

Teaching for Cognitive and Affective Outcomes

By Joel C. Gerlach

Social critic Peter Drucker, in a *Psychology Today* article (June 1972) titled “School Around the Bend” insists that “we cannot allow schools to do their traditionally poor job of teaching.” He analyzes the current scene in the nation’s public schools, insists that this is a time for rethinking fundamentals and for building school systems different from anything we have seen, and then proceeds to propose eight radical goals for American education. Drucker lists the following four assumptions which underlie schooling around the world:

1. learning is a separate and distinct “intellectual” activity;
2. learning goes on in a separate organ, the mind, divorced from the body or emotions;
3. learning is divorced from doing - indeed opposed to it; at best it is preparation for doing; and
4. learning, because it is preparation, is for the young.

Those assumptions have traditionally produced schools which are discipline centered, schools whose primary objective has always been a cognitive one. Drucker says, “The school of tomorrow will be neither behavioristic nor cognitive, neither child-centered nor discipline-centered. It will be all of these.”

Mary Harbeck is another secular educator who is calling for a reevaluation of the goals of teaching. In an article, “Instructional Objectives in the Affective Domain” in the January 1970 issue of *Educational Technology*, Dr. Harbeck says:

If the truly educated person can be described as one who has a well defined value system (character) that he lives by and is willing to defend, an appreciation of the arts, a *concern for* the future of mankind, and the ability to live in harmony with his fellows, then educational objectives must certainly be formulated in the affective domain, as described by Krathwohl, as well as in the higher levels of the cognitive domain.

Educational goals at these levels have been in existence for a long time, but they are usually stated once in some obscure document such as a school philosophy, and then are largely forgotten when the actual instructional sequences are planned. Teachers do not often consciously teach or test for objectives in the affective domain. More or less on faith we assume that people will develop a value complex as they continue to learn.

What Harbeck, Drucker, Piaget, Kohlberg and a host of others have been saying about secular education generally is also applicable in part to Christian education specifically. Whether we are speaking about Sunday schools, vacation Bible schools, Christian day schools, confirmation classes, Bible classes, area high schools or synodical academies, colleges and the seminary, our basic approach to our teaching task is similar to that employed in secular schools. The classroom is a place to process information. It is a place for teachers to impart and for learners to acquire knowledge. The cognitive outcome gets the emphasis. This is true in spite of the fact that we have always insisted that Christian education is unique, and that its purpose is not only to teach God’s Word, but also to promote the maturation process of God’s people.

The attention secular educators are giving to the importance of affective as well as cognitive teaching outcomes suggests an analytical and critical review of our own teaching system. Perhaps that is what prompted the Commission on Higher Education to include on the program for this conference a paper entitled: *Teaching for Cognitive and Affective Outcomes*. In our treatment of the theme we intend to consider:

- I. The Scriptural objective of Christian teaching
- II. The Scriptural goals of Christian teaching

III. The relative importance of the goals, and

IV. The need to develop/maintain a proper balance in our own teaching.

The Objective

The mission of Christ's church is a teaching mission. In the familiar words of the great commission our Lord authorized His followers to "make disciples" of all nations. The discipling of the nations in turn involves two activities, one an action intended to bring men to faith in the Savior, "baptizing them," the other an action intended to enable God's people to live the life of faith, "teaching them to observe all things."

This teaching activity (διδάσκω) which has as its object the making of a disciple, is the particular subject of this study. We teach for the purpose of making disciples who endeavor to keep (τηρεῖν) everything Jesus has commanded. Jesus' choice of words is significant. We teach others, not merely to know, not γινώσκω, or οἶδα, or ἐπιγινώσκω, but to keep, that is to watch carefully, or to observe all that He has taught us.

