MILLENNIAL LEARNERS AND THE MISSIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

AND THE ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL HIGHER EDUCATION

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO

THE DWIGHT SCHAR COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Doctor of Education in Leadership Studies

Wayne Joseph Pessia, B.S., M.M.

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY

ASHLAND, OHIO

2014

Millennial Learners and the Missions of the Members of the Council of Christian

Colleges and Universities and

the Association of Biblical Higher Education

By

Wayne Joseph Pessia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Doctor of Education in Leadership Studies

_____
Dr. Ann Converse Shelly, Committee Chair   Date

_____
Dr. Carla Edlefson, Committee Member   Date

_____
Dr. Dan Lawson, Committee Member   Date

_____
Dr. Judy A. Alston, Chair, Department of Leadership Studies Date

_____
Dr. James VanKeuren, Dean, College of Education   Date

_____
Dr. John E. Moser, Interim Director of the Graduate School   Date

Ashland University
March 2014

MILLENNIAL LEARNERS AND THE MISSIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

AND THE ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Wayne Joseph Pessia

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY, 2014

Dr. Ann Converse Shelly, Dissertation Chair

A growing amount of research and literature supports a relationship between student success at the college level and the implementation of student-centered learning. Millennial students report higher levels of persistence and satisfaction in institutions that understand and try to adapt to their unique learning style, which is unlike the learning styles of their Boomer and Generation X faculty and administration (Debard, 2004; Noel & Levitz, 2009; Oblinger, 2003). What are institutional members of organizations such as the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) and the Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE) doing to understand and adapt to the change in generational trends and attitudes toward learning? Recent literature consistently indicates Millennial students have certain expectations about learning. Organizations must address these expectations so Christian higher education institutional effectiveness does not experience negative consequences in our changing global society.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my loving and supportive family: my wife, Anne and my children, Katelyn, Jacob, and Zachary. They are the greatest family one could ever have. Raising a family and earning a terminal degree is challenging, to say the least. I will always remember their faithful support and personal sacrifices.

I also dedicate this work to my parents, Lawrence and June, who supported me and encouraged me to become everything God wanted. I dedicate this to my grandparents, Joseph and Amelia—Italian immigrants. Joseph served the U.S. in World War I, left their family in Italy and stepped into the New World. I dedicate this to my dear grandparents, Bessie and George Koehler. They adopted my mother and aunt during the Depression after the girls' mother passed away giving birth to them. I also dedicate this work to future generations who will help to make a better world.

For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, says the LORD,

thoughts of peace and not of evil, to give you a future and a hope.

Jeremiah 29:11 (NKJV)

Acknowledgments

I express my sincere appreciation to my dissertation chair, Dr. Ann Shelly, for her gracious spirit and guidance throughout this process. I thank Dr. James Olive for guiding me through the research process. I also thank my dissertation committee members, Dr. Carla Edlefson and Dr. Dan Lawson, for their patient support and keen input during the development and revision process. Through their efforts, I developed as a writer, scholar, and person, for which I am grateful. I also thank compassionate, missional, Christian people who invest in the lives of others. Their example inspires me daily to walk and serve as they have.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

V.

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In the United States, the Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions identifies many colleges and universities as Special Focus Institutions (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010). Within this classification type, Carnegie identifies some universities as Special Faith Institution such as theological seminaries, Bible colleges and other faith-related related institutions (Carnegie, 2010). In the 1960's and early 1970's, some Christian higher learning institutions began to separate from other traditional faith-related institutions. One group felt concern that the other group moved away from their Christian heritage (Association of Biblical Higher Education History and Mission, 2014; Council of Christian Colleges and Universities History and Mission, 2014). According to Kerr (2001), this era in American higher education exhibited widespread protests and reform movements among many institutions (pp. xiii, 96).

In 1976, interest grew among many of these "intentionally Christian" institutions to improve and achieve academic excellence in Christian higher education. Leaders came together to eventually form the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) and the Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE). Although these organizations have faced many societal challenges during their existence, the Millennial student learning style challenge and the digital learning revolution may be among the most significant challenges impacting institutions of higher education today (Debard, 2004; Noel & Levitz, 2009; Oblinger, 2003). These challenges are the focus of this study.

Background of the Study

The CCCU defines itself as "an international association of intentionally Christian colleges and universities" (CCCU, 2014, p.1). When some institutions describe themselves as "intentionally Christian," they may be distinguishing themselves from other traditional or historic Christian institutions of higher education. Some of these institutions have possibly drifted from their biblical roots and may not be Christian in their current educational philosophy and practice (CCCU, 2014). Gordon Werkema, former president of Trinity Christian College, was CCCU's first founder and president. He, with 38 Christian U.S. higher education leaders, came together and formed the CCCU. Since its foundation in 1976, the council has grown to 118 members in North America and 53 affiliate members in 19 other countries (CCCU, 2014).

The ABHE formed in 1947 from a growing Bible college movement. The association has grown to represent approximately 200 colleges and universities that uphold biblically centered curriculum encompassing many academic programs and disciplines (ABHE, 2014). The ABHE is also an accreditation association for these institutions.

Many U.S. religious schools have mission statements representing their spiritual foundations. CCCU and ABHE members are purposefully Christian, although some faith-related institutions within the Carnegie Special Focus Institutions are not purposefully Christian. CCCU's mission is "to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and to help our institutions transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to *Biblical truth*" (CCCU, 2014, p. 2). ABHE's mission is "to enhance the quality and

credibility of higher educational institutions that engage students in biblical, transformational, experiential, and missional higher education" (ABHE, 2014, p.1).

In this digital information age, institutions like the CCCU and ABHE face serious challenges. Both Christian and non-Christian students may decide to attend an institution based on whether the school meets the needs of their unique learning style. These needs include allowing more interdependent ways of seeking knowledge and beliefs such as social constructivism. Knowledge and belief construction is relative to the student through socially connected ways of knowing (Galanes & Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009). This particular learning occurs when students arrive at their knowledge and beliefs through interactive social learning, including, for the purpose of this study, the growing use of digital and social media technology. Today's students are more familiar with and drawn to this learning style, rather than hearing a lecture from a single authority about what to know and believe (Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999).

Problem Statement

The Millennial (born 1982-2000) student began attending college in 2000. Since that year, frustration and friction has grown between these students and their predominantly Boomer (born 1943-1960) and Generation X (born 1961-1981) faculty and administration (Debard, 2004). This tension also arises as Millennials have entered the workplace, forcing business and commerce management to adapt to Millennials' unique attitudes, values, and behaviors (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Experts predict this generation could be one of the most populous and influential ever, requiring that

organizational leaders acknowledge and adapt to the coming vast societal and technological changes (Combs, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2000).

Millennials have different values and learning styles from previous generations. Millennials possess a mindset that expects quick, easy access to any information at any time. They desire technologically enabled activity and position themselves to construct social learning. They require interesting media and expect media to motivate them to learn. Millennials expect institutions to engage them socially and intellectually (Brown & Adler, 2008; Oblinger, 2005; Prensky, 2001, 2005; Roberts, 2005; Tapscott, 1998). Today's students socially construct their own truth and knowledge rather than seeking an expert authority who imparts truth and understanding (Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999). For example, a Millennial might not consult a Bible scholar about how life began, but instead might ask their friends on *Facebook*.

Learning Style

For the purpose of this study, a learning style is the general epistemology preferred by a specific generation of learners used to arrive at what they know and believe (Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M., 1997; Brown, 2005; Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Debard, 2004; Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999; Roberts, 2005).

A central part of learning style is social constructivism (Galanes & Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009). For the purpose of this study, social constructivism is defined as the way people construct knowledge and understanding about their world through social

interaction and language. People develop meaning in connecting with and communicating with others rather than from within oneself or an individual (Galanes & Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009). With the explosion of the digital media world, expanding technology has broadened this learning concept even further (Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Roberts, 2005).

Learning styles and epistemology have changed with the Millennial generation, and this change challenges CCCU and ABHE members. Christian higher education is historically instructor or instruction-centered, so institutions must face the challenge of adapting to Millennials' learning style. This style is student-centered, where instruction is adapted to the student's learning styles (Astin, 1993; Barr & Tagg, 1995). Millennials like inter-active learning, technological capabilities for explorative learning, access to collaboration, and to work within teams. Millennials desire professors who creatively facilitate and engage them in this creative type of learning (Oblinger, 2003; Prensky, 2001, 2005; Roberts, 2005; Skiba & Barton, 2006).

Some higher education institutions have begun to grapple with and aggressively adapt to the current generational learning style. CCCU and ABHE institutions feel this challenge to adapt to their core of existence. Faith-based institutions generally have a mission to train Christian leaders in making a difference in their world. Spiritual formation developing Christian disciplines necessary to live as a person of faith is a critical objective of these institutions. Millennial students, while interested in spiritual matters, challenge Christian colleges concerning the issue of relevance when appealing and adapting to their learning needs (Astin, 2010; Erikson, 2005).

Some Christian university faculties have sought innovative student-centered teaching approaches focused on improving motivation and persistence in spiritual formation (Porter, 2008). Little research exists, however, that reveals intentionally Christian universities should adapt to this new socially constructed learning style in spiritual formation. This reluctance to adapt is possibly because of the intergenerational differences between instructor and instruction-centered learning and the Millennial student learning style. *Sacred* and *secular* issues could also hinder the adaptation of new learning styles. In the struggle to uphold biblical and absolute truth in a pluralistic society, leaders may resist the adaptation of any learning style that questions absolute truth claims, such as *Biblical truth* (Holmes, 1977).

Nevertheless, intentionally Christian institutions must address this issue. If not, Millennial students may seek colleges more relevant to their learning style. Prospective students considering CCCU and ABHE institutions may not find growing in Christian faith and spiritual formation as appealing as in past generations (Astin, 2010; Erikson, 2005). Many public research universities may be more attractive to Millennial students because these institutions are generally less expensive, more technologically advanced, and more student-centered in guiding students to an independent construction of knowledge and personal values. Many public and private universities, founded with a Christian missional purpose, may now market themselves as good, but not religious. These universities seek to be more relevant to today's learning style, as well as, committed to shaping leaders and professionals of excellence. CCCU and ABHE institutions also face the challenging dominance of distance learning, as students prefer

self-teaching through the convenience of distance, time, and easy access to online information (Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005).

The purpose of this study was to understand what impact the Millennial generation has had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian missional institutions?

Significance of This Research

The digital explosion has significantly impacted the Millennial students' (and future students') learning style. Higher education is struggling to understand these and other phenomena facing their institutions.

Recent articles and research on higher education issues have shed light on growing concerns such as chief financial officers doubts about financial sustainability and rising tuition rates with revenue not expected to increase. Other growing concerns are increasing student retention and satisfaction to protect decreasing revenue and the rapid growth of alternative digital content and teaching practices to the traditional classroom. Additional doubts are the result of the explosive use of student devices, straining campus networks, the pressure on private liberal arts colleges to adapt to non-face-to-face delivery practices and socially constructive learning styles, and the skepticism of faculty, administration, and stakeholders to adapt to digital learning styles. Last, a number of progressive university presidents and administrators have been fired, which is a cause for concern (Fain, 2013; Kiley, 2013; Kolowich, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c; Lederman, 2013; Lederman & Jaschik, 2013; Straumsheim, 2013).

This study's importance is fourfold. First, little data exists that reveals whether CCCU, ABHE, and similar institutions understand that their lack of Millennial learning style relevancy jeopardizes their mission. If institutions resist contemporary adaptation of their delivery of content and teaching practices, Millennials may view these institutions as a poor fit for their learning expectations. Second, research is necessary to guide CCCU and ABHE institutions down the controversial generational relevancy path without compromising historical and biblical mission. Third, CCCU and ABHE institutions must maintain their mission and heritage even while the average American family chooses to avoid formidable debt over the value of spiritual formation. This issue may be the most important for intentionally Christian universities. Current generations may no longer find the church or Christian institutions relevant to their personal preferences and learning style. Thus, they make a poor financial decision for students (Ashley, 2004). Fourth, Christian higher educational institutions should research how intentionally Christian institutions currently address this challenge. Then similar institutions can explore the issue of adaptation without compromising their mission from more experienced institutions. Compromise of missional purpose could mean loss of all stakeholder support. Thus, colleges may suffer decreased funding, enrollment, and retention.

Special Faith Institutions like CCCU and ABHE members are a significant part of higher education. They provide a quality learning environment and integrate faith with excellent academics, while preparing students to be strong future servant leaders (Carnegie, 2010). However, Special Faith Institutions like CCCU and ABHE members are at the crossroads of controversy, whether they understand the issue or not (Carnegie,

2010). Today the pressure is greater to understand students, attract them to their type of institution, impact their lives through mission and spiritual formation, and develop Christ-like servant leaders. However, their institutional effectiveness and existence may be at risk. Stories of financial struggles, closures, and mergers are becoming more common among historically Christian colleges (Scruggs, 2013).

This study attempts to intentionally Christian institutions, including CCCU and ABHE members, as they work to maintain their missional effectiveness while simultaneously understanding and adapting to the changing student learning mindset.

Overview of Methodology

This exploratory descriptive study used mixed method research, employing an electronic survey instrument to collect quantitative and qualitative information. The research method was a 22 item on-line survey. I designed the survey to produce data helpful in informing Christian missional higher education institutions about the Millennial generation's influence on delivery of content and teaching practices. I electronically distributed the survey to provosts or chief academic officers of 315 CCCU and ABHE institutions. The survey results found several category-based themes among participants which are presented in chapter IV.

Definitions

GI Generation = born between 1901 and 1924 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Silent Generation = born between 1925 and 1942 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Boomer Generation = born between 1943 and 1960 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Generation X = born between 1961 and 1981 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Millennials or Generation Y = born between 1982 and 2000 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Net Generation = same as Millennials (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Absolutes = the quality of being sound, principled, true, complete, and unalterable.

Budgetary commitment = when institutions prioritize a budgetary objective and make a long-term commitment to complete the objective. An example is investing in technology and research for institutional advancement and student success.

Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions = classification system developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to improve policy and research teaching and learning (Carnegie, 2010).

Collaboration = an innate desire to be in community where people freely contribute and value a common pursuit. Equality, respect, tolerance, unity, and teamwork are key community values.

Connected knower = a socially collaborative individual seeking to nurture connection and harmony through agreeing with others' opinions. He or she accepts these without concern for his or her opinions in order to keep peace. He or she views people who believe they are right as self-centered. He or she is trying to grow in the ability to accept others' viewpoints in constructing understanding because it is important to them (Belenky, et al, 1997; Perry, 1999).

Curriculum innovation = creative willingness and skill that adapts to the learner's

learning styles when current curriculum is irrelevant and/or ineffective.

Digital media = electronic means such as wireless computers, ebooks, iPhones,

iPods, internet, online programs, social media venues, multimedia

presentations and multimedia interactive presentations and simulations.

Digital Learner = an individual who learns by perception as the normal use of

digital media, the easy access and connectivity to information through

electronic delivery systems and devices, and the connected knowing of

faculty to student and student-to-student (Prensky, 2001).

Distance learning = capacity to learn and have access to learning through digital

media-technology with no limit to time and space. For example, a U.S.

student could speak to another student in South Korea through an online

chat program outside the classroom.

Education philosophy = guiding principles of pedagogy to which an institution

adheres that determine curriculum's structure and content, teaching

methods, learning environments, technology, and budgetary priorities.

Epistemology = a branch of philosophy that investigates the origin, nature,

methods, and limits of human knowledge.

Explorative learning = Millennials' desire to seek discovery and knowledge

independently through digital means and collaboratively through social

media and peer groups.

Instruction-centered or instructor-centered learning bias = educators, as the

authority, hold their own Cartesian pedagogical view as the correct

method of transferring knowledge and beliefs to the student rather than

adapted to the student's particular learning style.

Inter-connectivity = creating strong interactive learning activity between students,

student to teacher, or student to digital peer connections outside the

classroom.

Intergenerational learning styles = the different preferred learning style each

generation embraces, has affinity for, and thinks necessary for learning.

Learning or teaching paradigm = a college's communication method and

environment based on its perception of how students best develop

knowledge.

Learning style = (for the purpose of this dissertation) general epistemology

preferred by a specific generation of learners used to determine what they

know and believe (Belenky, et al, 1997; Brown, 2005; Chickering &

Gamson, 1991; Debard, 2004; Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger &

Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999; Roberts, 2005).

Legitimate = conforming to the accepted rules and principles, required or

perceived.

Missional = an institution that acts in accordance with its organizational

heritage, institutional vision and mission statement.

Missional Appeal = an organization's attraction to prospects by what it represents,

culture, behavior, and sense of purpose.

Monitoring mechanisms = methods that monitor educational bias such as end of

course surveys, teaching assessments, and peer review.

Post Modern Millennial Learner = the Millennial generation's learning style that

prefers to deconstruct and construct knowledge digitally and socially,

independent of social restraints, science, and absolutes.

Progressive = inclination to advocate change and improvement.

Relevant = concerned with the thought and culture of people today and making

connection to their priorities as opposed to a "this is the way it has always

been" mentality.

Secularized = drawn away from a religious orientation to a public, non-religious

orientation.

Separate knower = an individual who knows what he or she knows by preferring

value judgments of right or wrong, looking for every opportunity to prove

what is right and convince people where they are wrong and how he or she

can change them. He or she believes this is the best way for people to

relate, understand, and make meaning together. He or she believes it is

best for people to accept the logic and reason of those who have mastered

a subject or have authority or control over another (Perry, 1999).

Servant leader = one who leads by nurturing and serving others without thought

of their own needs (Greenleaf, 2002).

Social constructivism = (for the purpose of this study) how people construct

knowledge and understanding about their world through social interaction

and language. People develop meaning by connecting and communicating

with others (Galanes & Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009).

Special Faith Institutions = Carnegie Classification of Higher Education

Institution's Classification for Theological seminaries, Bible colleges,

universities, and other faith-related related higher education institutions

(Carnegie, 2010).

Spiritual formation = integrating biblical faith, character, and values

into curriculum, learning environments, methods, and campus life in order

that students develop a strong inner Christian life and discipline, resulting

in good citizenship and leadership.

Student-centered learning = the student's learning style is the criteria

for curriculum development, content and teaching practices, and learning

environment as opposed to an institution-centered (prestige, research,

mission), instruction or instructor-centered style. Students receive the

opportunity to construct knowledge through social collaboration, self-

managed research and discovery, and faculty input and guidance (Astin,

1993; Barr & Tagg, 1995).

