited to specific problems (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000; Gorard, 2001; Ezzy, 2001).

Ensuring the Coherence of Learning

We regard it as important that graduates from our courses have a coherent understanding of what they have learned that demonstrates a coherent body of knowledge. For this reason the NICE has included as a required final subject in the BEd and MEd program, a unique summative integration component, with two options. In the best traditions of Donald Schon's reflective practitioner model (Kelleher, 2002; Schon, 1987), these concluding units provide the opportunity for students to reflect upon the comprehensive growth and development that has occurred during their entire study program, demonstrating at the end of the course that what has been learned has been integrated into a coherent understanding of effective educational practice. As an innovative, longitudinal component of the entire course, this additional piece of coursework reflects NICE's concern to equip teachers with the evaluative tools that enable them to confront change and the deprofessionalisation of teaching (Caine & Caine, 1997; Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999) by becoming collegial shapers of their educational contexts rather than "be victimized by the relentless intrusion of external change forces" (Fullan, 2001, p. 123).

Bibliography

- Augros, R. R., & Stanciu, G. (1987). *The new biology: Discovering the wisdom in nature*. Boston: New Science Library.
- Barnett, K., McCormick, J., & Conners, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools—panacea, placebo or problem? *Journal of Educational Administration* 39.
- Beane, J. A. (1997). *Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic education*. New York: Teachers NICE Press.
- Belcher, C. (2005). The place of worldview in Christian approaches to education. *Journal of Christian Education*, 48(3), 9–24.
- Bottery, M. (1990). Values behind the practice. *The morality of the school: The theory and practice of values in education*. (pp. 6–16). London: Cassell.
- Brady, L. & Kennedy, K. (1999). *Curriculum construction*. Sydney, Australia: Prentice Hall.
- Caine, G., & Caine R. N. (1997). *Education on the edge of possibility*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. Victoria: Deacon University.
- Cohen, L, Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. (5th ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Counts, G. (1952). *Education and American civilization*, New York: Teachers NICE Press.
- De Jong, N. (2001). *Teaching for a change: A transformational approach to education*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R.
- DeBoer, P. P., Van Brummelem, H., Blomberg, D., Koole, R., & Stronks, G. G. (Eds.). (1993). *Educating Christian teachers for responsive discipleship*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Free Press.
- Driscoll, M. P. (2000). *Psychology of learning and instruction* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Edlin, R. J. (1999). *The cause of Christian education* (3rd ed.). Blacktown, NSW: National Institute for Christian Education.

- Edlin, R. J. (2003). Core beliefs and values of a Christian philosophy of education. In J. Braley, J. Layman, & R. White (Eds.). *Foundations of Christian education* (pp. 67–81). Colorado Springs, CO: Purposeful Design.
- Edlin, R. J., & Ireland, J. (2006). *Engaging the culture: Christians at work in education*. Blacktown, NSW: National Institute for Christian Education.
- Ezzy, D. (2001). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and Innovation*. Crows Nest, NSW Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Fennema, J. (2005). *The religious nature and biblical nurture of God's children: A guide for parents and teachers*. Sioux City, IA: Dordt NICE Press.
- Feyerabend, P. (1978). *Against method*. Thetford, Norfolk: The Thetford Press Ltd.
- Fowler, S. (1997). Unearthing gifts with multiple intelligences and other tools. In I. Lambert & S. Mitchell (Eds.), *The crumbling walls of certainty: Towards a Christian critique of postmodernity and education*. Sydney: Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity.
- Fullan, M. G. (1992). Visions that blind. *Educational Leadership*, 49 (5), 19–20.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers Press, Columbia University.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giles, D. (2005). Philosophy to ideological praxis: A component theory approach to developing and educational framework. *Journal of Christian Education*, (48)3, 25–33.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. (2002). *Looking in Classrooms* (9th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Gorard, F. (2001). *Quantitative methods in educational research*. London: Continuum.
- Grace, G. (1993). On the study of school leadership: Beyond education management. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 41 (4), 353–365.
- Greene, A. E. (1998). *Reclaiming the future of Christian education: A transforming vision*. Colorado Springs, CO: Association of Christian Schools International.
- Habermas, J. (1978). *Theory and practice*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (1999). *Cognitive dissonance: Progress on a pivotal theory in social psychology*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Holmes, M., & Wynne, E. A. (1989). *Making the school an effective community: Belief, practice and theory in school administration*. London: Falmer Press.
- Howell, R. W., & Bradley, W. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Mathematics in a postmodern age: A Christian perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hull, J. E. (2003). Aiming for Christian education, settling for Christians educating: The Christian school's replication of a public school paradigm. *Christian Scholar's Review*, 32(2), 203–223.
- Jackson, P. W. (1996). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum: a project of the American Educational Research Association* (pp. 3–40). New York: Macmillan Library Reference USA.
- Kelleher, J. (2002). Encouraging reflective practice. *Principal Leadership*, 3(2), 20–24.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart R. (Eds.). (1997). *The action research planner*. (3rd ed.). Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press
- Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kok, J. H. (1998). *Patterns of the Western Mind: A reformed Christian perspective* (2nd rev. ed.). Sioux Center, IA: Dordt NICE Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press.
- Lakomski, G. (1985). Theory, value and relevance in educational administration. In F. Rizvi, (Ed.), *Working Papers in Ethics and Educational Administration*.