Time limitations do not allow us at this point to make a study of the words used in Scripture for teaching, learning and knowing. Such a study, however, makes it obvious that teaching as our Lord conceives of it is not merely a matter of processing Bible facts from one mind to another. Cognition is not the whole or even the primary objective of Christian teaching. It is equally clear that the words for knowing do not imply merely an activity of the intellect and nothing more. When, for example, Moses says that "Adam knew his wife," he is speaking about an experiential knowing. The Greek terms in the New Testament suggest a similar kind of knowing. The word for *knowing* a person (οἶδα, Mark 1:34; John 1:26, Acts 3:16) may also mean *to be intimately acquainted* (Matthew 26:72; Mark 14:71; 2 Cor. 5:16) or even *to be able* (Matthew 7:11, 1 Timothy 3:5).

The disciples of Jesus also came to know their teacher experientially. That was the objective Jesus had in mind when He chose the twelve, "That they might be with him," Mark says, Mark 3:14. His purpose was not to enable them to know what He knew, but to enable them to become like Him. "The disciple is not above his master; but everyone that is perfect shall be as his master" Luke 6:40. The NASB makes the point of Jesus' words more clear. "A pupil... after he has been fully trained (κατηρτισμένος) will be like his teacher."

Those words help us understand exactly what Jesus had in mind as His objective. As their teacher He spent three years in close and intimate association with the twelve in order to transform them from what they were into what He was. He was their model, their pattern. "I have given you an example (ὑπόδειγμα) that ye should follow in my steps," He told them after He had washed their feet. Jesus called His disciples to be with Him because they needed to see the concepts He taught them in action in His own life. What they saw was no less important than what they heard because what they did was no less important than what they knew.

Jesus came, He said, that men might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. Those words suggest the proper focus of Christian education, life, abundant life. Christian teachers teach to make disciples. That is just another way of saying that they teach to transform. They teach to promote likeness to Christ. They teach in order to model the divine Model for their pupils. They teach so that their pupils might experience more and more completely the abundant life Jesus came to share with them. St. Paul would agree with that. He reminds us that God gave pastors and teachers as gifts to His church "for the perfecting of the saints for their work of the ministry."

Christian pupils then are persons in whom through regeneration new capacities and possibilities have been created which are to be nurtured until they are experienced as Christ-like realities. That is our objective. Disciple, transformation, association, likeness, those are key words when defining the objective of Christian teaching. The teacher is as much a model as an information processor. The learner is more an imitator than a sponge.

Goals

To accomplish any task successfully, not only must we be absolutely clear about our objective, we must be equally clear in our thinking about goals. Goals are the steps we take in the direction of the attainment of our ultimate objective. To disciple people is a process. It involves people whose lives are undergoing a constant transformation as they grow in likeness to their Lord. Obviously then we must teach both for cognitive as well as for affective outcomes. These are the twin goals of Christian teaching. These goals are as Scripturally determined as they are psychologically sound.

The human mind as God created it consists of intellect, emotion, and volition. The Word of God as He inspired it is adapted appropriately to the tripartite mind. He created. God's Word has this psychological quality along with ordinary human speech. Thus God addresses himself in His Word to the intellect, to the emotion and to the will. The Bible is a book which records propositional truth. It transmits that truth to man's intellect. The Bible is also a book which records the story of God's love. Love involves man's emotions. The Bible is a book which also records the holy and immutable will of God. He wants man's will to operate submissively in tandem with His will. Thus His Word also addresses itself to the will of man

Jesus has the intellect in mind when He declares, "This is life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" John 17:3. In that same High Priestly prayer Jesus speaks of truth propositionally when He asserts "Thy word is truth." Peter too has the intellect in mind when he speaks of the "more sure word of prophecy" to which "ye do well that ye take heed," 2 Peter 1:10. So does Paul when he speaks of God's operation in our hearts "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God," 2 Cor. 4:6. So does the Psalmist who confesses, "Through thy precepts I get understanding," 119:104. Jesus attempted to help the perplexed Emmaus disciples by opening "their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." His review of Old Testament prophecies was a cognitive pursuit for the sake of an affective outcome.