Teaching environments and methods = classroom, virtual classroom, online

delivery system technology, learning platform, software, access to

information, audio-visual technology, digital technology, teamwork, role

playing, case studies, oral presentations, lectures, and any other teaching

situation or approach considered relevant or irrelevant to today's learner.

Problem Rationale: Why Study The Impact of Millennial Learning?

The primary research questions that drove this study were these: What impact has the Millennial generation had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian missional institutions? In addition, what are CCCU and ABHE institutions doing to understand the change in generational attitudes and motivational behavior of Millennial learning? What kind of mechanisms or teaching tools do CCCU and ABHE institutions have in place to balance student styles in learning with the learning biases of current faculty and administration? How are CCCU and ABHE institutions adapting to meet the Millennial learning styles and the strategic use of a student-centered learning paradigm and digital media to improve the effectiveness of their mission? Do stakeholders view these adaptations as compromise to their constituents and a threat to their institutional mission of spiritual formation? If CCCU and ABHE institutions develop a strategic plan that includes distance-learning programs, what would be the impact on their missional environments and objectives?

Christian students and sometimes parents select schools based primarily on students' needs, tuition cost, academic quality, and facility excellence rather than considering the benefits of a private Christian university where faith is integrated into academics (Noel & Levitz, 2009).

Additionally, an educational philosophy exists among some former Christian institutions marketing themselves as institutions with a Christian background to Christian students and families that leaves one's thinking to be determined by the individual (Perry, 1999). Some Christian students prefer these schools to break out, so to speak, of the

confinement of a Christian home and go to a university where they independently discover, investigate, and form their own knowledge (Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999).

In today's pluralistic society, people may view those who believe in absolutes and claims of truth as intolerant and irrelevant. For example, someone could be criticized as intolerant for having a deontological view of right or wrong concerning someone else's teleological moral choice. CCCU and ABHE institutions must recognize current generations' thinking and learning styles, or they may find they are irrelevant to those whom they were entrusted to mold into Christ-like servant leaders. This concern is built on the growing research and literature supporting a relationship between student interest, success, and the implementation of student-centered learning. Millennial students report higher levels of persistence and satisfaction with institutions that understand and attempt to adapt to their unique learning style, a style unlike their Boomer and Generation X faculty and administration (Debard, 2004; Noel & Levitz, 2009; Oblinger, 2003).

Primary Research Question and Guiding Questions

Every research project must have primary guiding questions. This study's primary research question is, "What impact has the Millennial generation had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian missional institutions?" The subsequent questions that guided this study are:

Research Question 1: What are CCCU and ABHE institutions doing to understand the change in generational attitudes and motivational behavior of Millennial learning?

Research Question 2: What kind of mechanisms or teaching tools do CCCU and

ABHE institutions have in place to balance student styles in learning with the

learning biases of current faculty and administration?

Research Question 3: How are CCCU and ABHE institutions adapting to meet

the Millennial learning styles and the strategic use of a student-centered learning

paradigm and digital media to improve the effectiveness of their mission?

Research Question 4: Do stakeholders view these adaptations as compromise to

their constituents and a threat to their institutional mission of spiritual formation?

Research Question 5: If CCCU and ABHE institutions develop a strategic plan

that includes distance-learning programs, what would be the impact on their

missional environments and objectives?

How do CCCU and ABHE institutions understand changing generational trends

and attitudes toward learning? What mechanisms do CCCU and ABHE institutions use to

balance student styles in learning with the learning biases of current faculty and

administration (Oblinger, 2005)? How will CCCU and ABHE institutions adapt their

educational philosophy, curriculum, teaching methodology, facilities, and technology to

new learning styles, improving mission effectiveness without compromising it? Should

CCCU and ABHE institutions develop distance-learning programs at the expense of their

missional environments and objectives (face-to-face instruction) in order to stay in

existence? These challenges are a great concern to CCCU and ABHE members and other

Christian institutions that greatly prioritize spiritual formation. Recent literature

consistently indicates Millennial students have institutional life and learning expectations

that if not addressed, could have major implications on institutional relevancy in our progressive and changing global society.

Summary

Chapter I provided introduction, background, the problem statement, research significance and questions, methodology overview, and definition of terms. Chapter II provides a review of recent literature indicating Millennial students possess certain institutional expectations that have major implications on institutional effectiveness. The review begins with a discussion concerning Millennials' pressure toward institutions to adapt and change, then closes with a discussion of challenges for colleges and universities, particularly those having intentional Christian mission of spiritual formation.

CHAPTER II

Introduction

The literature review section has five primary components. First, the review

identifies the Millennial generation and begins to explain its impact on Christian higher

education. The Millennial generation is comprised of digital learners who learn

differently than previous generations. These differences significantly challenge Christian

higher educational institutions to understand and adapt this new learning style, a style that

could weaken missional spiritual formation. Personal development and spiritual

formation hinge on one's learning tendency.

Second, Christian higher education institutions prioritizing spiritual formation

must also seek understanding of Millennials' needs and expectations if they desire

student success and institutional effectiveness. Administrators, faculty, and staff must

face this change if the institution desires to survive generational challenges that have

come with the digital generation. Colleges and universities must move past generational,

curriculum-centered or teacher-centered bias. They should center their curriculum design,

technology advances, and teaching practices on students' learning styles for maximum

student satisfaction and success.

Third, the review discusses research and literature concerning generational

differences, generational conflict, and Millennial characteristics. The emergence of

student-centered instruction is a central issue here. Present higher education models are

not student-centered and are either slow or resistant to change. Many educators call for

institutions to acknowledge these societal changes and adapt effective educational models

to improve student success and institutional effectiveness. A major focus of this study was how generations learn through their unique learning style. For this purpose of this study, a learning style is the general epistemology preferred by a specific generation of learners used to determine what they know and believe (Belenky, et al, 1997; Brown, 2005; Chickering & Gamson,1991; Debard, 2004; Oblinger, 2003, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999; Roberts, 2005).

Current Millennial research addresses how these students think and learn differently from previous generations. Millennials are "digital learners," strongly desiring engagement, interaction, convenient, immediate information access, and different types of learning spaces. Institutions should consider these needs (Brown, 2005; Debard, 2004; Prensky, 2005).

Fourth, the review discusses whether the adaptation of a Millennial learning style compromises missional intent of spiritual formation. This is a controversial issue for Christian higher education. What are the adaptation fears? What values and principles are at stake? The discussion will weigh these questions as well as further existing implications.

Fifth, the literature review discusses the implications if Christian higher education institutions who do not adapt to Millennials' learning style. Institutional survival is uncertain without adaptation; institutions must improve and be effective without compromising their mission. Of the same importance, will Millennial students feel successful and satisfied concerning institutional enrollment and retention? Institutions

must have leaders to challenge the status quo and become champions in adapting their institutions for the present millennium, pleasing all stakeholders involved.

The Millennial Generation and Christian Higher Education

As Millennial students have begun to attend college in the last ten years, frustration and friction have developed between students and their predominantly Boomer and Generation X faculty and administration (Debard, 2004). The workplace senses this tense climate as Millennials have entered there, and the business world and commerce management have adapted to Millennials' different attitudes, values, and behaviors (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Some have predicted this generation to be one of the most populous; therefore, organizational leaders must adapt to the vast coming changes from possibly the most influential generation ever (Combs, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2000).

Millennials are the product of their Generation X parents, who understood technology, raised their children in a protective, structured environment, and cultivated their children's motivation and self-esteem to succeed at anything they might value. (Debard, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2000). However, Millennials possess very different values and learning styles from previous generations. Millennials have an information mindset and greatly expect quick, easy information access anywhere and anytime. They desire technologically enabled activity and position themselves to construct learning socially. They require interesting media in order to learn and expect institutions to engage them socially and intellectually (Brown & Adler, 2008; Oblinger, 2005; Prensky, 2001, 2005; Roberts, 2005; Tapscott, 1998).

With this generation, a learning change has occurred to challenge institutions of higher education. Historically, institutions were instructor or instruction-centered, but they now face the challenge of adapting to a Millennial learning style. This style is student-centered, focused on the student's learning needs (Astin, 1993; Barr & Tagg, 1995). Most Boomer and Generation X faculty and administrators have been slow to adapt. Millennial studies show their innate learning style requires inter-connectivity and technological capabilities for explorative learning. They need collaborative access, enjoy learning and working within teams, and desire professors who creatively facilitate and engage them in constructive learning (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009; Oblinger, 2003; Prensky, 2001, 2002; Roberts, 2005; Skiba & Barton, 2006).

Public and private higher education institutions have begun to grapple with intergenerational learning style issues. Faith-based institutions, however, grapple with the challenge to adapt at its most basic level. Faith-based institutions generally have a mission to train Christian leaders in making a difference in their world. Spiritual formation or developing Christian disciplines necessary to live as a person of faith is a critical objective of these institutions. Millennial students, while interested in spiritual matters, challenge Christian colleges with relevance when appealing and adapting to their learning needs (Astin, 2010; Erikson, 2005).

Some Christian university faculties have sought innovative and interactive student-centered teaching approaches. These approaches, e.g. role-playing, focus on improving motivation and persistence in spiritual formation (Porter, 2008). However,

little research exists to show that Christian universities must adapt to the new student-centered learning style in spiritual formation. This study will seek to point out that need.

Adaptation has not occurred possibly because of intergenerational differences and bias toward instructor-centered or instruction-centered learning rather than the new Millennial learning style. Christian higher education must address this issue, or Millennial students may find other colleges that are adapted to their learning style and thirst for constructive knowledge, even over priorities of faith and spiritual formation. Christian universities may need to take the necessary steps to improve their institutions in order to effectively continue the mission of spiritual formation and leadership development.

Building an understanding of the challenge of intergenerational learning style differences suggests the following questions: What are intergenerational learning styles? What are major differences in intergenerational learning styles and how do these differences affect Christian higher education? How can intergenerational learning styles support or inhibit student spiritual formation? Are institutions adjusting to the diverse learning styles of those currently attending college? What implications do intergenerational learning styles have for today's Christian higher education leaders and faculty in improving institutional effectiveness in spiritual formation and leader development? When educators seek to know the challenges that face them, they are better prepared to face progressive organizational change.

Challenge to Student Success and Institutional Effectiveness

Christian higher education leaders and faculty need answers to improve student spiritual formation without compromising their tradition and values. Educational leaders are in a precarious position if they fail to recognize intergenerational learning style differences. Disconnection could occur between the educator's spiritual formation teaching methods and the learning styles associated with successful student motivational development. This lack of understanding could create generational frustration and tension in the work place, politics, and education including spiritual formation in Christian higher education. Understanding this disconnect is critical to improving student motivation and academic development at Christian higher education institutions.

Increasing and adapting understanding into academic programs may improve institutional effectiveness in student motivation and development. Ignoring these implications could result in perpetuating a lack of understanding, disconnection between generations, academic irrelevance inhibiting student success, and lack of institutional appeal and effectiveness (Astin, 2010; Erikson, 2005; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Noel & Levitz, 2009; Oblinger, 2003).

This study's purpose is to understand what impact the Millennial generation has had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian missional institutions. In the future, it is hoped that this will help institutions address the obstacles to effectiveness in Christian higher education caused by these differences; to apply this knowledge to reduce intergenerational differences in learning style conflict by adopting a student-centered academic paradigm. This new paradigm could lead to reaching student

enrollment benchmarks and ultimately, more effective Christian higher education. Failure to understand and adapt to more student-centered instruction paradigms may continue to disconnect generations, impeding the effective development of Christian citizens. These are society's future labor force, business, education, and community leaders. Christian higher education institutions could fail to benefit from possible knowledge and current research, stunting their missional effectiveness and displeasing all stakeholders involved.

Student Success

Researchers find that Millennium or Generation Y generation do not commit themselves to traditional institutions like the GI, Silent, Boomer, and Generation X generations did in the past (Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2000). Today's institutional leaders (from previous generations) are realizing that Millennial thinking about long term institutional commitment is different from their own view (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000). This realization may create serious conflict. This literature review indicates a necessity for understanding Millennials' thought process regarding long-term institutional commitment; this understanding may be valuable to today's leaders. Educational leaders should seek solutions to improve Millennial students' commitment to college and personal development. Business leaders may help motivate Millennial employees toward long-term development and productivity. Religious leaders may encourage Millennial constituents towards spiritual formation, personal development, involvement, and service.

Generational Differences

One's generation is a very strong identifier of a person's place and influence in society. Howe and Strauss (2000), in an earlier work, defined generation as, "generational persona recognized and determined by (1) common age location; (2) common beliefs and behavior; and (3) perceived membership in a common generation" (p. 64). The last defining phrase is probably the most significant. A person's generational self-perception is a strong factor, not only in the sense of solidarity with their generation, but also in potential conflict toward a generation different from their own (Howe & Strauss, 2000).

A generation's history and culture is a critical factor that identifies it with unique values and behaviors (Coomes, 2004; Taylor & Keeters, 2010). For example, people laugh when they hear music from their youth, and say, "Now that's real music." Older generations smile when they see an old car and say, "They don't make them like that anymore." Some previous generations thought anything made in Japan was poor quality. Now Americans often buy non-American products without any thought about their source. A father may think his son lacks loyalty when he does not commit to a job indefinitely; the son may not see commitment in the same manner.

Experts agree that everyone observes the world through generational lenses conditioned by their popular culture and historic context. They have innate values and behaviors resulting from that conditioning (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Taylor & Keeters, 2010). Some have said the biography of each generation shows how it was shaped by history and also determines how it will shape history (Coomes & Debard, 2004). Millennials are powerful in our society, and they are poised to alter and assume our

country's future. However, to be successful, generations must work in collaboration rather than conflict (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

Generational Conflict

Higher education's Millennial concern has been the business world's concern for some years now. Tapscott (1998) was among the first to raise awareness for Boomer leaders and managers concerning generational collision dangers when he stated, "unless Boomers have a change of heart about youth, their culture, and their media, the two largest generations in history may be on a collision course – a battle of the generational titans" (p. 12). Others who observe and study various generations of today's business world strongly encourage intergenerational collaboration in order to address this challenge. Lancaster and Stillman (2002) called these intergenerational differences *clash points*. They attribute a great proportion of this conflict to technology advances that create a divided media, slanting peoples' generational views and creating resentment from stereotypes. Lancaster and Stillman (2002) challenged all generations with this statement: "Failing to sit down together and learn from one another carries a heavy cost" (p. 334). Studies show intergenerational differences are a leading employee turnover cause, resulting in weak motivation and business retention (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Zemke, et al, 2000). Mutual generational understanding could greatly improve our society. Higher education leaders should bring all represented campus generations together to promote mutual understanding, and thereby improve enrollment, student satisfaction, and success.

Millennial Characteristics

Many authors have described the Millennial Generation. In order to improve higher education, researchers should examine and try to understand their primary generational characteristics. Howe and Strauss (2000) and Debard (2004) offer a complete study of these characteristics. These authors described Millennial characteristics as: confident, conventional, special, sheltered, pressured, team-oriented, and achieving (Debard, 2004, p. 34-38).

Millennials are strongly optimistic, differing from their Generation X parents' skepticism. They have a future hope that they can attempt whatever they choose and do not know the phrase, "It can't be done." They desire structure and conventional organizations as long as the rules are clear and consistent. Their own goals motivate them. These goals are not necessarily self-centered, but more community and service-oriented as they strive to live a meaningful life (Sax, 2004; Taylor & Keeters, 2010). Millennials typically feel very special because they had parents who encouraged them to be anything they wanted and empowered them to reach any goal. Their parents gave them everything necessary and even protected them when seemingly treated unfairly by a coach or teacher (Debard, 2004). This performance pressure to be the best has been sometimes negative when Millennials fail or experience a setback. Some have felt their success was more their parents' attempt for significance than the Millennial's own achievement (Debard, 2004). Millennials, unlike other generations, esteem cooperation, collective goals, living in community, and especially working and succeeding as a team (Debard, 2004; Taylor & Keeters, 2010). In the end, Millennials love to achieve. They

desire to be responsible, to outperform their personal best, and to make a meaningful contribution to their workplace and society (Debard, 2004).

Educators face different challenges with this latest generation. The Millennial generation may be the most influential of all time, compared to the other existing Silent, Boomer, and Generation X generations (Howe & Strauss, 2000). In addition to the challenge of potential generational conflict, higher education experts have also detected a different learning style from previous generation cohorts in the Generation X and Millennial Generation (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005).

Emergence of Student-Centered Instruction

A decade before Millennials began college, researchers began to question traditional higher education teaching philosophy and methods. Some researchers discovered a link between student satisfaction and success, and they developed new student-focused learning paradigms. A new educational era began unfolding in the mid 1980's. Educators' eyes focused on Generation X and a groundbreaking article called *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,* proposed by Chickering and Gamson (1987). Their study began a chain reaction by many institutions and individuals who sought a universal transformation of our national higher education system.

Various faculty development programs have adapted *Seven Principles* into different academic disciplines. The principles are:

1. encourage faculty-to-student contact in and out of the classroom;

2. encourage cooperation among students;

3. encourage active learning;

4. give prompt feedback;

5. emphasize time on task;

6. communicate high expectations;

7. respect diverse talents and ways of learning. (p. 1)

This research studied effective faculty practices in higher education. The study also helped shift academic paradigms from teacher and curriculum-centered instruction to instruction centered on the student's learning needs.

Astin (1993) continued to shape a new academic paradigm with research on student satisfaction. He discovered a widening gap between students' satisfaction with research-oriented institutions and student-oriented institutions (p. 411). He also exposed alarming data statements from students with research-oriented faculty: "they made them feel like second class status not meriting their personal attention" (p. 419). Barr and Tagg (1995) argued the necessity for a new higher education teaching paradigm. Traditional higher education has long held the teaching paradigm as the guiding educational criteria. Barr and Tagg (1995) argued for a new learner paradigm in which quality education centers on effective student learning style and environment, not on faculty and curriculum quality. Barr and Tagg were on the education reform frontier as online distance learning and virtual learning rapidly increased in popularity among Gen Xers and Millennials. They described a learning paradigm as, "Where a college's purpose is not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students

to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems" (1995, p. 16).

Some researchers believed American higher education stood at a critical crossroad in the first millennial decade (Skiba & Barton, 2006; DeBard, 2004). Wilson (2004) related Chickering and Gamson's (1987) *Seven Principles* to Millennial students' learning style, building a case for a new teaching paradigm. Skiba and Barton (2006) advocate teaching methods change by outlining numerous learning styles of the "Net Generation." They stated, "Net Generation characteristics include digital literacy, experiential and engaging learning, interactivity and collaboration, and immediacy and connectivity" (p. 15). Prensky (2001) strongly advocated that non-Millennial educators change their teaching paradigm: "today's students are no longer the people our educational system was designed to teach" (p. 1). Based on these arguments, Christian higher education must evaluate and adapt its academic paradigm to be relevant to Millennial learning style. The following research encourages educators to consider important Millennial learning characteristics and urges them to adapt a more student-centered teaching paradigm.