- Lambert, I. (2004) Community leadership for the new millennium: Between maverick and monk. In J. Ireland, R. Edlin, & K. Dickens (Eds.). *Pointing the way: Directions for Christian education in a new millennium*. Sydney: National Institute for Christian Education.
- Langton, R. (2001). *Kantian humility: Our ignorance of things in themselves*. Oxford University Press.
- Maxcy, S. (2001) Educational leadership and management of knowing: the aesthetics of coherentism. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 39 (6), 573-588.
- McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2002). *Action research: Principles and practices* (2nd ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Moreland, J. P. (1997). *Love your God with all your mind: The role of reason in the life of the soul*. Colorado Springs, CO: Navpress.
- Moreland, J. P., & Craig, W. L. (2003). *Philosophical foundations for a Christian worldview*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Neuhaus, R. J. (2001). *The best of "The public square" Book two*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Nickel, J. (1990). *Mathematics: Is God silent*. Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books.
- Noddings, N. (2005). What does it mean to educate the whole child? *Educational leadership*, 63 (1) 8-13.
- Nord, W. A., & Haynes, C. C. (1998). *Taking religion seriously across the curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Normark, S. (2005). Presentation Speech: The Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine 2005. http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/medicine/laureates/2005/presentation-speech.html. Retrieved 23 August, 2006.
- Orme, C. (1980). Values in Education. In R. Straughan & J. Wrigley (Eds.), *Values and evaluation in Education* pp. 71-95. London: Harper and Row.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Ozman, H., & Craver, S. (2003). *Philosophical foundations of education*, (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Pazmiño, R. W. (1997). *Foundational issues in Christian education: An introduction in evangelical perspective* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Pearcey, N. (2004). *Total truth: Liberating Christianity from its cultural captivity*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Penrose, R. (1989). *The emperor's new mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peterson, D. (Ed.). (1999). *Witness to the world: Paters from the Second Oak Hill NICE Annual School of Theology*. Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Paternoster Press.
- Plantinga, C. (2002). *Engaging God's world: A Christian vision of faith, learning and living*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Polanyi, Michael M. (1962). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago: IL.: University of Chicago Press.
- Popper, K. R. (1983). *Realism and the aim of science*. London: Hutchinson & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.
- Postman, N. (1995). *The end of education: Redefining the value of school*. New York, Random House.
- Romanowski, M. H., & Oldenski, T. E. (1998). Challenging the status quo of teacher education programs. *The Clearing House*, 72(2), 111--115.
- Rorty, R. (1989). The contingency of language. In R. Rorty. *Contingency, irony, solidarity*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Saxe, G. B. (1988). Candy selling and math learning. *Educational research*. 17(6).), 14-21.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Schultze, Q. J. (2002). *Habits of the high-tech heart: Living virtuously in the information age*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1999). *Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles*. Arlington Heights, IL: SkyLight Professional Development.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *The lifeworld of leadership: Creating, culture, community, and personal meaning in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Silver, H. F. (2000). *So each may learn: Integrating learning styles and multiple intelligences*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smith, D. I., & Shortt, J. (2002). *The Bible and the task of teaching*. Stapleford, Nottingham, UK: Stapleford Centre.
- Spindler, G. (1987). The transmission of culture. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Education and cultural process*, pp. 303-334. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Stronks, G. G., & Blomberg, D. (Eds.). (1993). *A vision with a task: Christian schooling for responsive discipleship*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Suppe, Frederick F. (Ed.). (1977). *The structure of scientific theories*. (2nd ed.) Chicago, IL.: University of Illinois Press.
- Thompson, R. (2005). *A biblical introduction to worldview*. Auckland, NZ: Masters.
- Van Brummelen, H. (2002). *Steppingstones to curriculum: A biblical path* (3rd ed.). Colorado Springs, CO: Purposeful Design.
- van Dyk, J. (2000). *The craft of Christian teaching: A classroom journey*. Sioux Center, IA: Dordt Press.
- van Reeuwijk, Martin. (1995). The role of realistic situations in developing tools for solving systems of equations. Utrecht, Netherlands: Freudenthal Institute.
- Vryhof, S. C. (2004). *Between memory and vision: The case for faith-based schooling*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Wells, D. F. (1994). *God in the wasteland: The reality of truth in a world of fading dreams*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Wentz, R. E. (1987). *Why do people do bad things in the name of religion?* Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- West, S. (1993). *Educational values for school leadership*. London: Kogan Page.
- Wolterstorff, N. P. (2002). *Educating for Life: Reflections on Christian teaching and learning*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Woods, J. D. (2003). *The significance of religious factors in the development of resilience in secondary students in Christian schools*. Unpublished Masters thesis, National Institute of Christian Higher Education, Blacktown, NSW.
- Woolsey, K. H. (1996). Hope and joy in a rational world: Kids, learning, and computers. In *Education & technology*. In C. Fisher, D. C. Dwyer, & K. Yocam, (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. R., & Fitzgerald J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York/London: Longmans.