Scripture addresses itself no less evidently to the emotions, particularly when it speaks of the effect of the Word on the heart. The Psalmist speaks of God enlarging the heart. "*Wenn du mich tröstest,*" Luther translates it, 119:32. Again the same Psalmist gives vent to his emotion when he says, "I was afflicted," (107) and "my flesh trembles for fear of thee" (120). Probably no other portion of Scripture covers so large a range of emotion as does Psalm 119. What we find in that Psalm we find throughout Scripture. Paul, for example, encourages God's people to rejoice in the Lord always. Joy, hope, gladness, sadness, grief, are all regularly recurring themes in Scripture.

When God enlarges the hearts of His people, He does it to elicit a response. "I will run the way of thy commandments when thou shalt enlarge my heart." Intellect and emotion work together to bend the will. What the Psalmist knows, and what he feels incline him to will and do what God wills. Scripture is no less replete with appeals to the will than it is with appeals to the emotion. Recall how frequently the words recur in the epistles, "I pray you therefore," or "I beseech you, brethren..." Paul's epistles are also filled with exhortations—all of them appeals to the will. So is every rebuke, every warning.

Now let's sum up these points and restate this truth in the light of Scripture's objective for Christian teaching. Jesus came that men might have new life. With that new life comes a new ability to perceive reality. With this new life also comes a capacity to experience and express genuine love. And with this new life comes the option of living life responsively with God. The perception of reality is an intellectual exercise ("through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God"). The experience and expression of genuine love are emotional exercises ("Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love for the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently"). Living life responsively with God is a volitional exercise ("Ye have chosen you the Lord to serve him." Josh. 24:22).

In terms of teaching outcomes, then, the goals of Christian teaching are twofold, cognitive and affective. It hardly needs saying that our work in the classroom is done for a cognitive outcome. We *are* there to process

information, to help students know in the narrow sense, to transmit facts from books or from our heads to the mind of the learner. Content, particularly Biblical content, is important. Intellectual activity must characterize all Christian teaching. There is no new life apart from knowing God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, as our Lord states unequivocally. We are committed as Lutheran Christians to a belief-system and to the perpetuation of that belief-system with its creeds and confessions drawn from the Word of God. That necessitates teaching for cognitive outcomes. Jesus did that; so did the prophets and the apostles; so must we. We cannot train disciples to make disciples without enabling them to communicate propositional truth verbally.

Pentecost, which we are still celebrating this week, reminds us of that fact. The chief work of the Holy Spirit is to testify of Jesus by promoting knowledge of the Person and work of the Savior. Peter's Pentecost sermon does exactly that. He reviewed the facts of Jesus' life, death and resurrection. He pointed up God's purpose in what had happened. He presented the testimony of David in support of his claims. He taught for a cognitive outcome.

But the outcome that day was more than cognitive. People who heard Peter were "pricked in their heart," (that's affective), "and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" That's affective too. Both emotion and will were affected by the facts Peter presented so persuasively - like men filled with new wine. The sermon ought not to be divorced from the remarkable context in which it was presented. That incident provides a pattern for all Christian preaching and teaching. The Scriptural objective demands that it be done for both cognitive and affective outcomes.

Teaching for an affective outcome is teaching which aims beyond the intellect at the emotion so that the two acting together influence the Christian's will. It is teaching which moves God's people to want to grow and helps them to know how in specific ways. It is teaching which helps them to translate faith into life, teaching which stimulates the process of transformation into the likeness of Jesus. It is teaching that is never satisfied merely with programming facts into computer-like minds so that the possessors of such minds qualify as orthodox Christians.

Peter's Pentecost sermon is but one example of that kind of teaching. The epistles of Paul offer another example. The doctrinal/practical format which characterizes them, Romans and Galatians for example, suggests that Paul was keenly aware of the importance of teaching for both cognitive and affective outcomes. The apostle James too expresses a genuine concern about Christians who apparently are not affected by what they know. He would certainly agree that all Christian teaching should be done with an affective outcome in mind.