Millennials: How They Think and Learn

One may challenge the importance of this discussion, and ask why Christian institutions must change historic, traditional methods. In actuality, thought processes are changing worldwide (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Taylor & Keeters, 2010). Tapscott (1998) bears alarming witness to this truth concerning the digital age: "Many educational institutions have become mired in the past. If universities don't reinvent themselves in

terms of their delivery systems … they will be doomed" (p. 153). Educational institutions are at risk if they do not seek understanding of today's learner thought process. Oblinger and Oblinger (2005) asked the following questions: How do people learn today? How are today's learners different from their faculty and administrators? What are faculty and administration learning biases that act as barriers to modern adaptation? How can faculty engage today's learners? How can colleges use information technology (IT) to engage learners (pp. 2, 15, 16)? Oblinger (2003) asked whether institutions have mechanisms to balance student styles with faculty and administration opinions (p. 44). To answer these questions, we must consider Millennial students' mindset, expectations and need for engagement, interaction, convenient immediate access, and learning spaces.

Information Mindset

The 20th century is the information age, with the invention of the telephone, radio, television, computer, and satellite. Frand (2000) spoke of today's learning, however, as the *information mindset* (p. 16). Millennial students prefer the information-gathering Internet, cell phones, and PDA's, over television and books. They also prefer typing and texting rather than writing. These issues create concerns for higher education. Learning occurs, not only in technology, but also in balancing information technology, students' learning style, and faculty teaching style (Frand, 2000, p. 24).

We must combine the new way with the old to improve education. Although previous generations constructed knowledge, today's information mindset is much different because we condition today's children to have an innate desire to construct knowledge and not just receive and memorize it (Brown & Adler, 2008). Millennials are

used to participating in multiple, interactive, and non-sequential activities all at once. Learning socially together is the student's deepest need (Brown & Adler, 2008). Today's educator must understand these learners perceive teachers as facilitators, rather than transmitters. Learning is now a social activity where learners construct their own knowledge with the teacher's help (Brown & Adler, 2008; Tapscott, 1998).

Millennial Student Expectations

When Boomers and Generation Xers marvel at a new technological creation, Millennials accept them as normal. They use and master technology as if they were programmed from birth to do so. Boomers simply watch television, Millennials simultaneously watch television, surf the web, and talk on the phone! Roberts (2005) is a Net Generation member and understands his generation's expectations and learning styles. Much of what Generation X considers technology, Millennials accept as common; Millennials want technology and software customization that meets their needs and gives access whenever they want it.

Roberts (2005) referred to a poll indicating that the Net Generation prefers 50% lecture and 50% interactive learning. The poll also indicated that Millennials rank teacher expertise very near the same priority as the ability to use technology (such as Power Point) (p. 3, 4). Free web access to PDF's or downloading faculty lectures are examples of today's open access to information. Levitz, Noel and Richter (1998), experts in enrollment, stated: "expectations are critical: they serve as the point from which students make qualitative judgments about an institution" (p. 48). Net Generation expects this technological application. If not present, prospective students may judge an institution to

be of low quality and not relevant. This could create critical concerns for Christian

colleges and universities.

Creating Engagement

Prensky (2001) called Millennial students *digital natives* (p. 1), meaning they

have grown up in a technological world of interactive video games that challenged them

to learn new competitive skills and advance to new levels. Prensky (2001) established the

argument that educators should adapt to the digital Millennial learning style. Every

subject needs new learning methodologies that educators must develop. Video games and

simulations more effectively teach concepts and skills in the natives' learning style.

Perhaps digital or electronic literacy is as important as reading literacy. If educators do

not develop digital literacy teaching methods, Millennial students may not effectively

learn and develop. Prensky (2005) made a compelling argument for digital technology

use to engage Millennial students:

> It's not the technology, but what is required for them to master and develop to
>
> win…. They do not have attention span problems if they are engaged in this way
>
> like their video games challenge them. The brains of this new generation may not
>
> be different from ours, but their trained thinking and learning patterns are. If we
>
> do not change our methods and adapt to teaching content by challenging them and
>
> engaging them, we'll lose them. (p. 63)

With this in mind, Millennial students may prefer universities that understand

their learning styles and engage them on their terms. Engagement is a primary concern

regarding enrollment, retention and persistence (Astin, 1993; Koljatic & Kuh, 2001; Perry, 1999). Higher education leaders may want to observe these expectation changes.

Interaction Adrenaline

Millennial Students thrive on socializing and staying connected. Whether they are multitasking on *Facebook* during a school project, texting while walking to class, asking a friend a question through an online chat while in a class lecture, or learning through a *Wiki* discussion, the Net Generation thrives on connectedness (Oblinger, 2005). Oblinger (2005) built a convincing argument about the connection between content learning, social learning, and information technological learning. Using technology does not guarantee successful learning, but employing learning through technology increases successful learning.

Social learning through online interaction, texting, or in a class group activity is a primary learning style for today's Millennial students (Tapscott, 1998; Oblinger, 2003; Roberts, 2005). For example, students today can text a particular number, ask any question, and receive a response within minutes. Oblinger and Oblinger (2005) stated, "the social nature of Net Geners, as well as their desire for experiential learning, implies that interaction is an important technique for colleges and universities to employ" (p. 2.13). Educational institutions must give attention to using social learning in their teaching methods and practices.

Quick and Convenient Learning

The Net Generation is very interested in learning and gaining immediate access to their desired information. The learning key is not in technology, but in how quickly they

find the desired information or social learning (Brown & Adler, 2008). Millennials enjoy interactive learning situations, simulations, interconnectivity like blogging, online discussions, and instant messaging (IM). *Wiki* is an online discussion where others can edit someone else's contribution, such as *Wikipedia*. Brown and Adler (2008) wrote concerning this new individual learning and construction of truth saying,

> The Cartesian perspective assumes that knowledge is a kind of substance and that pedagogy concerns the best way to transfer this substance from teachers to students. By contrast, instead of starting from the Cartesian premise of *"I think, therefore I am,"* and from the assumption that knowledge is something that is transferred to the student via various pedagogical strategies, the social view of learning says, *"We participate, therefore we are".* (p. 18)

The construction of truth from community networks rather than from reliable scholasticism and absolutes could pose serious problems for Christian institutions. Spiritual formation could be vulnerable to independent human reason in applying biblical and scholastic truths to one's life. Christian institutions must find methods that allow students to learn through quick and convenient social networking in and out of class. Faculty could find mechanisms to monitor, give input, and intervene without compromising their mission (Astin, 2010; Erickson, 2005, Oblinger, 2005). This brings up the issue of where Millennials learn.

Learning Spaces

Students have traditionally learned within a classroom's four walls. Today's Millennial is constantly gathering information through technology all around. As

previously noted, this daily learning style is normal and common, much different from Boomer and Gen X learning situations. Thus, educators must use physical classrooms and outside classroom experiences. These outside class designs must use social, electronic, and web learning that is more accessible in space and time than in the traditional classroom experience (Brown, 2005). Examples are wireless classrooms, listening to a missed lecture with an *Ipod*, online chats, group discussions, *Wiki*, live video conference with a South Korean guest instructor or attending a virtual school like *Second Life*.

The cyberspace world has growing interest in development of new pedagogical methods (Brown, 2005). Although difficult to believe for Boomer and X Generation faculty and administration, Oblinger (2005) found that "more learning takes place outside of the classroom than in it" (p. 5). Christian colleges and universities are at a crossroad. Major academic reform must begin for many institutions to improve effectiveness and student success in spiritual formation and character development.

Christian Higher Education's Ability to Adapt

Missional Spiritual Formation

In the United States, a large number of colleges and universities identify themselves as the institutional type called Special Faith Institutions by the Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions (2010). This Special Faith Institution classification covers Christian universities, theological seminaries, and Bible colleges. In the 1960's and early1970's, some faith-related higher education institutions that identify themselves as intentionally Christian began to separate from other traditionally faith-related institutions. These had moved away from their Christian heritage. According to

Kerr (2001), this era in American higher education witnessed widespread protests and reform movements (pp. xiii, 96). In 1976, many of these intentionally Christian institutions collaborated to improve and achieve Christian academic and organizational excellence. This group formed the Council for Christian College and Universities.

These intentionally Christian higher education institutions have purposeful mission statements that include student spiritual formation and character development. Their mission, typically, is to educate and develop Christian leaders to influence the world in profession, in lifestyle example, and through community service. Spiritual formation generally means teaching and modeling a Christian belief system to develop students into Christ's followers and servant. Attempts to reform and improve these missional institutions are challenging. With the pressure of economic strain and competition for the minds of Millennial students, many institutions are at a crossroads.

Pressure to Adapt

Erikson (2005) studied whether adaptive initiatives erode Christian colleges' strong missional orientation. He stated, "Christian colleges have been hard pressed to stay true to their mission statements within the current economic and social environment that encourages them to function adaptively" (p. 2). Although Erickson (2005) specifically looked at institutional pressure to conform to the larger enrollment-marketing model, one may see similar connection to the pressure colleges face in adapting to Millennial learning styles versus compromising missional purpose and values.

Summary

The literature review included five main components of writings most relevant to the study. The Millennial generation (born 1982-2000) is changing society's landscape in technology, business, and education. Millennials are the concern of this study. The review identified the Millennial generation and discussed their challenge to Christian higher education. These learners exhibit monumental differences from the learners in previous generations. These differences challenge Christian higher educational institutions to understand and adapt to Millennial expectations. These differences may weaken the missional intent of spiritual formation if not promptly addressed.

The review established that Christian colleges with a spiritual formation mission must understand generational differences in learning styles. They must meet Millennials' particular academic expectations and learning style to ensure student success and institutional effectiveness. All administrators, faculty, and staff must face this challenge if institutions plan to survive these Digital Generation changes. Colleges and universities must take into account any generational, curriculum-centered, or teacher-centered biases and center their curriculum design, technology advances, and teaching practices on Millennial student's learning style and academic needs. This adaptation is necessary for maximum student appeal, satisfaction, and success.

The research reported evidence of generational differences, generational conflict, and Millennial characteristics. A debate was brought to light concerning the emergence of student- centered instruction paradigm and how current higher education models have not been historically student-centered and are slow to change. Research on Millennials

showed how they think and learn with different mindsets and expectations. Digital

Learners have a strong need for engagement, interaction, convenient and immediate

access to information, and use different learning spaces than previous generations.

Finally, the review discussed whether institutions have the ability to adapt delivery of

content and teaching practices without compromising their missional intent of spiritual

formation.

Chapter III proposes a survey that samples CCCU and ABHE institutions. The

survey's purpose is to gather data to analyze how well these institutions understand

Millennial student learning. This primary research question is, "What impact has the

Millennial generation had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian

missional institutions?" Responses to the survey were analyzed with the five research

questions as a focus.

Research Question 1: What are CCCU and ABHE institutions doing to

understand the change in generational attitudes and motivational behavior of

Millennial learning?

Research Question 2: What kind of mechanisms or teaching tools do CCCU and

ABHE institutions have in place to balance student styles in learning with the

learning biases of current faculty and administration?

Research Question 3: How are CCCU and ABHE institutions adapting to meet

the Millennial learning styles and the strategic use of a student-centered learning

paradigm and digital media to improve the effectiveness of their mission?

Research Question 4: Do stakeholders view these adaptations as compromise to their constituents and a threat to their institutional mission of spiritual formation?

Research Question 5: If CCCU and ABHE institutions develop a strategic plan that includes distance-learning programs, what would be the impact on their missional environments and objectives?

CHAPTER III

Introduction

Current literature indicates very little research about the Millennial generation's learning style and the style's influence on Christian higher education. Although information exists about Millennial learning and intergenerational differences, research concerning a Christian missional institution's response to these changing societal realities is necessary. Chapter II reviewed pertinent literature. Chapter III presents this study's research plan. This study gathered information concerning the Millennial generation's impact on delivery of content and teaching practices at Christian missional institutions. This study informs educational leaders that research is necessary on this subject. This chapter contains a conceptual framework, researcher's lens, research methodology, design and procedures, data collection and analysis, and sample population description. I also included validity and reliability procedures, expected research limitations, and study trustworthiness.

Conceptual Framework

Three theories formed the research's conceptual framework. The first theory involves effective faculty practices in higher education. Chickering and Gamson (1987) presented the *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*. The following principles show the study's necessity: encourage student-faculty contact, encourage cooperation among students, encourage active learning, respect diverse talents and ways of learning. Three of the Principles (give prompt feedback; emphasize time on task; communicate high expectations) were not used in this study. The four principles

selected, were chosen for their influence on student retention and departure and

contribute criteria used to analyze whether CCCU and ABHE institutions are effectively

educating Millennials (Braxton, Milem, & Sullivan, 2000, p. 582).

Astin (1993) played a significant role in shaping a new student-centered academic

paradigm to improve student satisfaction. His work set the stage for this study's second

theory, put forth by Barr and Tagg (1995). They identified the need for a new teaching

paradigm in higher education, arguing traditional higher education has long held the

teaching paradigm as its guiding criteria. Barr and Tagg proposed a new learning

paradigm: Quality education centers on the student learning style and educational

environment, not on the quality of faculty, curriculum, and other factors. Barr and Tagg

(1995) were at the educational reform frontier as distance and virtual learning exploded

in popularity among Gen Xers and Millennials. They are among the most frequently cited

of writer/researchers in the area of new paradigms in teaching-learning paradigm at this

time. They defined learning paradigm as, "Where a college's purpose is not to transfer

knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and

construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of

learners that make discoveries and solve problems" (1995, p. 16).

The third theory most influencing this study was *Millennials Rising: The Next*

Great Generation (Howe & Strauss, 2000). The authors helped establish the

unprecedented ways the Millennial Generation will change American institutions. Howe

and Strauss strongly stated that generational differences affect institutions, and they

stated what leaders must know regarding Millennial institutional commitment. These

generational differences could challenge higher education institutions with regard to delivery of content and teaching practices. Educational leaders, seeking ways to attract Millennials to their universities and improve their persistence, retention, and commitment to personal development, must not overlook the commitment characteristics unique to this generation (Astin, 1993; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Koljatic & Kuh, 2001; Perry, 1999).

Researcher's Lens

I evaluated the research from my faith-based background as a clergyman. I have worked and taught in Christian higher education for over 10 years and have worked for both CCCU and ABHE institutions. I have been a minister for over 25 years, strongly valuing the missional intent of spiritual formation in Christian higher education.

Some of my values include the priority of expert authority, *Biblical truth*, and absolutes in the development of today's learner. I do not see a separation between the *sacred* and the *secular* (Holmes, 1977). *Expert authority* means a transmitter of expert knowledge in a chosen field. *Biblical truth* means whatever is in the Bible is completely reliable and credible. *Absolutes* means one must acknowledge unalterable truths about a given subject, such as the *Biblical truth* that *God is love* or *men and women are equal*. As the researcher, I do not believe there is a separation between what is *sacred* and what is *secular*. *Sacred* would mean all things associated with a religious orientation. Secular would mean all things associated with a public or non-religious orientation. *Sacred and secular* carries the meaning that God is the intelligent designer of all things, and all truth is God's truth (Holmes, 1977). The impact of these beliefs would be seen in two areas: construction of the questionnaire and interpretation of the data.

I established a process of checks and balances, accounting for my bias described in the researcher's lens. I acknowledge the possible impact of my bias in the survey instrument. In the development of the survey instrument, I carefully selected the language and asked outside readers to evaluate the language in a pilot survey. They identified leading questions and pre-supposed answers possibly generated from my background.

I acknowledged the possible impact of bias in data interpretation and conclusions, also generated from my background. Outside readers and the members of the review group analyzed my interpretation and conclusions, addressing possible background bias issues. I took all of this input in account.

Research Methodology

I used an exploratory descriptive study comprised of a mixed method research approach. I collected quantitative and qualitative information with a 22- item online survey instrument (Appendix A). I chose this method for its accuracy in studying sensitive organizational issues, as supported by Jehn and Jonsen (2010). They stated, "The multiple method comparison techniques demonstrate that a more accurate and thorough understanding of organizational issues, and sensitive issues in particular, is achieved when multiple methods are used and compared in a systematic manner" (2010, p. 315). The survey gathered data from a sample of CCCU and ABHE member institutions. The data were analyzed to produce information on how well these institutions understood differences in Millennial generation learning. The survey gathered information on demographic characteristics of the institutions necessary to give me a description of the size, location, and affiliation of the participants involved. The survey

also gathered information concerning institutional research and adaptation resistance, current education philosophy and faculty teaching practices, and university advancement goals and expenditures.

Design and Procedures

The research method was an electronic survey designed to produce data to help inform research about Millennial learning style awareness, knowledge, curriculum and delivery practices, and Millennial adaptations of intentionally Christian higher education institutions. I distributed the survey to the provosts or chief academic officers for 315 CCCU and ABHE institutions. The study sought to determine whether Christian institutions have addressed and adapted to meet the Millennial Learner's learning styles while maintaining their missional purpose.

This study's primary research question is, "What impact has the Millennial generation had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian missional institutions?" The subsequent questions that guided this study are:

Research Question 1: What are CCCU and ABHE institutions doing to understand the change in generational attitudes and motivational behavior of Millennial learning?

Research Question 2: What kind of mechanisms or teaching tools do CCCU and ABHE institutions have in place to balance student styles in learning with the learning biases of current faculty and administration?

Research Question 3: How are CCCU and ABHE institutions adapting to meet the Millennial learning styles and the strategic use of a student-centered learning paradigm and digital media to improve the effectiveness of their mission?

Research Question 4: Do stakeholders view these adaptations as compromise to their constituents and a threat to their institutional mission of spiritual formation?

Research Question 5: If CCCU and ABHE institutions develop a strategic plan that includes distance-learning programs, what would be the impact on their missional environments and objectives?

This descriptive exploratory study utilized an electronic survey methodology as its data-gathering mechanism. Each survey question was designed to provide data for one or more of these five research questions through strategic assignment (see Appendix C.