The cognitive and affective outcomes which are the Scriptural goals of Christian teaching are both incorporated by Paul into a familiar exhortation he addressed to young Timothy, words we regularly hear at an ordination or an installation service. In the familiar words of the AV the exhortation reads, "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine." (ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 4:16). The NIV translates, "Watch your life and doctrine closely." Doctrine or truth and the exemplification of that truth always go hand in hand. Living the truth and telling the truth are twin goals for a Christian teacher. He tells it for a cognitive purpose and he lives it for an affective purpose. That is why Paul encourages Timothy to "set an example for the believers in speech, in life, in faith and in purity." Paul had done just that for Timothy. He reminded Timothy, "You know all about my teaching, my way of life, my purpose, faith, patience, love, endurance, persecutions, sufferings." Timothy was to be as open to others as Paul was to Timothy in order to make apparent the harmony between life and doctrine. Christian teachers express visibly with their lives the reality of the concepts expressed in the Word. It is not enough to help people know what the teacher knows. Christian teaching must help learners become what their teacher is. That is teaching for cognitive and affective outcomes.

The Relative Importance of the Two Goals

It is significant that Paul tells Timothy to watch his life and his doctrine closely. We would almost expect him to turn it around and to say, "Watch your doctrine and your life closely." The fact that he says it the way he does suggests the need to speak also about the relative importance of the two goals.

It is apparent from Scripture that one goal cannot be elevated above the other in importance. That is clear from James's exposition of the relationship between faith and works. Faith without works is not saving faith, and works without faith are not Christian works. They are not expressive of thankful love, nor are they reflective of the indwelling Christ.

So the teacher who sees himself merely or even primarily as a transmitter who programs and processes Bible information as truth will cripple the learners he is endeavoring to teach. Faith is not nurtured with facts only. Similarly the teacher whose motto is "deeds, not creeds," who scorns content in the interest of results, will also produce spiritual dwarfs in the classroom. If our objective is to promote faith/life, then we would have to say the relative importance of the two goals is equal.

Though the two goals are equal in importance, they certainly are not attained with equal ease or effort. Lawrence Richards, author of "A Theology of Christian Education," says, "It is not difficult to design an educational system to produce a product of content knowledge. But knowledge of content, even of biblical content, is *not* the goal on which Christian education is to focus." He adds, "It is not difficult to design an educational system to produce behavioral conformity. B. F. Skinner's followers have shown *how* operant conditioning and selective reinforcement can be used to modify behavior. But behavior, even moral behavior, is not the goal on which Christian education is to focus," p. 22.

One might add that it is relatively easy to conduct a catechism class in which you program the minds of catechumens with catechism facts so that they can respond satisfactorily to questions in the presence of the elders at the examination service. It is not so easy to equip them with the attitudes and skills they need to function as active, useful members of the body of Christ.

In other words, to teach for affective outcomes is equally as important as teaching for cognitive outcomes, but it is not equally as easy.

There are a number of reasons why the one is more difficult than the other. Secular educators usually cite three reasons. We will offer the three plus another. Secular educators point to the difficulty of measuring for affective outcomes in contrast to the ease of measuring for cognitive outcomes. That holds for Christian educators too. The NWPB produces Catechism and Bible History quiz packets which enable the teacher to determine what the student actually knows about the content of the lesson or the story. Similar measuring devices for affective outcomes are not available and might be condemned for moralizing if they were.

Secular educators also point to the traditional arrangement of school classrooms as an asset for teaching for cognitive outcomes, but as a liability to teaching for affective ones. Rows of desks facing the teacher's desk in the front of the room filled with respectful, quiet, attentive learners casts the teacher into the role of a dispenser of words of wisdom and the children as empty vessels to be filled, filled with information much of which might turn out to be useful sometime. But for the moment much of it is purely academic. Churches tend to follow the same system and pattern in structuring the agencies of Christian education with similar results.

Richards offers this worthwhile criticism in this connection. "In our culture, classroom treatment of any subject matter tends to clue learners to process that content as academic, and the academic is perceived as 'unreal' in so far as present experiences, feelings, attitudes and values are concerned. This is particularly tragic for Christian education. We communicate a revealed truth that must be perceived as life and integrated into life. If our method of communication is not in harmony with the message communicated, we distort the message itself," p. 191.

Mary Harbeck, in the *Educational Technology* article referred to previously ("Instructional Objectives in the Affective Domain") offers a third reason why teaching for affective outcomes loses by default to the cognitive. She says, "In spite of recent emphasis on the necessity for integrating cognitive with affective processes, the gap between what is known about the nature and development of thinking-feeling processes and how this is translated into instructional practices is still enormously wide." Another researcher in educational psychology puts his finger on a possible reason for this. Writing on "Emotional Barriers to Education" in *Psychology Today*, Richard Farson offers a complaint which may also be appropriate as an evaluation of our traditional approaches to Christian education. He says:

At present noncognitive and nonverbal skills just aren't considered academically respectable. They have not been formulated into a conceptual structure; and they seem imprecise, fuzzy, vague, and even threatening. We feel we must keep the lid on tightly on Pandora's box, for we fear that it contains the irrational, the potentially explosive elements of human nature. When emotionality or interpersonal relationships escape from the box, we flinch and take refuge in the dictum that only the qualified professional is capable of dealing with the layers of humanness below the rational. Old-fashioned psychiatry is largely responsible for the prevailing attitude that teachers should avoid tampering with children's psyches. This nonsense has so frightened teachers that they shun almost any engagement with the student as a person. ... This fear of emotionality is in part, I think, responsible for our widespread fear of intimacy. We dare not reveal ourselves, share our feelings. We have developed an elaborate set of social devices which allows us to put distance between ourselves and others, which lubricates our relationships, and which gives us privacy in a crowded and complex society. Even to use such terms as "intimate" and "loving" disturbs most people. Popular belief and much professional opinion holds that the machinery of any social organization, and certainly of a school, will become clogged if people are concerned with each other instead of tending to business. Nevertheless, we have a deep need for moments of shared feeling, for they give us a sense of community, and remind us of our membership in the human race. (R. quoted on p. 49-50)

That fear of emotionality is certainly understandable in the ordinary mix one meets in a public school. But in our educational circles we deal always with brothers and sisters in Christ who are taught even to confess their faults one to another. That fear therefore ought not be a barrier to us in teaching for affective outcomes. But unfortunately it is.

Last but by no means least is the conviction of some in our fellowship that teaching for affective outcomes constitutes interference with the work of the Holy Spirit. The idea that a Christian teaches for outcomes other than cognitive ones obscures or even nullifies the power inherent in the Word, they contend. One answer to that objection is to point the objector to what we have already said about the nature of the Word which addresses itself not only to the intellect, but to the emotion and the will of the Christian as well. We also need to remind them of the validity of the point our Lutheran dogmaticians have made, to wit that "The mode of operation of the Word is both psychological and supernatural," (Meyer's notes, II, Soteriology, p. 32. cf. also Huelsemann, quoted in Hoenecke, IV, 10). We cannot add anything to the effectiveness of God's Word, but we can place hindrances in the way of its effectiveness with methodology inappropriate to the task of making disciples.

Richards makes a similar point. He opposes those who "insist that because in our present educational programs we do 'teach the Bible,' the programs themselves are beyond criticism." He notes that this is a common reaction and then adds, "Somehow because what we are attempting to do (teach the Bible) has validity, we tend to feel that our programs and methods are valid. And we tend to view criticism of methodology as an attack on 'Bible teaching.' No matter how obviously different the two considerations (*what* is being communicated and *how* it is being communicated), there is an emotional reaction that clouds the distinction, and permits us to resist recognition of the weaknesses in what we have been doing." I don't think we can afford to do that, not at the expense of depriving God's people of the kind of teaching Jesus has commissioned us to provide for them.

In considering the relative importance of the two goals, a brief word is also in order regarding the consequences of an imbalance in our teaching. This is a subject I have dealt with at some length in a Teachers' Conference paper with which a number of you are familiar. So a summary of the point should suffice.