Sample

The subjects of the study were a sample of intentional Christian institutions of higher education. I chose them because they prioritize spiritual formation in their mission statement. They met these criteria by their membership in one of the two major Christian higher education associations that represent these criteria, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) and the Association of Biblical Higher Education (ABHE). The study participants were chief academic officers, such as provosts or vice-presidents of Academic Affairs for 315 CCCU and ABHE institutions. I chose these officers based on their responsibility to oversee institutional curriculum and instruction. The CCCU consists of approximately 115 member institutions, while the ABHE consists of 200 institutions. I e-mailed the electronic survey online link to representatives of these

institutions. The link took them to a 22 item survey, which produced the data for this analysis.

Data collection and analysis

I used a mixed-method research approach with a quantitative phase and a qualitative phase. The quantitative phase collected statistical information from the electronic online survey, which described how CCCU and ABHE institutions are dealing with Millennial student impact. This phase also informed the research study through multiple-choice questions. The qualitative phase collected online survey information via open-ended questions to gain deeper insights into the feelings, values, and behaviors of the sample used to determine Millennial Student impact on their institutions.

Figure 3.1 provides a description of the questionnaire as it was constructed with a description of each question. The major categories are identified for use in analyzing the data in both quantitative and qualitative formats.

Figure 3.1: Review of Questionnaire-Based Categories

Question-naire Items	Questionnaire Category	Category Label	Subcategories
Items 1-3	Demographic Information	Respondent characteristics	Sample characteristics
Items 4-8	Institutional Research and Adaptation	Institutional Research on Millennials	Research on students (4)
		Institutional adaptation	Adapting facilities for technology (5) Classrooms with wireless internet access (6) Online delivery (7)
		Mission	Missional Compromise (8)

Figure 1 continued			
Items 9-19	Educational Philosophy and Faculty Teaching Practice	Faculty Professional Development	Professional Development (9) Train faculty on how students learn today (11)
		Faculty Teaching	Faculty Teaching: digital information learning (10) Percent lecture (13A) Podcasts (13B) Multimedia presentation (13 C) Out of classroom digital peer activity (13D) Assignments requiring digital information research (13E) Group project/social media (13 F) Experiential learning (18) Communicate digitally (19)
		Mission	Institutional Philosophy: Student vs Teaching Centered (12)
		Mission	Administrators' view of student desire to construct truth (14) Faculty use group processes to discover/construct truth (16) Control mechanisms (16) Faculty correct wrong views/ reconsider (17)
		Faculty Teaching	Faculty as experts, facilitators, both (15)
	University Advancement	Institutional adaptation	Budget for research and advancement (information technology in traditional classroom (20) Budget for research and advancement online (21)
		Mission	Missional vs student appeal (22) If both, percentages

Figure 3.2 presents the data sources using the category labels. The discussion of

the data is based on these deductively generated categories.

Figure 3.2: Deductive Coding Categories

Category Label	Subcategories
Respondent characteristics	Sample characteristics
Institutional Research on Millennials	Research on students (4)
Institutional Adaptation/Advancement	Adapting facilities for technology (5) Classrooms with wireless internet access (6) Online delivery (7)
	Budget for research and advancement (information technology in traditional classroom (20) Budget for research and advancement online (21)
Faculty Professional Development	Professional Development (9) Train faculty on how students learn today (11)
Faculty Teaching	Faculty Teaching: digital information learning (10) Percent lecture (13A) Podcasts (13B) Multimedia presentation (13 C) Out of classroom digital peer activity (13D) Assignments requiring digital information research (13E) Group project/social media (13 F) Experiential learning (18) Communicate digitally (19)
	Faculty as experts, facilitators, both (15)
Mission	Missional Compromise (8)
	Institutional Philosophy: Student vs Teaching Centered (12)
	Adm. view of student desire to construct truth (14) Faculty use group processes to discover/construct truth (16) Control mechanisms (16) Faculty correct wrong views/ reconsider (17)
	Missional vs student appeal (22) If both, percentages

Quantitative Phase

Data Collection and Analysis

The quantitative phase of this mixed method study gathered statistical information

from an electronic survey (created in SurveyMonkey and distributed electronically) by

collecting participants' responses to 22 items initially describing demographic characteristics of size, location, and affiliation (see Appendix A). The survey also collected participants' information describing how Millennial students impact CCCU and ABHE institutions in several ways. These items were related to the participant's institutional research and adaptation resistance, current education philosophy and teaching practices (including any proactive attempt to understand and adapt to a Millennial student-centered paradigm), and the impact of the Millennial mindset upon university advancement goals and expenditures.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS Statistics 19) was used to generate frequency distributions for each of the quantitative or descriptive questions. Each question was related to one or more the research questions and the frequency data was used in the analysis.

The quantitative phase gathered information using multiple-choice questions and some fill-in-the-blank answers, e.g. stating their institutional affiliation, if applicable. I used a multiple-choice method to help narrow answer flow into analytical categories. These categories would inform the descriptive study. I grouped the responses and categorized them by similarities, using deductive reasoning. Figures 3.1 (Review of Questionnaire-Based Categories) and Figure 3.2 (Deductive Coding Categories) provide the framework for the analysis. This reasoning produced the results demonstrating how Millennial students are or are not impacting the content and delivery practices of intentional Christian higher educational institutions.

Qualitative Phase

The qualitative phase of this mixed method study collected qualitative information in the form of open-ended responses from the same participants. The study used the same electronic survey and structured categories as the quantitative phase, adding 10 open-ended questions (see Appendix A). The qualitative phase built upon the quantitative information and provided deeper study understanding through the open-ended questions. These open-ended questions required that participants share their personal and institutional values, biases, and beliefs. The purpose was to understand what is meaningful to these institutions and what drives their motivation and behavior. The questions also provided insight into institutional hindrances to understanding, adaptation, and effectiveness when engaging millennial learners.

The responses were organized using an open coding system guided by the research questions and by the categories developed from the questionnaire. Figures 3.1 (Review of Questionnaire-Based Categories) and Figure 3.2 (Deductive Coding Categories) provide the framework for the analysis.

Validity and Reliability Procedures with Limitations

Validity

I used various methods to ensure that I gathered useful and meaningful information about CCCU and ABHE colleges and universities who are adapting to Millennial learning in content and delivery practices, as opposed to those who are not adapting. I was concerned that the survey instrument asked the appropriate questions about the content information sought (Creswell, 2007; Glesne, 2006).

I constructed the content and nature of the survey questions from two contributing influences. First, I asked two university chief academic officers to evaluate the survey questions. They examined the questions to ensure they served their intended purpose in gathering the correct information. They contributed clarifications and improvements that modified the questions for the quantitative and qualitative phases. Second, an additional review for both content validity and bias was conducted using an external reviewer with survey research credentials and credentials in the sociology of religion prior to the pilot survey. The reviewer has a PhD in sociology and has taught sociology of religion as well as research methods and statistics. He has a thirty-year career in academia and has a national reputation as a researcher. He indicated that the survey was credible in format and wording and that my bias (see Researcher's Lens) was not evident in the survey contents.

After I developed the instrument, a pilot survey was sent to eight participants asking them to provide feedback. They were asked if the questions were appropriate for the content and if they were clearly stated. The eight participants gave valuable feedback concerning the nature of the questions, and if the information content correlated correctly with the knowledge sought. I made changes and improvements to the survey instrument questions based on their input. These changes improved the questions' capacity to gather the correct information sought. The questions sought to reflect the study's focus on Millennial student learning styles, ABHE and CCCU institutions, and these institutions' adaptation (or lack thereof) of Millennial content and delivery practices.

Reliability

I sent the survey to eight administrators, who gave valuable suggestions to improve the survey questions and ensure the gathering of correct information (Creswell, 2007; Glesne, 2006). They highlighted possible confusion and clarified the questions' structure and content. The pilot tests revealed data that helped determine survey consistency and incongruity. I addressed any question or corresponding answers that could suggest anything other than the intended meaning. All feedback from the participants' input and data clarified and improved the data-gathering process, resulting in a more reliable survey instrument.

Limitations

The study was confined to only CCCU and ABHE institutions and may not speak to non-CCCU and non-ABHE institutions. Some general principles may apply that may be helpful in conducting further research in other settings but may not predict responses from other types of institutions. Participant responses only reflected views of the CCCU and ABHE institutions that they are associated with, and may not say anything about other institutions not included in the study. Due to the possible non-participation of the entire sample, the descriptive information results in the quantitative phase may not represent the entire population. Lastly, some of the institutions surveyed may be members of both the CCCU and the ABHE thus reducing the possible sample size.

The results of the study included my own biases and may not be the sole interpretation of the data gathered. There may be other interpretations by the participants or their institutions. Outside readers served to help me in taking this bias into account.

Truthfulness

Member Checking

I tested the survey instrument and my findings for truthfulness by using member checking and peer-to-peer debriefing methods. Member checking is used in a research process to ensure the credibility of the study's interpretation and results (Creswell, 2007; Glesne, 2006). Member checking took place when I asked four chief academic officers to test a pilot survey, take notes and provide feedback. Those participant members shared insights that helped me, and the survey was changed to improve clarification and accuracy. In addition, before four different chief academic officers took the survey, they asked me questions about the survey so I could provide feedback ensuring the questions could be answered with greater clarity and accuracy.

Further member checking was used after the qualitative findings were collected, interpreted, developed into categories, and resulting findings. The researcher sent the results to the same four chief academic officers to validate the trustworthiness of the interpretations and results (Creswell, 2007; Glesne, 2006). They reported the categories as accurate. The members were asked to respond *yes* or *no* if the categories related clearly to the respective questions. If there was conflict in their assessment, I asked them to assign a percentage to those questions that responses were *yes*. I asked them to explain the reason for any questions not possessing the content and categories representing the question. Two of four members responded. These two answered *yes*, stating the resulting categories reflected the appropriate content sought in answering the respective questions.

Peer to Peer Debriefing

I also asked the same questions to the four peers who had previously helped test the pilot survey, all were CCCU and ABHE chief academic officers. Peer to peer debriefing is an outside check for the accuracy and trustworthiness of the research process by individuals who help the research stay honest (Creswell, 2007; Glesne, 2006). I asked these peers to verify whether the entire data set, resulting interpretation of categories, and study results reflected appropriate and trustworthy content sought in answering the respective questions. The peers were asked to respond *yes* or *no* as to whether the categories could be correlated clearly to the respective question. If conflicted in their assessment, I asked them to assign a percentage to those questions that responses were *yes*. For those they felt did not possess the content and categories representing the question, they were asked to explain why. The four responded *yes*, stating the resulting categories reflected the appropriate content sought in the answering the respective questions. Therefore, no changes were made since the peer group found no conflict in the assessment.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

Chapter III presented the research project designed to gather information on how the Millennial generation impacts the delivery of content and teaching practices of CCCU and ABHE institutional members. The research had three theories, comprising the conceptual framework for the study: *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* (Chickering & Gamson, 1987); new student-centered academic paradigm (Astin, 1993; Barr & Tagg, 1995); and *Millennials Rising: The Next*

Great Generation (Howe & Strauss, 2000). An explanation of the researcher's lens and research methodology were presented. The methodology was a mixed method approach using quantitative and qualitative design and procedures to carry out the research. I discussed data collection and the process of analysis, the research sample, validity and reliability procedures, research limitations and steps taken to strengthen study trustworthiness. The study's results found trends among participants that informed the study and these will covered in the next chapter. Chapter IV will present the quantitative and qualitative results obtained through this descriptive study.

CHAPTER IV

Results of Data Analysis

Chapter III presented the descriptive research project that was designed to gather information on how the Millennial generation impacts the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian institutional members of the CCCU and the ABHE. I used a mixed-method research approach with quantitative and qualitative phases. Chapter IV will present an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered in this descriptive study.

I integrated quantitative information and qualitative information into emerging category-based themes. I evaluated the emerging category-based themes through peer-to-peer debriefing and member checking procedures, validating that the category-based themes reflected the appropriate content sought in answering the respective questions. I asked the participants to respond y*es* or *no* if the themes correlated clearly to the respective question, and all participating peers and members answered *yes*.

The survey results comprise four sections. The first section presents the demographic information for the participating institutions, describing the CCCU and ABHE institutions' enrollment size, geographic region, and organizational affiliation, using tables and a description for each table. The following three sections represent quantitative and qualitative data concerning institutional research, university advancement, and adaptation, and education philosophy and faculty teaching practices (the category university advancement is included with institutional research and adaptation in Chapter IV). Each section contains various category-based themes based on

the study's research questions. Quantitative data tables, the description of results, and the qualitative data integrated under the categorical themes are included in each section.

Institutional Demographic Information

Ninety-three participants out of three hundred and fifteen contacted completed the survey. The first section of the instrument is comprised of demographic information important for the study.

Of the ninety-three study participants, 51 or 54% in Cluster A. indicated undergraduate enrollments numbering 100-499 students. Cluster C., the second largest group at 19 or 20.4% reported enrollments of 1,000-2,999 students. Cluster B., at 17 or 18.3% reported enrollments of 500-999 students. The smallest group was Cluster D. at 1 or 1.1% indicating student enrollment over 3,000.

Administrators used these four regional designations to represent their institution location: Eastern U.S., Western U.S., Midwest U.S., and outside the U. S.

The results are as follows: Cluster C., Midwest U.S., represents the largest cluster of 33 or 35.5%. Second is Cluster A., Eastern U.S., representing 27 or 29%. Cluster B., Western U.S., represents 19 or 24%. The smallest is in Cluster D., outside the U.S., of 14 or 15.1%.

Table 4.1

Institutional Religious Affiliation	Frequency
Assemblies of God	4
Baptist	15
Christian Church	3
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	1
Christian Church/Church of Christ	5
Christian Reformed Church in North America	1
Church of Christ	1
Church of God (Holiness)	2
Churches of Christ in Christian Union	1
Evangelical Free Church	1
Evangelical Missionary	1
Foursquare	1
God's Missionary Church (Wesleyan in theology)	1
Grace Brethren	1
Interdenominational	1
Mennonite	1
Mennonite Brethren	3
Methodist	2
Multi-denominational	1
Nazarene	3
Non-denominational	33
Pentecostal	3
Presbyterian	4
United Brethren in Christ	1
Wesleyan	3
Total	93

Table 4.1 presents institutional religious affiliation. The top five institutional religious affiliations were: Non-denominational 33 or 35.5%, Baptist 15 or 16.1%, Christian Church/Church of Christ 5 or 5.1%, Assemblies of God 4 or 4.3%, and Presbyterian 4 or 4.3%. Five other institutions, representing 3 or 3.2%, claimed affiliations with the Christian Church (general), Mennonite Brethren, Nazarene, Pentecostal, and Wesleyan. Two institutions, representing 2 or 2.2%, claimed affiliations with the Church of God (Holiness) and Methodist. The remaining institutional clusters represented 1 or 1.1% in religious affiliation.

Institutional Research on Millennials

The ninety-three study participants responded to a series of questions regarding institutional research and specifically, how Millennial students have impacted their institutions and how they have responded.

Table 4.2

Institutional Research into the Way Students Construct Knowledge Today

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	1	1.1
A. Yes	23	24.7
B. No	69	74.2
Total	93	100

Participants responded to the question answering whether their institution conducted research about the way students construct knowledge and truth today. Cluster

A, answering yes, represents 23 or 24.7% of institutions conducting research into this issue. Cluster B, answering no, represents 69 or 74.2%, indicating they are not conducting research about how students construct knowledge today.

CCCU and ABHE administrators gave a variety of responses about conducting research on the way students construct knowledge and truth today. A few academic leaders shared that researching and knowing how today's students learn was not a priority, or they were new to their role and had not considered its importance. Others shared they did not have the time, resources or did not know about the issue. One leader shared that they "did not focus on how students learn, but only on student outcomes."

A few CCCU and ABHE participants said they have researched only in a limited way on how students learn today. Three said they have faculty assigned for this research. One said, "I have a faculty development team for research." Another mentioned, "We have a faculty member who earned his or her doctorate in this discipline and has initiated faculty training on content and delivery methods."

Participants mentioned a number of research methods that gather data on student critical thinking skills and the construction of knowledge. One leader stated, "We are contemplating implementation of some of these tools for understanding how students learn today. Tools like questionnaires, surveys, worldview questionnaires, portfolios, capstone presentations, and a tool called Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) provide information on students' learning styles." One leader proactive in addressing this issue said, "We implemented course evaluations, asking the question,

"What would have made your learning experience better, more relevant, or more

robust?'"

Institutional Adaptation

Participants answered the question whether their institution was adapting facilities

for information technology uses. Cluster A, comprised of 86 institutions or 92.5%,

reported they were adapting for information technology uses, while Cluster B represented

4 or 4.3% that were not adapting for information technology uses. The remaining 3 or

3.2% had no response.

Table 4.3

Classrooms with Wireless Internet Access

	Percent
A. 0-29%	5.4
B. 30-49%	1.1
C. 50-79%	7.5
D. 80-100%	84.9
No Response	1.1
Total	100

Institutions answered the question regarding what classroom percentage was

equipped with wireless access. Cluster D indicated 79 or 84.9% and said 80-100% of

their classrooms had wireless access. Clusters A-C were considerably smaller than

Cluster D.

Table 4.4

Courses Available Through Online Delivery

	Percent
A. 0-29%	65.6
B. 30-49%	15.1
C. 50-79%	5.4
D. 80-100%	11.8
No Response	1.1
Total	100

Institutions responded to the question regarding their use of information technology and the number of courses available through online delivery or distance education. Cluster A was the largest with 61 or 65.6% indicating that 0-29% of their courses were available online. Cluster B, representing 14 or 15.1%, indicated 30-49% of their courses were online. Cluster C, comprised of 5 or 5.4%, indicated 50-79% of their courses were available online. Cluster D, 11 or 11.8% of institutions, indicated 80-100% of their courses were available online.

Table 4.5

Budget for research and advancement in the uses of information technology in the traditional classroom environment.

	Percent
A. $0 – 49,999.	78.5
B. $50,000. – 99,999.	9.7
C. $100,000. – 199,999.	3.2
D. $200,000. +	5.4
No Response	3.3
Total	100

Study participants responded to the question regarding their general budget for research and advancement of information technology in the traditional classroom. Cluster A was the largest group at 73 or 78.5%, reporting $0-$49,999. Cluster B, at 9 or 9.7%, reported $50,000.-$99,999. Cluster C, at 3 or 3.2%, reported $100,000.-$199,999. Cluster D, at 5 or 5.4%, reported $200,000+.

Table 4.6

Budget for Research and Advancement of the Uses of Information Technology in Online Delivery Systems (distance learning)

	Frequency	Percent
A. $0 – 49,999.	74	79.6
B. $50,000. – 99,999.	12	12.9
C. $100,000. – 199,999.	2	2.2
D. $200,000. +	2	2.2
No Response	3	3.1
Total	93	100.0

Study participants responded to the question regarding their general budget for research and advancement of the uses of information technology in online delivery systems (distance learning). Cluster A was the largest group at 74 or 79.6%, reporting $0-$49,999. Cluster B at 12 or 12.9%, reported $50,000.-$99,999. Cluster C and Cluster D, both at 2 or 2.2%, reported $100,000.-$199,999 and $200,000+ respectively.

CCCU and ABHE participants reported adaptation in explaining their use of information technology concerning the content and delivery methods. Many leaders stated that the following were their attempt at information technology adaptation: expanding wireless and bandwidth capacities, online or distance education options, hybrid learning platforms, hardware upgrades, *PowerPoint*, projectors, *SmartBoards*, course management/delivery systems like *Moodle, Populi*, and *Blackboard*, and specific purpose labs for art, digital media, teaching, and science. Several of these leaders

described their adaptation as "slow and/or limited by their budget." One institutional leader requested information about researching the learning style of Caribbean inhabitants.

A number of participants revealed a priority for keeping pace with information technology's newest trends in learning adaptation. Three institutions stated they provided every new student with their own *iPad.* One mentioned the use of *Populi*, a *Cloud-based* course management system. Some mention futuristic strategic planning initiatives, upgrading technological services, and incorporating different platforms in classroom instruction, including *smart classrooms, smart podiums,* and hybrid courses with exercises and assignments posted online in either individual or discussion format.

Two universities are planning advanced innovations. One institution has two faculty committees dedicated to research and adaptation of information technology pedagogy. The other institution describes their new development: "*As* (mine) information transmission in the classroom environment to mentor, process, evaluate, and apply information and to learn to work together as a learning community around *Big Truths* and significant relationships in the *Big Story*. We have also un-invited instructors who want to operate as the *sage on the stage*!"

Table 4.7

Stakeholders Concerned with Missional
Compromise Versus Adaptation

	Percent
A. Yes	44.1
B. No	43.0
No Response	12.9
Total	100.0

Cluster A, with 41 institutions or 44.1%, indicated university stakeholders were concerned about missional compromise relative to adapting to online delivery or distance education. Cluster B., with 40 institutions or 43%, indicated university stakeholders were not concerned about missional compromise in relation to adapting to online delivery or distance education. 12 or 12.9% of participants did not respond.

CCCU and ABHE academic stakeholders who consider alternative content and delivery methods expressed concern that the institution could lose control and purpose of their biblical mission and vision aligned with curriculum objectives of Christian universities. They believe a university should use the advantages of information technology, but not at the expense of maintaining missional integrity. Some view distance education and hybrid learning platforms as a missional threat. One leader stated, "We will approve only curriculum and instruction that aligns with our mission; we approve this on a case by case basis with both traditional and newer course delivery methods." Another said, "We are concerned about making disciples in the sense that online learning

compromises that capacity." Christian universities generally agree that mission is foremost, although some believe the teaching method or process is neutral. Others take the opposing view.

Many academic leader survey participants are concerned about the breakdown in the teacher to student relational aspect in electronic delivery methods, or more specifically, the online and hybrid format. One leader said, "Faculty are more concerned about the loss of productive time and attentiveness during class. Some faculties, particularly in the sciences, are concerned about a drop-in quality whenever we shift courses to an online format." Another leader said, "In our scenario it is more difficult to track student outcomes than traditional campus students. While many leaders, trustees, and faculty are excited about the possibilities, many faculty fear loss of missional effectiveness with the reduction of face-to-face interaction."

Table 4.8

Missional Criteria or Student Appeal and Learning Styles

	Frequency	Percent
Unidentified	1	1.1
A. Missional criteria priority	47	50.5
B. Student-centered priority	5	5.4
C. Both	40	43.0
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to choosing what was more important to their university, developing students for a specific missional criteria or appealing to Millennial students' learning styles and needs so they will enroll to fulfill the university mission. Cluster A. was the largest group at 47 or 50.5% choosing missional criteria as their priority. Cluster C. was the second largest group at 40 or 5.4%, choosing that they equally prioritize missional criteria and student appeal and learning styles. Cluster B. was the smallest group at 5 or 5.4%, choosing student appeal and learning styles as their priority.

Table 4.9

Both Priorities, What Percentage for Missional Criteria and the Balance for Student Appeal and Learning Preference

	Frequency	Percent
Unidentified	50	53.8
a. 0-29%	4	4.3
b. 30-49%	15	16.1
c. 50-79%	21	22.6
d. 80-100%	3	3.2
Total	93	100.0

Study participants responded to the question regarding if both were priorities, what percentage they would assign for missional criteria and the balance for student appeal and learning preference. Cluster C was the largest group at 21 or 22.6 reporting 50-79% for missional criteria and 20-50% for student appeal and learning preference. Cluster B was the next largest group at 15 or 16.1% reporting 30-49% for missional

criteria and 50-70% for student appeal and learning preference. Cluster A was 4 or 4.3% reporting 0-29% for missional criteria and 70-100% for student appeal and learning preference. Cluster D. was the smallest group at 3 or 3.2% reporting 80-100% for missional criteria and 0-20% for student appeal and learning preference.

Some academic leaders responded that stakeholders had mixed attitudes across their campuses. Some see alternative content and delivery methods as a wave of the future, while others see technology as distraction or even a learning threat. Many report their board of trustees does not express concern between their institution's mission and alternative delivery methods. With other leaders, alternative delivery methods are only considerations because administrators doubt these methods can accomplish their mission. Some said, "You have pockets of resistance; however, by and large, the community is positive regarding online curricular developments. There are a few traditionalists, but most understand the need for alternative delivery." Others state, "Our board is committed to providing the best delivery and our mission is built into all courses no matter how they are delivered." Concerning alternative content and delivery methods in light of today's learner, the attitude is a mixed one.

A few participants stated they are traditional colleges and have been so for some time. One leader said regarding those resistant to alternative innovations in content and delivery methods, "Those who have not learned online are not sure you can have a quality online teaching experience *compared to those who have experienced online learning* (italics mine)". In an effort to remain progressive and effective, a number of participants indicated they are continually evaluating and examining teaching content and

methods of delivery. One administrator said, "It has never occurred to anyone that method of delivery could compromise content." A number indicated that a clear missional institutional objective was the intentional integration of faith perspectives into course content and assignments.

Some innovative universities report they have been intentionally innovative. Administrative boards, faculty, and students embrace opportunity without compulsion for alternative delivery formats, such as online education at the seminary, graduate, and undergraduate level. However, some argue that online education is not transformative in personal development and spiritual formation in the same way that traditional education is transformative. Concerning the progressive integration of faith and learning, most participants are committed to increasing use of new methods, but some stakeholders still have reservations about some of these methods' integrity. Participants noted a high regard for leadership as a positive for balancing innovation with missional purpose.

Faculty Development and Faculty Teaching Practices

The study shifts its focus from collecting responses to asking participants if they have conducted faculty professional development to adapt teaching methods and curriculum to meet Millennial Learner needs.

Table 4.10

Faculty Professional Development on Adapting Teaching Methods and Curriculum

	Frequency	Percent
A. Yes	71	76.3
B. No	21	22.6
No Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

CCCU or ABHE institutional members responded to the question about conducting faculty professional development to adapt teaching methods and curriculum to meet the learning needs of the digital information learner. Participants answered in Cluster A with 71 or 76.3% saying yes, and Cluster B with 21 or 22.6% saying no.

When educational leaders responded to the question regarding possible faculty professional development with focus on adapting teaching methods and curriculum to meet the needs of the digital learner, many shared various reasons why they have not moved in this direction. Some responses were: "too busy preparing for an accreditation visit," "new to a role," "not having time," "in the planning stage," "struggle with faculty turnover," "using skilled ad hoc individuals on an as-needed basis." General responses to the question included "Minimal awareness," "need for exploration," and "focus or motivation to train faculty in alternative content and teaching practices." Two online colleges said this development has been their professional development training all along.

Table 4.11

Instruction Carried Out by Lecture

	Frequency	Percent
a. 0-29%	7	7.5
b. 30-49%	20	21.5
c. 50-79%	49	52.7
d. 80-100%	16	17.2
No Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding how much faculty instruction was by lecture method. The largest group was Cluster C at 49 or 52.7%, reporting 50-79%. Next was Cluster B at 20 or 21.5%, reporting 30-49%. Cluster D, at 16 or 17.2%, reported 80-100% and lastly, Cluster A, at 7 or 7.5%, reported 0-29%.

Table 4.12

Instruction Carried Out Through Podcasts or Digital Means
(e.g., missed lectures, additional lectures, videos or
PowerPoints)?

	Frequency	Percent
Unidentified	1	1.1
a. 0-29%	68	73.1
b. 30-49%	16	17.2
c. 50-79%	5	5.4
d. 80-100%	2	2.2
Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding how much faculty instruction

occurred by Podcasts or other digital means. Cluster A was the largest group at 68 or

73.1%, reporting 0-29%. Cluster B, at 16 or 17.2%, reported 30-49%. Cluster C, at 5 or

5.4%, reported 50-79%. Cluster D, at 2 or 2.2%, reported 80-100%.

Table 4.13

Instruction Carried Out Through Multimedia Presentations

	Frequency	Percent
a. 0-29%	32	34.4
b. 30-49%	32	34.4
c. 50-79%	21	22.6
d. 80-100%	5	5.4
No Response	3	3.3
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding how much faculty instruction occurred by multi-media presentations. Cluster A and Cluster B were both at 32% or 34.4&, reporting 0-29% and 30-49% respectively. Cluster C at 21% or 22.6%, reported 50-79% and Cluster D at 5% or 5.4%, reported 80-100%.

Table 4.14

Instruction Carried Out Through Outside Classroom Digital Peer Activity

	Frequency	Percent
a. 0-29%	78	83.9
b. 30-49%	12	12.9
Response	3	3.3
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding how much instruction occurred through outside classroom digital peer activity. Cluster A at 78 or 83.9%, reported 0-29% and Cluster B at 12 or 12.9%, reported 30-49%.

Table 4.15

Faculty Use Some Form of Experiential Learning and Communicate Digitally

	Frequency	Percent
A. 0-29%	47	50.5
B. 30-49%	26	28.0
C. 50-79%	7	7.5
D. 80-100%	12	12.9
Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

Study participants responded to the question regarding what percent of their faculty use some form of drama, role-playing, or other experiential learning designed to engage a video-game generation. The largest group was Cluster A at 47 or 50.5%, reporting 0-29% faculty usage. The next largest was Cluster B at 26 or 28%, reporting 30-49% faculty usage. Cluster D at 12 or 12.9% reported 80-100% faculty usage and the last group Cluster C at 7 or 7.5% reported 50-79% faculty usage.

Some institutional leaders listed a number of faculty professional development practices, indicating they take seriously the adaptation challenge. These participants mentioned faculty development practices that implement teaching methods and

curriculum, such as seminars, retreats, required reading, recommended reading, and having a development team focused on digital learners. One stated, "This is a hot topic for us this year."

Some leaders explained practices causing them to stand out from the other institutions in the study. They shared practices like "hiring teaching technology designers," or "utilizing their information technology departments to instruct faculty on technology, including the *Kindle* and *iPad*." One reported, "I would say 85% of the faculty are engaged in teaching through technology." However, the most noted standout institutions have invited consultants to train faculty beyond the mere use of technology to topics such as Concept Mapping, Information Literacy, and *Flipping the Classroom*. Institutions used consultants like *LearningHouse* (http://www.learninghouse.com) and Mark Taylor (http://taylorprograms.org) for faculty development. One academic vice-president said, "We were somewhat successful in changing some minds last year when we brought in Mark Taylor to talk about *flipping the classroom*." Some are investigating learning management systems like *Moodle* (https://moodle.org). One university shared it has a strong driven value statement about 'how students learn', used in faculty development and individual coaching.

Table 4.16

Percentage of Faculty who Involve Students in Digital Learning

	Frequency	Percent
A. 0-29%	46	49.5
B. 30-49%	25	26.9
C. 50-79%	15	16.1
D. 80-100%	4	4.3
No Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

Study participants responded to the question regarding the percentage of faculty involving students in digital learning. The largest group was Cluster A at 46 or 49.5% with 0-29% engaging students. Cluster B was next at 25 or 26% with 30-49%, Cluster C was at 15 or 16.1% with 50-79%, and the smallest groups was Cluster D at 4 or 4.3% with 80-100%.

Table 4.17

Institutions That Train Faculty on the Way Students Learn Today

	Frequency	Percent
A. Yes	48	51.6
B. No	41	44.1
No Response	2	2.2
Total	93	100.0

Regarding teaching with students' learning style in mind, institutions responded to the question about whether they trained faculty in how today's students learn. The response was Cluster A at 48 or 51.6% saying yes, and Cluster B at 41 or 44.1% saying no.

Academic leaders responded to a question regarding whether their institution had sought to train faculty about how today's students learn. Many discussed professional development methods employed when asked, "Have you conducted faculty professional development on the adapting teaching methods and curriculum to meet the needs of the digital learner?" However, this question revealed more information on this topic. Many responses revealed minimal concern for how students learn today and why they have not trained faculty in this area. Responses were as follows:

- "It is not a top priority."

- "We have limited time and resources."

- "We have limited staff."

- "We have no expertise."

- "We have too many other pressing issues."

- "We are not convinced this is a valid issue (suspicious).

- "This training is unnecessary."

- "We leave it up to our faculty to informally research this for themselves."

Others who are concerned about this training gave these responses: we are about to, we have had one workshop, we have learned technology, but not its relationship to

students and learning. One said, "Previous administrations have not even been aware that such a thing existed."

The research revealed a number of innovative faculty development practices about teaching according to today's learning methods. Responses to this initiative were as follows:

- "We are researching and having discussions on how this happens."

- "We are working to develop the best content and delivery method."

- "We have not done this very well, but we have attempted to make faculty aware of changes in the way digital-age students learn.

Some stated they were developing this in their faculty training through online training forums, new faculty seminar, and mentoring discussion. One leader said, "My own doctoral research was focused on collaborative learning for intercultural adaptation with students abroad. We press collaborative learning as a result, to prepare them for the junior and senior terms abroad where they become highly collaborative in student learning teams of 6-10."

Table 4.18

Educational Philosophy: Student-centered or Teaching-centered

	Percent
A. Student (Curriculum and teaching practices adapted to student learning style)	44.1
B. Teaching (Student learning style must adapt to curriculum and teaching practices)	46.2
C. Both	1.1
No response	8.6
Total	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding whether their institution's education philosophy was more student-centered or teaching-centered. Cluster B. reported 43 or 46.2% teaching-centered and Cluster A. reported 41 or 44.1% student-centered.

When participants responded to the question, regarding whether their institution's educational philosophy was student-centered or teaching-centered, most said they were student-centered. Some who were teaching-centered responded: "Many of our staff have been teaching for years and are resistant to moving toward a student-centered model; our college is still operating on the traditional model assumed to be necessary 60-70 years ago. Other responses were:

- "We desire to bring our philosophy into the 21st century."

- "We are intentionally transitioning from teaching-centered to student-centered, most faculty are traditionally trained and accustomed to their own learning style.

- "We are transitioning to more student-focused learning; continuing to adjust.

Still other responses were:

- "We are in the midst of a paradigm shift with growing faculty interest (new generation of faculty) in these topics."

- "Goals are written in student-centered terms, but some faculty may operate more along the teacher-centered style.

- "Administration and faculty leadership would say student-centered, but many faculty persist in teaching-centered teaching, thinking they are being student-centered."

- "We are a mix, but working on methods for Millennials".

Academic leaders with a student-centered educational philosophy explained, "student-centered varies by teacher still; many of our courses include creative options (e.g., video presentation vs. paper). Faculty are encouraged to lecture no more than 20 minutes without an activity of some sort. This is still a growing area, but this is our philosophy; different instructors have different inclinations, however we have stressed a student-centered approach with discussions/workshops on technology and learning styles. The professor is required to adjust his/her teaching to meet course objectives because our mission is to serve the student's needs; within majors, we try to present courses in such a way that different learning styles are employed in the courses."

Some leaders responded with content and methods involving collaborative learning through student groups stating, "We use small classes and have collaborative assignments to maintain active learning and participation of students in academic content" and, "we create opportunities for students to study by themselves." Others mentioned using more active learning and engaging practices saying, "More faculty now engage students in research; more use of travel/trips; more internships required; starting service-learning in courses; in other words, seeking to use more active learning that engages students with content" and, "We are implementing different learning activities that involved various learning styles. We pay attention to research from Perry (1999) and others, and it has been foundational for curricular design not only in individual courses, but also in the creation (and ongoing revision) of our general education program." A few participants viewed their educational philosophies differently, seeing teaching-centered and student-centered as inadequate philosophies. Many referred to learning-outcomes as the focus of their educational philosophies, using student outcomes as the criteria for designing content and teaching practices (not learning styles). One said, "We take a holistic approach to adapting our content and delivery methods to the students' needs."

Two leaders stated that Parker Palmer (http://www.couragerenewal.org/parker) had a major influence on educational philosophies. One academic leader said, "I think we would describe ourselves more along Parker Palmer's notion as *big idea-centered*, where learners and learning leaders (instructors) gather around big ideas, and do whatever the *big idea* calls us to learn and be shaped by it. We call our model *transformational learning* and regard the dichotomy between student-centered and teacher-centered

learning as artificial and somewhat passé." Another said, "I would describe it as *Big Story* centered, with both learners and learning leaders gathered around the Big Themes (See Parker Palmer). We think that in an age of narcissism, neither the Kingdom, nor her agent (the church), are served well by either a student-centered or a teaching-centered approach. Theological institutions must relearn how people learn the *Big Story*, finding themselves in the story, not just masters of their own theories or those of the instructor."

Educational leaders responded to the question regarding what they believed their institution's view is on student desire to construct their own knowledge and meaning with digital information and social media technology. Along with this question, the survey asked them to describe their institution's attitudinal response toward this reality. Would the response be accepting, adapting, resisting, or compromising? Most said they were accepting or adapting. A few believed they were between two rather than one, saying they were resisting and adapting while others were accepting and adapting.

Table 4.19

Institutional Response to the Way Students Construct Truth and Knowledge Today

	Frequency	Percent
A. Acceptance (we must accept this is how students learn today)	16	16.5
B. Adaptation (we must adapt to be relevant while maintaining mission)	75	77.3
C. Resistance (students must adapt to traditional teacher/truth-centered learning)	17	17.5
D. Compromise (student-centered learning will compromise our mission)	4	4.1

Participants responded to the question regarding how they describe their institutional view concerning student desire to construct their own knowledge and meaning from digital learning and social media technology as a position of acceptance, adaptation, rejection, or compromise.