If we strike a proper balance between an appeal to the intellect and an appeal to the emotion, then we will also be teaching for both cognitive and affective outcomes. There may be room for improvement in both

method and content, but at least we are on the right track. If we fail to strike that necessary balance, we are in danger of either one of two unacceptable consequences.

If my preaching and teaching overemphasizes an appeal to the intellect in an effort to produce cognitive outcomes, the result will be orthodoxism, cold, lifeless and even dead orthodoxism. That approach to preaching and teaching produces people who know the right answers, but who for the most part remain unmoved by what they know. Richards says, "When Christians use such mechanisms it is not at all unusual for them to attend church, hold conservative beliefs, and fail completely to develop attitudes, values, and behaviors which are in harmony with the gospel," p. 63.

If on the other hand my preaching and teaching overemphasize an appeal to emotion in an effort to produce affective outcomes, the end result will be enthusiasm - a view of faith based on what people feel rather than on what they know. That approach produces pietists who get turned on to Jesus without any real understanding of the objective basis of faith. Because they are more concerned about the Christ *in* them than about the Christ *for* them, they are in constant need of something to keep them emotionally high. The charismatic movement offers a good case in point. Both overemphases result in a sad caricature of the Christian's faith/life.

Effecting/Maintaining a Proper Balance in our Own System

The time has come for a bit of subjective evaluation of our own system and its agencies. The way in which I have worded the concluding part of this paper implies a judgment on my part to the effect that we have not achieved that keen, delicate balance between an appeal to the intellect and to the emotion. My conviction is that we overstress cognitive outcomes at the expense of affective ones. I think the symptoms of it are both numerous and obvious and can be offered in the discussion of this paper if necessary. Permit me now to suggest a reason for our particular approach which stresses cognitive outcomes. In my teachers' conference paper I propose a number of historical questions. I intend to limit myself in this paper to one pedagogical reason, adapted from Richards, chapter 6, p. 60ff.

According to Richards, "We have not maintained a balanced, whole-person focus in our educational ministries. We have not designed our educational ministry to link in a holistic way all that Christian faith means to the learner." That calls for an explanation.

When we think of personality, we surely include more in the term than just a person's beliefs. Attitudes, emotions, the way a person understands and relates to other people, his behavior, his values, his conception of himself, all are part of his personality. The point of significance for us is the fact that in our culture we have picked out one element and have attached special priority to it, namely belief. Our educational emphases seem to derive from the notion that if we change belief, we change the entire personality. We also appear to operate with the notion that all that is required to change belief is new information. That idea is, of course, at the heart of Plato's ethics. "If a man knows the good, he will unfailingly choose the good."

Recent research by behavioral scientists in the area of learning theory discredits the age-old theory which connects doing with knowing and attitude with belief. Current theory holds that use of a concept is more significant in the development of an attitude than a *formally learned* idea. In other words, "when an idea about an object has been informally learned through situations in which the concept has been applied, that idea has a more direct impact on attitude," p. 61. That's another way of expressing the old idea that truth is caught rather than taught. The new theory also links the various dimensions of personality, beliefs, attitudes, and behavior.

Visualize if you will those three parts of personality as the points of a triangle, beliefs at the top, attitudes and behaviors at the other two points. Normally the three are in a balanced relationship with each other. Learning theory says that when a change occurs in the equilibrium of the system, learning takes place. Therefore cause a change to occur and growth or learning is produced.

Richards says that "our educational or change strategy relies on intervention at one point in the system, - in the cognitive." He continues, "But the assumption that attack on a single system element will produce desired

changes is *not* reasonable nor certain. There are too many intervening variables. There are too many ways to isolate or modify the impact of isolated changes.

“For instance, let’s suppose we are trying to touch the whole person through his beliefs. It would seem, because the systems are linked, that we would change the whole person by changing his beliefs. But this is not necessarily so. There are a number of ways the person can handle new information to isolate it from the system.” We all know Christians whose Sunday confession apparently does not affect Monday’s conduct, or Christians who resist change because they tell themselves their faith isn’t strong enough yet to try the challenge of something new, be it increased giving, witnessing or whatever.