The majority of participants responded that institutions were generally accepting and adapting to the way students construct knowledge today. Although no one indicated their institutions were compromising, a number of them held the opposite position, possibly viewed as resistance. They possess a "Commitment to face-to-face learning, as a community "and" Faculty are not in favor of adaptation;" and "while acceptance and

adaptation are our two strongest views, we want to be accommodating and sensitive to students, but student's learning styles cannot rightly determine our pedagogy."

Among those who believed they were more accepting and adapting, they indicated they were in transition or in-between educational philosophies. These leaders commented:

- "Most faculty understand the need to adapt and have willingly participated in training and discussion groups to assist with the transition…yet some continue to use traditional ways

- I feel they are not yet comfortable moving into a new type of classroom learning experience."

- "I find taking small steps has helped and proved to be effective."

- "We are moving…some faster and some closer than others.

- "We both adapt and accept, although I checked "adaptation" because we do feel that some traditional learning methods are still relevant and important for today's student. At the same time, we emphasize outcomes in designing our courses and assignments, so we are interested in what is actually effective in helping students to learn, whether that is traditional or not.

- "Leadership has stressed the need for adaptation – however, the prevailing attitude among instructors may be acceptance."

- "Once we are properly educated to deal with information literacy, issues like this shouldn't be a problem."

- "We have a growing awareness that we need to accommodate new learning styles."

A number of academic leaders gave insight into their institutional attitudes regarding initiatives toward adapting content and teaching practices to today's learner. One leader was direct in this regard saying, "As president, I am convinced of the need to adapt content and teaching practices to today's learner. My task now is to gain board approval, finance the infrastructure, train the staff, adjust the curriculum, and implement the strategy." Other leaders commented on their strategies with one saying: "Adaptation toward relevancy will promote life-long learning and self-discovery in students; perhaps because we are primarily a younger faculty, we are adapting to intuitive student-centered learning." Other comments: "Using digital information to expand our institutional reach," "It enables us to serve more students in a variety of life situations;" "I believe that while faculty is concerned about time wastage with social media, we see the potential for it. We have found text messaging (broadcast and individual) to be the most effective way of communicating to students, including recruitment and have adapted to this." "We tie all courses to our course management software *Populi* and expect students to download and upload assignments and communicate with instructors through this. *Populi* allows topical discussion forums, which faculty have started using effectively."

Still, concerns exist with regard to certain courses like foundational theology courses, which are more truth-centered, as opposed to technical courses such as math. Other comments included:

- "Our faculty are working hard to direct the use of digital information with truth-centered resources and interaction."

- "We are firmly committed to truth-centered learning, but we are striving to adapt to the way students learn today."

When university leaders shared their institution's view as either accepting or adapting with regard to student desire to construct knowledge and meaning with digital information and social media technology, some shared how they meet this challenge while balancing their biblical, historic institutional mission. One responses was: "realizing that we must accept how students learn today, we are seeking to adapt to be relevant while maintaining the institutional mission without compromise; we must adapt to learners; that's part of being student-centered— however, we need to maintain our mission. Another comment: "We take a reformational view; that there is good, God-given capacity in the created order of how people learn and our creative ability to develop technologies, pedagogies, etc., but we also believe everything is affected by sin and therefore is imperfect. We need to be discerning in our work to use/develop obedient technologies and pedagogies."

Some participants shared a truth/learning-centered view saying, "We view learning as the end, and technologies (whatever they might be) as means - neither information, nor how it is acquired through any number of technologies are the end, transformation of life is the end. So just as we reject 'the sage on the stage', stand and deliver approach to pedagogy, we also reject unprocessed information delivery of any sort, as inadequate, this drastically changes the role of an instructor from being an expert

in their field, to being a catalyzer, coach of information processing, and a mentor for responding appropriately to information." Yet another comment was: "I think we see the means of learning as simply that, a means, what is learned, the *Big Story*, its implications for the world and my story in the *Big Story*, are really what we seek. We don't see new ways of processing information or constructing meaning as being in conflict with our mission, which is to engage students in the *Big Story*. Therefore, our ability to distinguish between ends and means helps us immensely as we have moved from an information/instructor centered model, to a transformational, 'butterfly' metaphor. In a word, we want students to be changed into the likeness of Christ." One leader stated, "This is the trend of Biblical higher education today. This is how students learn and what they are looking for."

Table 4.20 *View on Student Desire to Construct Knowledge and Meaning Themselves*

Faculty Experts or Facilitators		
A	80% experts and 20% facilitators	2
B	75% experts and 25% facilitators	2
C	70% experts and 30% facilitators	3
D	65% experts and 35% facilitators	1
E	60% experts and 40% facilitators	7
F	50% experts and 50% facilitators	13
G	40% experts and 60% facilitators	12
H	5% experts and 75% facilitators	1

University leaders responded to the question regarding whether students perceived faculty as experts with the truth, or do they facilitate discovery? The largest group, Cluster F revealed 50% experts and facilitators. The next largest, Cluster G revealed 40% experts and 60% facilitators. The last group representing more than three institutions was Cluster E at 60% experts and 40% facilitators.

When academic leaders responded to the question regarding whether their students perceived the faculty as experts with the truth, or if they facilitate discovery, the survey reported three areas that affected the outcome— student age, academic discipline and faculty orientation. One leader believed their faculty was 70% experts and 30% facilitators, and that traditional college students expected this, saying, "I think that is a function of student expectation of college. It is the mental construct they begin approaching us with and assume of us. They actually sometimes seem uncomfortable with faculty who don't take the *expert* role." Others stated that some students are lazy and force faculty to be experts and, as students mature, they become more sophisticated about the pursuit of knowledge and truth. One leader uniquely responded about the age of their students, "A guess would be our faculty are viewed by *traditional* (mine) students as 25% expert and 75% facilitator. Interestingly, I would say that our adult program features an average age of 42, probably 100% of our instructors as facilitators. I think that the issues in this survey have as much to do with the nature of good learning as it does with age-appropriate instruction."

A number of leaders shared that academic discipline determined whether students viewed faculty as experts or facilitators. Some said, "Faculty are facilitators in more fact-

based courses. Students expect experts to teach highly conceptual courses." Additionally, if the subject was fact or knowledge-based information such as historical dates, or math or languages, experts would usually teach them. Facilitators would better teach courses that were more philosophical, containing value-based information.

Faculty may be oriented as an expert or facilitator by academic discipline as well as some other factors reported. Most who responded said it varies among faculty and some said there is a current process for having instructors move toward becoming facilitators. Two administrators had comments about being facilitators of learning and discovery. One said "It would limit man's ability to be an expert" and the other said that "It increased the capacity for people to learn and think saying, "I don't know that we would work with this as a binary....we might see overlaps or both with an acknowledgement that any person's ability to be an *expert with the truth* is limited by the fact that we are creatures, not God." The other said, "We are known for teaching people how to think, not what to think."

CCCU and ABHE academic leaders were asked if their faculty facilitated student collaborative learning and social media interaction in and outside the classroom where they can discover and construct truth and knowledge among themselves. Additionally, they were asked to describe any mechanisms they had in place for guiding and controlling missional outcomes toward Biblically based truth-claims and values.

Table 4.21

Instruction Carried Out Requiring Research Using Digital Information Technology

	Frequency	Percent
a. 0-29%	72	77.4
b. 30-49%	15	16.1
c. 50-79%	4	4.3
No Response	2	2.2
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding how much of their instruction was carried out requiring research using digital information technology. Cluster A was the largest group at 72 or 77.4% reported 0-29%. Cluster B at 15 or 16.1% reported 20-49% and Cluster C at 4 or 4.3% reported 50-79%.

Table 4.22

Instruction Carried Out Through Group Projects Using Social Media

	Frequency	Percent
a. 0-29%	34	36.6
b. 30-49%	33	35.5
c. 50-79%	17	18.3
d. 80-100%	8	8.6
Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding how much of their instruction was carried out through group projects using social media. Cluster A was the largest group at 34 or 36.6% reporting 0-29%. Cluster B was close behind at 33 or 35.5% reporting 30-49%. Cluster C at 17 or 18.3% reported 50-79% and Cluster D at 8 or 8.6% reported 80-100%.

Table 4.23

Faculty Use Some Form of Experiential Learning and Communicate Digitally

	Frequency	Percent
A. 0-29%	47	50.5
B. 30-49%	26	28.0
C. 50-79%	7	7.5
D. 80-100%	12	12.9
No Response	1	1.1
Total	93	100.0

Study participants responded to the question regarding what percentage of their faculty use some drama, role-playing, or some form of experiential learning designed to engage a video-game generation. The largest group was Cluster A with 47 or 50.5%, reporting 0-29% faculty usage. The next largest was Cluster B with 26 or 28%, reporting 30-49% faculty usage. Cluster D was 12 or 12.9%, reporting 80-100% faculty usage and the last group, Cluster C was 7 or 7.5%, reporting 50-79% faculty usage.

Table 4.24

*Faculty use group process, collaboration and social
media so students can construct truth*

	Percent
A. Yes	52.7
B. No	46.2
No Response	1.1
Total	100.0

Participants responded to the question regarding whether their faculty uses group

process, collaboration, and social media so students could discover and construct truth.

Cluster A. was 49 or 52.7%, saying yes they did, while Cluster B. was 43 or 46.2%,

saying no they do not.

Numerous academic leaders stated they were planning, initiating, or currently

using various content and teaching practices to utilize a collaborative learning

environment. This environment may include web-based or online learning management

systems, online discussion forums, threaded discussion boards or chat rooms, reading and

response forums in preparation for class discussion, and group work. The group work

could include report forums in and outside class to help complete class assignments, and

discussion forums, which could include faculty input. Those who utilize a collaborative

learning environment have very few faculty using e-learning platforms like *Moodle* and

Sakai learning system, which use Wikis, blogs, etc. One said, "A few faculty had begun to use *Twitter* in their communication and teaching practices.

When leaders responded to the question regarding whether faculty facilitated student collaborative learning and social media interaction, some said "They did not understand the question," "They have not had the opportunity to explore this issue," or "Constructing truth is not a phrase we embrace. We use the terms "discover truth" and "apply truth." One said, "We are much more likely to train students up (indoctrinate) than to trust them to discern for themselves."

Some leaders said this type of learning was not an option for them, stating that "college leadership had not provided direction toward this model of constructing knowledge." Another believed most faculty were not practicing collaborative learning to construct knowledge and truth because faculty may not be engaged in social media as often as students. One who currently uses this practice said, "Only a small percentage of faculty were using collaborative learning through social media for the explicit integration of the faith perspective." Another said, "Our institution currently utilizes the web-study platform to facilitate online learning. In addition to coursework, students are engaged in online chat-rooms and forums in which they are able to discover and construct truth and knowledge for themselves."

One participant represented an institution currently practicing pedagogical development of how people learn today in (their term) *transformative learning*. He or she states, "I would say the most important thing we do here is pedagogical development, including workshops on 'how people learn these days helping instructors develop

transformational assignments. One of the biggest blocks to moving beyond information dump/transmissive education is training instructors in developing both the learning outcomes, and the rubrics for evaluating them, so that they can move to adoption of a more facilitative approach. This would include celebrating the wins of transformational learning (including displays of student's work, be it posters, excellent research, videos, etc."

Table 4.25

Correct or Guide Students to Re-consider More Absolute Thought

	Percent
A. Correct	17.2
B. Guide	73.1
C. Both	7.5
No Response	2.2
Total	100.0

Participants responded to the question: would your faculty correct students for wrong views or guide them to re-consider more absolute thought? Cluster A. at 16 or 17.2% said correct students, Cluster B. at 68 or 73.1% said guide students, and Cluster C. at 7 or 7.5% said both correct and guide.

Some administrators described mechanisms and indicated they used faculty facilitated student collaborative learning and social media interaction where students can

discover and construct truth and knowledge among themselves. Some described mechanisms they had in place for guiding and controlling missional outcomes toward Biblically based truth-claims and values. Though a few said they had no control mechanisms, others said, "We used faculty feedback and interaction on online forums, posts, and discussion boards."

Another said "We use social media and other technological platforms to encourage students to discuss their worldview where faculty monitor, decipher, and shape their view to a more Christian worldview as needed." One stated, "We guide students toward *Biblical truth* with faculty input just as they would face to face in a classroom."

Academic leaders responded to the question regarding whether their faculty would correct students with "wrong" views or guide them to re-consider thought that is more absolute. While some believed their faculty would do both, one said, "We are conservative. However, we do see a switch taking place in a way that would correct and guide students to a deeper understanding. The younger faculty tend to lean more toward the second option (guide to re-consider more absolute thought)." Some leaders said they try to avoid indoctrination, but believe they should guide students to discover truth. One said about the faculty role of a guide, "We correct and guide initially to get their perspective for their choice, but then guide them to the deeper appreciation of the truth."

Some participants shared that their faculty strive to guide in the classroom as well as in outside activities, many seeing themselves as mentors. A number indicated they are moving away from a correcting approach and progressing more toward guidance. One leader stated, concerning whether to correct or guide, "It is only our place to guide

because religion is personal." Another said, "We do not chide them, but rather give more truth information."

Many academic leaders felt their educational philosophy was to respect students as thinkers. They desire students to develop their own convictions, avoid indoctrination and not merely accept other's views, and discover truth while believing they are contributing to their own learning. However, another voice representing universities who tend more toward indoctrination, stated, "The Bible and Ministry Departments will definitely correct people; other departments will too, but not as often, nor as sternly."

Leaders generally believed they were dealing in some way with Millennial students' learning styles. "Faculty realize students come from diverse mindsets and backgrounds and so encourage personal ownership and contribution to their own growth." Some faculty practices mentioned were these: "encouraging students to ask questions and to discover the answers for themselves," "speaking the truth in love," "making clear value statements about Scriptural views in a manner that engages students in owning and developing their convictions," and "facilitating students to dig deeper into Scriptural concepts and truth discovery by asking the question *why*."

Some participants shared their educational philosophies on their content and teaching practices. These practices focus on teaching today's learner *how* to think rather than *what* to think. One shared, "I believe we both guide and correct. Our educational philosophy is built around the principle of teaching students how to think, not what to think. Having said this, I recognize that this still indicates we do the teaching, and students do the learning. It is still a heavily didactic environment." Another shared the

concept about teaching students to find their voice saying, "We are much more concerned students find their own voice to their faith, rather than to articulate someone else's. The former, we believe, contributes to faith-formation; the latter, to conformity at best and atheism at worst."

Three participants shared in-depth views for their respective universities concerning faculty role in leading students into knowledge and truth formation today. The first said, "Faculty generally feel it's more important for students to learn to examine the Scriptures and see for themselves what the Bible teaches. Also, while we are part of a denomination, our student body comes from many denominations, so we try to not to *correct* so that those with different views still feel welcome."

The second said, "Our faculty has taken a *critical realist* perspective by and large…assuming there to be incontrovertible truths, but acknowledging our finite limitations and critical thinking even of our own limited understanding. We see Ephesians 3:18 as indicating that full perception of the love of God (and therefore other truths) only occurs in collaboration of a Body."

The third spoke about knowledge and truth formation, "Short answer: Jesus taught that the way to contribute to the foolishness in the world was to "hear only" and that the way to contribute to "wisdom" was to "hear and obey." If students are to become wise, they must hear and obey it personally, not as the secondhand voice of another. Actually correcting students by voice only is to contribute to unbelief and disobedience (foolishness)."

Missional Compromise

As mentioned previously, in the 1960's and early 1970's, some Christian higher learning institutions began to separate from other historic faith-related institutions. Two organizations formed believing many Christian universities were moving away from their Christian heritage and mission and a movement was needed to sustain the Biblical and Christian mission in Christian Higher Education (Association of Biblical Higher Education History and Mission, 2014; Council of Christian Colleges and Universities History and Mission, 2014). Although these organizations have faced many societal challenges during their existence, the Millennial student learning style challenge and the digital learning revolution may be among the most significant challenges impacting institutions of higher education today (Debard, 2004; Noel & Levitz, 2009; Oblinger, 2003).

The following is a synopsis of the research results relating to the attitudes and beliefs of the CCCU and ABHE institutions regarding missional compromise versus adapting content and teaching practices toward student learning style relevancy. The universities generally agree that mission is foremost. Some believe the teaching practice or process is neutral. While others take the opposing view believing adapting both content and teaching practices could compromise their mission. Some academic leaders responded that stakeholders had mixed attitudes across their campuses. Some see alternative content and delivery methods as a wave of the future, while others see technology as distraction or even a learning threat. Many report that their Boards of Trustees do not express concern about a conflict between their institution's mission and

alternative delivery methods. With other leaders, alternative delivery methods are only considerations because administrators doubt these methods can accomplish their mission.

The majority of participants responded that institutions were generally accepting and adapting to the way students construct knowledge today. Although no one indicated their institutions were compromising, a number of them held the opposite position, possibly viewed as resistance. Academic stakeholders who consider alternative content and delivery methods expressed concern that the institution could lose control and purpose of their biblical mission and vision aligned with curriculum objectives of Christian universities. They believe a university should use the advantages of information technology, but not at the expense of maintaining missional integrity. Others view distance education and hybrid learning platforms as a missional threat.

Summary

This chapter presented an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered in this descriptive study about how the Millennial generation impacts the delivery of content and teaching practices of CCCU and ABHE members. I asked ninety-three participants a series of questions. I presented the results in four categories: demographic information, institutional research and adaptation/resistance, education philosophy and faculty teaching practices, and university mission. Each category consisted of various emerging themes based on the study's research questions, beginning with quantitative data tables, a description of the results, and qualitative data integrated under the categorical themes.

The final chapter will provide review and discussion of chapter IV's most notable findings. Chapter V will summarize the implications according to the study's research questions and discuss their relative importance to university administrative leaders and faculty of Christian missional institutions. The final discussion will focus on how these institutions could respond in the immediate future.

CHAPTER V

Introduction

This chapter provides a review and summarizes the most notable findings

presented in Chapter IV. Millennial students' learning style is having a significant impact

on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian institutional members of the

CCCU and ABHE.

Chapter V's purpose is to summarize demographics and the most notable

implications according to the study's research questions and discuss their relative

importance to university administrative leaders and faculty of Christian missional

institutions. The final discussion focuses on the possible responses of these institutions in

the immediate future.