According to Richards, “Intervention at a single point is more likely to lead to isolation of taught beliefs (head knowledge) from the operating beliefs (heart knowledge) which actually function with other system elements in daily life.” (parentheses mine).

The solution is to change one’s change strategy from intervention at one point in the system to intervention at all points in the system at the same time. To the extent that we fail to do so, to that extent we will continue to content ourselves with teaching primarily for cognitive outcomes, and reap the consequences.

But how does one intervene at all points in the system at the same time? It takes Richards 300 pages to answer that question. I can only urge you to read what he has to say. Meanwhile here is a summary answer.

The twin concepts of “being with” (recall what we said about Jesus and His disciples) and “modeling” are of vital significance to Christian education. We must be ready to abandon our dependence on precedents established in a secular educational system which is not concerned with likeness but with information, and to design a unique educational process rooted in Scripture’s concern for the nurture of life. In that new design the roles of teacher and of learner must be harmonized with need for a model, who through shared learning experiences, can “make disciples.”

Biblical concepts...will be perceived by growing children as those concepts exist in his social environment. If Bible truths are treated by us as beliefs to be accepted intellectually, but without affective or cognitive (decisional) meaning, then the child will tend to perceive and integrate these concepts into his growing personality in the same way. No wonder the Bible insists, “These words which I command you this day shall be upon your heart; and you shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down and when you rise,” (Deut. 6:6,7 RSV) Scripture must be communicated as a lived and a livable reality. Its truths must be communicated by those who have integrated them into their personalities and who, in the shared experiences of life, talk the Word and words of God with their children. The critical location for Bible teaching is not the classroom but rather the household; the walk, the sitting together on the porch, the snuggling into the warmth of bed, the joy of rising to a new day. It is in life itself, where Bible truths are to have meaning for us as whole persons, that their communications must center.

And this kind of learning is rooted, not in “education,” but in the socialization process, (i.e. a child learns God’s truth in much the same way he learns to talk etc.)

This then is the major problem with even “good” classroom Christian education. If that is all we have, we are going to be communicating truths in such a way that their import must be distorted. If that is all we have, we are in our method of teaching going to shout to children that the Bible is an academic book; that the theological and moral truths it communicates are unreal as far as living is concerned. My concern for Christian education is that we will continue in our approach to teaching to isolate what is to be lived truth from life, and thus fail to communicate it in that context of shared experiences in which its whole person meaning can be seen and shared by a model in whom God himself does live.

Does this mean there is no place for a classroom teaching of the Bible to children? Not necessarily. But it does mean that the role we give the classroom must (1) be clearly understood to be a part, not the whole, of what we are doing in children's ministry; (2) to be integrated with the whole so that it supports and is supported by what is happening elsewhere; and (3) be designed so that teacher and learner roles, the ways concepts are communicated, etc., actually do fit in our total approach, and contribute to the socialization process. (pp. 193, 194)

Such a system designed to encourage and facilitate development of communication of faith as life on a socialization model, meets the following requirements:

1. Shift the primary focus for communication of faith as life from church agencies to the home.
2. Equip children's primary natural models, their parents, for effective communication of faith as life.
3. Shift the role of the in-church staff from the traditional 'teacher' role to that of model and friend.
4. Relate faith's belief-content in an organic, meaning-sharing pattern rather than transmit it merely as information to be believed.
5. Free all children and adults for expression of affective as well as cognitive data in all relationships that develop (parent-child; leader-children; children-children). (p. 207)

The necessity of teaching for affective outcomes has been the main thrust of this paper. The how-to is also vitally important, but beyond the scope of this assignment. Hopefully the necessity of teaching for affective outcomes as well as for cognitive ones will compel all of us who teach to reevaluate our methods and with God's help to make whatever changes are indicated for our continuing task of discipling God's people.