Demographic Description

The representative sample in this study comprised 93 provosts or chief academic

officers. These 93 participated in the study from the 315 institutions I invited. All invited

institutions were CCCU or ABHE members. Slightly more than half had enrollments

under 500 students. The second and third largest groups were very similar. Each

represented nearly 25% of the sample with enrollments of 1,000-2,999 and 500-999

students respectively. Only one college had an enrollment over 3,000 students.

The 93 participants reported the following information that identified their

institutional location in one of four geographic regions. The Midwest was the largest

representation with 33 or 35.5%. The Eastern U.S. was the second largest, representing

27 or 29%. The Western U.S. represented 19 or 24%, and the smallest were outside the U.S., representing 14 or 15.1%.

I grouped institutional religious affiliations into five categories. The largest affiliation was Non-denominational, representing 33 or 35.5%. The second largest was Baptist, representing 15 or 16.1%. The third largest included three similar affiliations—the Christian Church/Church of Christ, Assemblies of God, and Presbyterian, representing 5 or 5.1%, 4 or 4.3%, and 4 or 4.3% respectively. The fourth largest included five similar affiliations—the Christian Church, Mennonite Brethren, Nazarene, Pentecostal, and Wesleyan, all representing 3 or 3.2%. The fifth largest were two similar affiliations—Church of God (Holiness) and Methodist, representing 2 or 2.2%.

Research Categories and Questions

I asked ninety-three participants nineteen questions following the demographic questions. I presented results in four categories: institutional research and adaptation/resistance; education philosophy and faculty teaching practices; university advancement (the category university advancement is included with institutional research and adaptation resistance in Chapter IV), and Mission.

Millennial Impact Summary of Research Results

Research Question 1: What are CCCU and ABHE institutions doing to understand the change in generational attitudes and motivational behavior of Millennial learning?

I investigated this question through gathering descriptive survey information using percentage and open-ended questions. CCCU and ABHE participants gave varying responses about their conducting research on how today's Millennial students construct

knowledge and truth. Few stated they were conducting institutional research on how today's students construct knowledge. The majority stated they do not believe it is a priority. Others said they do not have the time, resources, or even knowledge of the issue to gauge its importance.

Some who have prioritized the issue had academic team members assigned to help inform the general faculty and administration about knowledge construction's importance. These teams help faculty understand these issues and evaluate widespread higher education trends to adapt teaching content and delivery practice. Some shared research tools like questionnaires, surveys, worldview tests, portfolios, capstone presentations, course evaluations, and the tool Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). They use these methods to inform themselves about students' learning approaches.

Most sampled participants were generally unaware of the ways in which students construct knowledge today and assign very little importance to it in light of other prioritized university objectives. This attitude generally prevailed among CCCU and ABHE institutions.

Research Question 2: What kind of mechanisms or teaching tools do CCCU and ABHE institutions have in place to balance student styles in learning with the learning biases of current faculty and administration?

CCCU and ABHE participants answered percentage and open-ended questions in the survey. Most were receptive to adapting their institutional view to one that realizes students prefer to construct their own knowledge and meaning using digital information

and social media technology. This means institutions would willingly become relevant to students' learning styles while maintaining the school's mission. About 15% said they believed they are accepting, meaning they accept students' learning styles. Another 15% said they believed they are resistant, meaning students should adapt to traditional truth-centered learning. A small percentage said the institution would compromise its mission if they were student-centered in this way.

The survey asked participants if they believed students perceived faculty as either experts with the truth or facilitators of discovery. The participant's responses was evenly divided. Participants indicated that half of the students perceived faculty as experts and half perceived them as facilitators. Many said they have been working with their faculty to develop them more as facilitators. Some admit that especially older faculty sometimes finds it difficult to change even when they agree to comply with new theories and methods. Other participants stated that the faculty's academic discipline also determined whether students viewed faculty as experts or facilitators. Some said more pragmatic courses usually have facilitators, while students in conceptual courses usually expect expert teachers. The majority indicated they primarily use traditional methods of content and delivery methods (such as a lecture) in traditional classrooms where the desks face the instructor. CCCU and ABHE institutions should develop faculty initiatives to improve teaching content and delivery methods. This development is critical considering the open access and exploding information age that uses newer digital trends to acquire knowledge in and out of the classroom.

Participants revealed the majority of institutions have increased campus digital

wireless capacity to 80-100%. A few universities have provided faculty with their own

Ipods, and one university gives each student an *Ipod* when they arrive as freshmen. These

efforts are noteworthy. More noteworthy, however, is that the majority of CCCU and

ABHE institutions have a limited budget. They are limited in technology use and

advancement in the traditional classroom. They are limited in the research and

advancement of information technology use in online delivery systems (distance

learning), with minimal courses available in online or hybrid format. CCCU and ABHE

institutions must improve the balance of student learning styles with faculty and

administration learning biases. The situation is less balanced than expected, which is a

cause for concern.

Research Question 3: How are CCCU and ABHE institutions adapting to meet the

Millennial learning styles and the strategic use of a student-centered learning paradigm

and digital media to improve the effectiveness of their mission?

CCCU and ABHE participants gave varying responses to this research question.

The survey gave participants the opportunity to choose a position for an institutional

attitudinal view: accepting, adapting, resisting, or compromising. The majority is

currently adapting facilities for information technology uses, and they have conducted

faculty professional development to adapt teaching methods and curriculum to the digital

information learner's needs. Though most instruction is still lecture-oriented, many

faculty are adapting to student learning styles. They use innovative digital instruction,

content and delivery methods like podcasts, and web-downloads for missed or additional

lectures. They also use supplemental video, multimedia, *PowerPoint*, travel, experiential learning activities, and peer-constructed learning venues (blogging and *Wiki* use) in and outside the classroom.

The survey asked CCCU and ABHE participants about whether their institution's educational philosophy was student-centered or teaching-centered. Most said they were student-centered in the open-ended (qualitative) response. However, slightly more than half indicated they were teaching-centered in the quantitative response. When participants explained, many said while the faculty and administration would prefer to think they were student-centered, they are not in the truest sense of the concept. Some shared that resistance existed to student-centered learning because faculty have been teaching-centered for many years and find it difficult to change. Or, their college has operated with a traditional model (thought necessary) for 60 – 70 years, and most faculty are traditionally trained and accustomed to their learning preference. Some participants shared their desire to understand the 21st century learning style and to adapt content and teaching methods to Millennial thinking. Robert J. Sternberg (2011), provost, senior vice president, and Regents Professor of Psychology and Education at Oklahoma State University has some insight from a study of faculty learning bias and student preferred learning styles:

> The first finding was that institutions differ widely in the styles of thinking that they reward. Hence, it is important for students to select a college or university …*that (mine)* value*s* at least to some degree the kinds of learning and thinking that best characterize a particular student. The second relevant finding was that

teachers tend to overestimate the extent to which students match their own profile of learning and thinking styles. Teachers often teach in a way that reflects their own preferred styles of learning. They believe they are teaching in ways that meet the needs of diverse students, when in fact they often are not. In essence, we are at risk for teaching to ourselves rather than to our students. The third key finding was that teachers tended to grade more highly students whose profiles of learning and thinking better matched their own. (pp. 6-9)

Student-centered for the purpose of this study refers to the curriculum and teaching practices adapted to the students' learning style and not the opposite. Sternberg's (2011) study advocated this as the best method for student learning and success, and the method could be a significant criterion for choosing the school best aligning with their preferred learning style.

CCCU and ABHE participants who indicated that "student-centered" was their educational philosophy explained that teaching practices still vary by teacher. One gave an example where faculty are encouraged to lecture no more than 20 minutes without an activity of some sort. Others admit different instructors have different inclinations; however, institutions have stressed a student-centered approach with faculty discussions/workshops on technology and learning styles. One college encourages courses including creative options (e.g. multimedia presentation vs. paper). One remarkable leader espousing the student-centered approach said the professor is required to adjust his/her teaching to ensure meeting course objectives. The mission is to serve the

student's needs…instructors present courses so that he/she accounts for different learning styles.

Some study participants, responding to the open-ended survey question, contributed alternative educational philosophies. They see "teaching-centered" and "student-centered" as inadequate philosophies. They focus their educational philosophies on "learning-outcomes" or "learning-centered," using student outcomes as criteria for designing content and teaching practice (rather than learning styles). Another focuses on student needs and not necessarily learning style. Participants cited notable philosophies from educational theorists and practitioners such as Parker Palmer. Participants suggested education philosophies such as truth-centered learning, *transformational learning*, *big-idea* and *Big Story centered*, and *Big Themes*. Proponents of these theories emphasize the inadequacy of student-centered and teaching-centered learning theories, proposing a grander theory of learning in and beyond this world.

CCCU and ABHE participants answered percentage questions in the survey indicating relatively few institutions who executed Millennial-relevant instruction. Those few who did mentioned instruction that included research using digital information technology, group projects using social media, drama, role-playing, or experiential learning. One institution stated they designed instruction to engage a multimedia *Avatar* generation.

The few institutions, who executed Millennial-relevant instruction, stated more than half of their faculty use some form of group process, collaboration, and social media so students can construct knowledge and truth. In the open-ended survey answers,

numerous participants stated they were planning, initiating, or currently using various content and teaching practices to develop a collaborative learning environment. These practices include web-based or online learning management systems, peer online discussion forums, threaded discussion boards or chat rooms, and reading and response forums that prepare students for class discussion. Practices also include group work in and outside class to prepare for class assignments and discussion forums that include faculty. Few faculty, however, participate in this teaching style at this time.

According to the study's sampled participants, institutions increasingly prioritize teaching content level and delivery practice adaptations for Millennial Learners. They desire to increase digital student-centered learning paradigms to improve mission effectiveness. However, institutions lack adequate understanding of these issues, and reveal fewer adaptation efforts than expected.

Research Question 4: Do stakeholders view these adaptations as compromise to their constituents and a threat to their institutional mission of spiritual formation?

CCCU and ABHE study participants answered percentage and open-ended questions asking them to choose their university priority: would they develop students for a specific missional criteria or appeal to Millennials' progressive learning styles and needs so they will enroll to fulfill the university mission? Fifty-one percent answered that keeping their missional criteria was their main priority. Forty-three percent said they valued missional criteria and student appeal and learning styles equally. Five percent chose student appeal and learning styles as their priority. I asked a second time to those answering that both choices were equally valuable what percentage they felt represented

each priority. The result was a little more than half chose missional priority over student appeal and learning styles.

Many CCCU and ABHE participants stated they are, and have been traditional colleges. Some revealed distrust for alternate content and delivery methods, and others did not. One leader stated about those resistant to innovations in content and delivery methods, "Those who have not learned online are not sure you can have a quality online teaching experience *compared to those who have experienced online learning* (italics mine)." In an effort to be progressive and remain effective, some indicated they continually evaluate and examine teaching content and methods of delivery. One progressive administrator said, "It has never occurred to anyone that method of delivery could compromise content." Some indicated they make intentional efforts to integrate faith perspectives into course content and assignments. This effort was a clear missional and institutional objective.

Some innovative universities report intentionally innovation. Administrative boards, faculty, and students embrace opportunity without compulsion for alternative delivery formats such as seminary, graduate, and undergraduate online education. On the other hand, some administrators argue that digital or online education does not have the same transformative personal development and spiritual formation as face-to-face education.

CCCU and ABHE academic stakeholders face challenging concerns when considering alternative content and delivery practices. They fear loss of control, biblical mission, and vision in aligning with curriculum objectives of their Christian universities. .

A fear of decrease in educational quality was also noted as a result less or no face-to-face inter-action. They believe a university should use the advantages of information technology, but not at the expense of missional integrity. In considering the integration of faith and learning, most participants are committed to increasing use of new methods, but some stakeholders still have reservations about their integrity.

CCCU and ABHE study participants answered percentage and open-ended questions asking them if they believed their faculty would correct students for holding wrong views or guide them to reconsider thought that is more absolute. The majority (73%) answered they would guide them. Open-ended responses defined the nature of guiding as to not indoctrinate or correct, but to listen to students' perspective, discern and show respect for their choice, and guide them to discover and have deeper appreciation for truth. Some felt they were moving away from a correcting to a guiding approach. One said, "It is only the faculty's place to guide because conviction of beliefs and values being so deeply personal."

Participants agreed about the importance of guiding students to knowledge discovery and truth in a way that invites and increases ownership of truth claims. Participants are respecting the way students think, not only what they should know and believe. Some faculty practices mentioned are these: encouraging students to ask questions and discover their own answers, speaking the truth in love, making clear value statements about Scriptural views in a way that keeps students engaged in owning and developing their convictions, and facilitating students to investigate Scriptural concepts.

Although most CCCU and ABHE participants supported guiding students over correcting them, today's Millennial students' construction of knowledge and truth is a concern. What should a Christian missional institution do about independent, self-managed construction of knowledge and truth through social media and online digital forums like *Wiki,* where no apparent censorship or moral control mechanisms exist? Though a few said they have no control mechanisms, some described mechanisms they have in place for guiding and controlling missional outcomes toward biblically-based truth-claims and values. Others said they use faculty feedback and interaction in online forums, posts, and discussion boards. Another said they use social media and other technological platforms to encourage students to discuss their worldview. Faculty monitor, decipher, and shape their view to a more Christian worldview as needed.

In considering study participants' answers, stakeholders view these adaptations as necessary to institutional effectiveness for this generation. This view mixes with concern that missional priority of spiritual formation may be compromised. Thus, participants reveal some resistance to alternative innovations in content and delivery practices. Leaders lack adequate understanding of the issue and reveal lower acceptance levels of adaptation because of concern for missional integrity.

Research Question 5: If CCCU and ABHE institutions develop a strategic plan that includes distance-learning programs, what would be the impact on their missional environments and objectives?

CCCU and ABHE study participants answered percentage and open-ended questions about distance learning. The questions sought to reveal progressive institutions

that could exemplify their understanding and adapting content and teaching practices to today's learning styles.

Participants answered two quantitative questions regarding whether their institutions purposefully sought to train faculty in today's learning style, using adaptation strategies in content and teaching practices. They also answered questions regarding whether stakeholders faced concern about missional compromise in adapting online delivery or distance education. Regarding training for teaching to a new learning style, the response was 48 or 51.6% of institutions saying yes, they do train instructors, and 41 or 44.1% saying no, they do not train instructors. Regarding stakeholder concern about missional compromise in adapting to online delivery or distance education, 41 or 44.1% of institutions indicated yes, they have concern, and 40 or 43% of institutions indicated no, university stakeholders do not have concern.

Study participants answered open-ended questions from a variety of perspectives, which helped explain their responses. CCCU and ABHE universities generally agree that mission is foremost. Some believe the method or teaching process is neutral while others take the opposing view. Academic stakeholders considering alternative content and delivery methods have concern that adaptation will result in loss of control and purpose of biblical mission, and could lose vision aligned with the curriculum objectives of Christian universities. I noted among academic leaders a fear of decrease in educational quality because of less (or no) face-to-face interaction. The leaders stated a university should use the advantages of information technology, but not at the expense of maintaining missional integrity. Some see distance education and hybrid-learning

platforms as a missional threat that may decrease educational quality. One leader stated, "We are concerned about making disciples in the sense that online learning compromises that capacity." Another leader took the opposite approach saying, "This is the trend of biblical higher education today. This is how students learn and what they are looking for."

Some responses indicated a movement within biblical higher education to innovate content and teaching practices for Millennial learners. They want their institutions to remain strategically and missionally effective by embracing new technologies and methodology (like distance learning) without compromise. Some leaders described their adaptation as slow and/or limited by budget, while others are progressive innovators, keeping pace or even at the forefront of the information technology curve.

Three institutions stated they provided every new student with their own *Ipod.* One mentioned the use of *Populi*, a *Cloud-based* course management system. Some mention futuristic strategic planning initiatives, upgrading technological services and incorporating different classroom instruction platforms. These include (what is called) *flipping the classroom*, *smart classrooms, smart podiums,* and hybrid courses with exercises and assignments posted online in individual or discussion format. Two universities are planning advanced innovation with two faculty committees dedicated to the research and adaptation of information technology pedagogy. Another leader recently completed doctoral studies exploring collaborative learning for intercultural adaptation with students abroad. However, the most noteworthy examples brought in consultants to

train faculty beyond the mere use of technology on topics such as *concept mapping*, *information literacy*, and *flipping the classroom*.

When considering the impact of the Millennial Student and the institution's strategic plan for adaption to relevant and effective alternative content and teaching practices, a few innovative leaders stood out among the sampled participant institutions, believing innovation was a top priority. 5.4 % are investing over $200,000. year on innovative research and adaptations within the traditional classroom and 2.2 % are investing over $200,000. on alternative content and delivery methods. Innovators shared progressive practices like hiring innovative faculty training consultants and teaching technology designers, as well as utilizing their information technology departments to instruct faculty on technology. 43% of the participants piloting and adapting alternative content and delivery formats say they have no concern for missional compromise.

Summary for Educational Decision Makers

This study sought to illuminate implications on how the Millennial student is impacting the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian institutional members of the CCCU and ABHE. The digital generation is forcing institutional change across every spectrum of society, and current generational CCCU and ABHE leaders must face this changing environment without compromising their Christian mission. Educational leaders must admit their generational bias and understand the best methods for the delivery of content and teaching practices to today's learning styles. They must adapt and operate in a learning-centered academic paradigm to fit the learning style and needs of this technologically and culturally sophisticated generation.

Christian higher education must address these issues, or Millennial students will select other institutions adapted to suit their learning style, even over the criteria of faith and spiritual formation. Some non-Christian missional institutions may have more student appeal if the schools are generally less expensive, technologically advanced, and more open in constructive thought and innovative ideas (Erickson, 2005). Christian universities must not ignore the changes necessary to facing the Millennial generation's learning style and must improve their institutions, thus accomplishing the mission of spiritual formation and Christ-like development.

Implications for Educational Decision Makers

Institutional Relevance

This study could help many decision makers in Christian colleges and universities, because little literature exists to help them understand the intergenerational conflict of learning styles. This study could help them understand the ramifications of adapting their institution's content and teaching practices without having their missional objectives compromised. The issue not only challenges the mission of these institutions, but it potentially challenges their future enrollments, so understanding is critical. If Millennial students perceive a Christian university to be irrelevant to their Net Generation learning style, they may attend a university that engages their self-managed digital information mindset and draws them into multiple technologies and interactive social learning environments (Sternberg, 2011).

Innovative Engagement

If Boomer and Gen X administration and faculty do not understand and adapt their institutions to Millennial student learning styles, they may not succeed in their generational mission. This study revealed the following results for CCCU and ABHE institutions: over 50% continue to rely primarily on lecture; less than 30% engage students through digital means, multimedia, interactive, experiential, and socially constructive digital learning; only 3 universities are investing significantly in content and teaching practice adaptations. If faculty primarily use a lecture-method (as in the past) or occasionally use a Power Point presentation, but do not foster more digital content and teaching practices inside and outside the classroom, they may lack relevance (Brown & Adler, 2008; Roberts, 2005). If academic instruction does not change from an instructor or curriculum-centered paradigm to a student-centered paradigm, enrollment may be at future risk (Astin, 1993; Barr & Tagg, 1995; Sternberg, 2011; Tapscott, 1998).

Legitimate concerns exist for spiritual formation and character development when grappling with the Net Generation's constructive learning style (Brown, 2005) rather than using a transmitter (Tapscott, 1998) of truth and knowledge. More research is necessary about learning styles centering on self-management, peer collaboration, social media and socially constructive learning. This learning may lack absolutes and legitimacy. Christian institutions must look for ways to maintain their mission while keeping this generation engaged, since engagement is linked to student persistence and success (Astin, 1993; Oblinger, 2005; Prensky, 2001; Tapscott, 1998).

More studies are necessary to understand and engage the Millennial mindset through instruction with experiential learning. Porter (2008) has explored and used innovative practices to educate and engage Millennial students. He writes, "Just getting them to show up for class can be difficult! Because there is a correlation between student engagement and success, including persistence to graduation, encouraging student engagement is important to me" (p. 230). Porter teaches religion classes and has used games and role-play in class to significantly improve student engagement and success. He has adapted his teaching style to the Millennial gamer and simulation learning style. Prensky (2001) and Roberts (2005) would support these experiences, since Millennials grew up playing roles in video games. They naturally acquire skills to reach new levels. Christian universities and colleges may need to explore these student-centered teaching methods if they value faculty-to-student interaction, involvement, and engagement. These methods enable them to teach in a relevant Millennial learning style.

Learn from Others

As professional educators, we should seek and obtain innovative educational philosophies from others who have begun the path of adapting content and delivery practices to this generation. Some CCCU and ABHE innovators are willing to collaborate and share their knowledge about the pursuit of effective missional objectives to this generation. CCCU and ABHE study participants gave a surprising amount of response; their feedback was informative and relevant. These Christian institutions have noticed societal changes and the impact of the Millennial generation. They are planning or executing their response to these students' technological, learning, and social behaviors.

Institutions can also learn from innovative, progressive public and private universities and should consider these innovations without bias. Although Christian institutions should preserve spiritual formation and their missional objectives, they should explore neutral content and delivery practices of public universities. For example, Sternberg's (2011) institution has a Learning and Student Success Opportunity Center that intervenes with students specifically to orient them toward meeting their diverse learning and thinking styles. Similarly, his Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence instructs teachers how to meet students' stylistic needs.

Further Research Needed

Christian universities and colleges face an enormous task in order to remain effective and relevant for Millennial Learners (and those after them). While this discussion has looked at generational differences, conflicts, Millennial thinking and learning, and the challenge to adapt as Christian missional institutions, much more research is necessary. With declining abilities for families to cover the escalating cost of private education and changes in student enrollment motivation noted, research is necessary concerning Millennial motivations to choose lower-cost or perceived relevant public institutions over the values of Christian education and spiritual formation. A survey targeting Millennial Christian college-age students would reveal their feelings about public versus private Christian education. A survey may reveal whether their spiritual formation is important or whether they received enough formation by growing up in church. In addition, we must know if socio-economic and/or socio-cultural backgrounds produce different attitudes and styles in the above questions.

Christian institutions of higher education should know more about initiatives like adapting facilities, technological capabilities, curriculum design, teaching paradigms, and professional development. Additionally, they should understand concepts such as learning-centered, truth-centered, and transformational learning in order to improve institutional effectiveness to the Net Generation. The Millennial Learners Survey provided some beginning data on these issues. Further study is necessary to show how the organizational culture and affiliation to a particular theological system or denomination may impact an institution's ability to understand and adapt to Millennial learning styles. More importantly, there needs to be more study on how institutions can achieve adaptation in a student-centered delivery of content and teaching practices, integrating faith with new learning styles, without compromising their spiritual formation and character developmental mission. Institutions would benefit from further study by discovering and understanding exemplar universities who model the way of adaptation without compromise.

Summary

Millennial students are dominating the university campus with certain characteristics that make them a unique challenge to their Boomer and Generation X educators. These educators may still hold to the traditional cognitive-social learning styles of previous generations. In the last decade, authors published a fair amount of literature concerning Millennial attitudes and behaviors, particularly as they began attending college (Coomes & DeBard, 2004; DeBard, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Sax, 2003). Previous generations must face the challenge to

understand and adapt this generation's social and highly technological learning style (Berger & Milem, 1999; Brown & Adler, 2008; Chickering & Gamson, 1999; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Perry, 1999; Prensky, 2001; Wilson, 2004).

These challenges particularly affect private Christian universities who may have limited understanding of Millennial cognitive-social learning styles and may struggle to adapt to a learning style that is not their own or one they do not value as effective (Porter, 2008). Also, they may have limited funding for technological and facility adaptation to Millennial students. This matter has serious missional consequence for these institutions who value successful student persistence regarding spiritual formation, graduation rates, and community citizenship (Braxton, Milem, & Sullivan, 2000; Sax, 2004; Tinto, 1993). If Millennials perceive that institutions have little interest in understanding them and adapting to their learning style, the result could be lower enrollment interest, satisfaction and retention. Christian institutions like the CCCU and the ABHE cannot afford to settle for successful methods of the past, or they may fail to accomplish their mission to Millennials and future generations.

Millennial students have certain life and learning expectations, which if not addressed, could have major implications on institutional effectiveness in our progressive and changing global society. The pressure to adapt and remain effective with today's students has never been more challenging. Public universities and colleges are competing more than ever, with similar missions focused on shaping and developing future leaders just as Christian institutions. The motivation to educate and develop future generations into leaders has not changed, but students have changed.

Millennial students' learning style and the progressively changing digital and social-media environment are having significant impact on Christian missional institutions like the CCCU and the ABHE in the same manner as public universities. Educational leaders should develop further understanding and adaptation regarding these phenomena, adding priority to effect of the Millennial Learners' impact. The adaptation of the delivery of content and teaching practices will sustain and improve institutional enrollment, technological advancement, professional faculty training, student satisfaction, student success, and missional effectiveness.

References

Ashley, J. (Ed.). (2004). *The relevant church: A new vision for communities of faith.* Lake Mary, FL: Relevant Books.

Association for Biblical Higher Education. (2014). *Association for Biblical higher education: Mission*. Retrieved from http://www.abhe.org/pages/NAV-OurMission.html

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2010). Exploring and nurturing the spiritual life of college students. *Journal of College and Character, 11*(3), 1-9.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27*(6), 12–25.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1997). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in causal model of student persistence. *Research in Higher Education*, *40*(6), 641-664.

Braxton, J. M., Milem, J. F., & Sullivan, A. S. (2000). The influence of active learning on the college student departure process toward a revision of Tinto's theory. *The Journal of higher education, 71*(5), 569-590.

Brown, M. (2005). Learning spaces. *Educause*, Retrieved on from

www.educause.edu/learningspaces

Brown, J. S., & Adler, P. R. (2008). Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail,

and learning 2.0. *Educause Review*, *42*(6), 16–32.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2010). *The Carnegie*

classification of institutions of higher education 2005: Basic categories.

Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/summary/basic.php

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). The seven principles for good

practice in undergraduate education. *American Higher Education Association,*

39(7), *3-7.*

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (Eds). (1991). Applying the seven principles for

Good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and*

Learning. 47, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coomes, M. D. (2004). Understanding the historical and cultural influences that

shape generations. *New Directions for Student Services, 106*, 17-31.

Coomes, M. D., & DeBard, R. (2004). A generational approach to understanding

students. *New Directions for Student Services, 106*, 5-16.

Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (2014). *Council for Christian Colleges &*

Universities: About. Retrieved from http://www.cccu.org/about

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among*

five approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeBard, R. (2004). Millennials coming to college. *New Directions for Student Services*, *106*, 33-45.

Erickson, T. (2005). *Do adaptive initiatives erode Christian colleges' strong mission orientation?* (Doctoral Dissertation). Trinity Western University. Retrieved from http://www.cbfa.org/Erickson.pdf

Fain, P. (2013). Intel on adaptive learning. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/04/04/gates-foundation-helps-colleges-keep-tabs-adaptive-learning-technology#ixzz2ev04JIv0

Frand, J. L. (2000). The information-age mindset: Changing students and implications for higher education. *Educause Review*, *35*(5), 15-24.

Galanes, G., & Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2009). *Socially constructing communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd Ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Greenleaf, R. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* Westfield, IN: Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.

Holmes, A. F. (1977). *All truth is God's truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Erdmans.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Jehn, K. A., & Jonsen, K. A. (2010) Multi-method approach to the study of sensitive organizational issues. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *4*(4), 313-341. DOI: 10.1177/1558689810380920.

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kiley, K. (2013). Price of a bad economy. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/05/07/nacubo-survey-reports-sixth-consecutive-year-discount-rate-increases

Koljatic, M., & Kuh, G. D. (2001). A longitudinal assessment of college student engagement in good practices in undergraduate education. *Higher Education, 42,* 351–371.

Kolowich, S. (2012a). Digital faculty: Professors and technology. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/digital-faculty-professors-and-technology-2012

Kolowich, S. (2012b). Into the fray. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/07/17/uva-and-11-others-become-latest-plan-moocs#ixzz20soqxabL

Kolowich, S. (2012c). Online learning and liberal arts colleges. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/06/29/liberal-arts-college-explore-uses-blended-online-learning

Lancaster, L., & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Lederman, D. (2013). CFO survey reveals doubts about financial sustainability. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/cfo-survey-reveals-doubts-about-financial-sustainability#ixzz2YptsDxdD

Lederman, D., & Jaschik, S. (2013). Survey of faculty attitudes on technology. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/survey-faculty-attitudes-technology#ixzz2dApGqwwi

Levitz, R. S., Noel, L., & Richter, B. J. (1998). Strategic moves for retention success. *New Direction for Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. *108,* 31-49.

Noel-Levitz. 2009. 2009 National student satisfaction and priorities report: Executive summary. *Noel-Levitz Inc*. Retrieved from https://www.noellevitz.com/documents/shared/Papers_and_Research/2009/NatSatisfaction ReportExecutiveSummary09.pdf

Oblinger, D. G. (2003). Boomers, gen-xers, & millennials: Understanding the new students. *Educause Review*, *38*(5), 37-47.

Oblinger, D. G. (2005). Learners, learning, and technology: The educause learning initiative. *Educause Review, 40*(5), 66-75.

Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger J. L. (Eds.). (2005). Educating the net generation. *Educause*, Retrieved from www.educause.edu/educatingthenetgen/

Perry, W.G. (1999) *Form of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme.* San Francisco, CA: Josse-Bass.

Porter, A. L. (2008). Role-playing and religion: Using games to educate

millennials. *Teaching Theology & Religion, 11(*4), 230-235.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the horizon, 9*(5), 1-6.

Prensky, M. (2005). Engage me or enrage me: What today's learners demand.

Educause Review, 40(5), 62-64.

Roberts, G. (2005). Technology and learning expectations of the net generation.

Educause, Retrieved from www.educause.edu/educatingthenetgen/

Sax, L. J. (2003). "Our incoming students: What are they like?" *About Campus, 8*(3),

15–20.

Sax, L. J. (2004). Citizenship development and the American college student.

New Directions for Institutional Research, *122*, 65-80.

Scruggs, S. C. (2013). Wilberforce University still in turmoil. *Diverse Issues in Higher

Education.* Retrieved from http://diverseeducation.com/article/51267/#

Skiba, D., & Barton, A. (2006). Adapting your teaching to accommodate the net

generation of learners. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, *11*(2), 15.

Sternberg, R. (2011). Classroom styles. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from

http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/09/27/essay_on_different_tea

ching_and_learning_styles

Straumsheim, C. (2013). Device explosion. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from

http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/09/05/wireless-devices-weigh-down-

campus-networks#ixzz2euzZLbLF

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991) *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069.* New York, NY: Morrow.

Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the net generation.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, T., & Keeters, S. (Eds). (2010). Millennials: A portrait of Generation Next. *Phew Research Center.* Retrieved from www.pewresearch.org/millennials

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* (2nd Ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, M. E. (2004). Teaching, learning, and millennial students. *New Directions for Student Services, 106*, 59-71.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, R. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, boomers, xers, and nexters in your workplace.* New York, NY: AMACOM.

APPENDIX A

MILLENNIAL LEARNERS SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Millennial Learners Survey Instrument

Demographic

1. What is the current size of your total enrollment Freshman to Senior Classes?
A. 100-499
B. 500-999
C. 1,000-2999
D. 3000-

2. In what geographical region is your institution located?
A. Eastern United States
B. Western United States
C. Central United States
D. Outside the United States

3. What is your institution's religious affiliation (ie. Baptist, Methodist, Non-
       denominational)?
Affiliation: _____

Institutional Research and Adaptation Resistance

4. Has your institution conducted research concerning the way students construct
       knowledge and truth today?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___
C. Please explain your response _____

5. Is your institution adapting facilities for information technology uses?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___
C. Please explain your response _____

6. What percentage of classrooms have wireless internet access?
A. 0-10% ____
B. 20-40% ____
C. 50-70% ____
D. 80-100% ____

7. What percentage of your courses are available through online delivery?
A. 0-10% ____
B. 20-40% ____
C. 50-70% ____

D. 80-100% ____

8. Are university stakeholders concerned about missional compromise in relation to adapting to online delivery or distance education?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___
C. Please explain your response _____

Education Philosophy and Faculty Teaching Practices

9. Have you conducted faculty professional development on the adapting teaching methods and curriculum to meet the needs of the digital information learner?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___
C. Please explain your response _____

10. What percent of faculty involve students in digital information learning?
A. 0-10% ____
B. 20-40% ____
C. 50-70% ____
D 80-100% ____

11. Has your institution sought to train faculty on the way students learn today?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___
C. Please explain your response _____

12. Is your institution education philosophy student-centered or teaching-centered?
A. Student-centered ___
B. Teaching-centered ___
C. Please explain your response _____

13. What percentage of your classroom instruction is carried out by:
A. lecture
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____
B. Podcasts (ie. missed lectures or additional lectures)
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____

C. multimedia presentations
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____

D. outside classroom digital peer activity (ie. chat rooms, Facebook)
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____

E. by assignments requiring digital information technology research
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____

F. by group projects using the social media (ie. Facebook)
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____

14. What is your view on student desire to construct their own knowledge and meaning
     with digital information and social media technology?
A. Acceptance ___
B. Adaptation ___
C. Rejection ___
D. Compromise ___
E. Please explain your response _____

15. Are your faculty perceived by students as experts with the truth or do they facilitate
     discovery?
A. Experts ___
B. Facilitators ___
C. If both, what percentage respectively:
        1. Experts
        a. 0-10% ____
        b. 20-40% ____
        c. 50-70% ____
        d. 80-100% ____

    2. Facilitators
    a. 0-10% _____
    b. 20-40% _____
    c. 50-70% _____
    d. 80-100% _____

16. Do your faculty use group process so students can discover and construct truth?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___

If Yes, describe the mechanisms in place used to guide and control outcomes:
_____

If no, please explain your response _____

17. Would your faculty correct students for wrong views or guide them to re-consider
      more absolute thought?
A. Yes ___
B. No ___
C. Please explain your response _____

18. What percent of your faculty use some form of drama, role-play, or some form of
      experiential learning designed to engage a video game generation mindset?
A. 0-10% _____
B. 20-40% _____
C. 50-70% _____
D. 80-100% _____

19. What percentage of faculty communicates with students by text, Ipod or social media
      like Facebook outside of the classroom?
A. 0-10% _____
B. 20-40% _____
C. 50-70% _____
D. 80-100% _____

University Advancement

20. What is your general budget for research and advancement of the uses of information
      technology in the traditional classroom environment?
A. $0 – $20,000. ___
B. $20,000 – 50,000. ___
C. $50,000 – 100,000. ___
D. $100,000 – 500,000. ___

21. What is your general budget for research and advancement of the uses of information
       technology in online delivery systems (Distance Learning)?
A. $0 – $20,000. ___
B. $20,000 – 50,000. ___
C. $50,000 – 100,000. ___
D. $100,000 – 500,000. ___

22. Which is more important to your university, developing students for a specific
       missional criteria or appealing to the progressive learning styles and needs
       of Millennial students so they will enroll to fulfill the university mission? (choose
       one)
A. Missional criteria priority ___
B. Student appeal priority ___

If both, what percentage for missional criteria and the balance for student Appeal?
A. Missional criteria
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____
B. Student appeal
a. 0-10% ____
b. 20-40% ____
c. 50-70% ____
d. 80-100% ____

C. Please explain your response: _____

APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD LETTER

ASHLAND
UNIVERSITY

TO:	Wayne Pessia
FROM:	Brent Mattingly, HSRB Summer Chair
DATE:	June 6, 2012
SUBJECT:	Human Subjects Review Board Approval
PROJECT TITLE:	Millennial Learners and Their Impact on the Mission of the CCCU and ABHE
HSRB APPROVAL CODE:	05-12-091

The Human Subjects Review Board has approved the research proposal you submitted. You may proceed with the project.

The primary function of the HSRB is to ensure protection of human research subjects. As a result of this mandate, we ask that you pay close attention to the fundamental ethical principles of autonomy, justice, and beneficence when establishing your research proposal. These ethical principles pertain specifically to the issues of informed consent, fair selection of subjects, and risk/benefit considerations.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Brent Mattingly, Ph.D.
Phone: 419-289-5342
E-mail: bmatting@ashland.edu

Graduate School | 401 College Avenue | Ashland, Ohio 44805 | 419.289.5750

APPENDIX C

TABLE OF SURVEY QUESTIONS ASSIGNMENT

TO

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

SURVEY QUESTION ASSIGNMENT		
"What impact has the Millennial generation had on the delivery of content and teaching practices of Christian missional institutions?"		
Research Questions	**Items**	**Categorical theme**
Research Question 1: What are CCCU and ABHE institutions doing to understand the change in generational attitudes and motivational behavior of Millennial learning?	Survey Items 4-8	Institutional Research (4) Institutional Adaptation (5,6,7) Mission (8)
Research Question 2: What kind of mechanisms or teaching tools do CCCU and ABHE institutions have in place to balance student styles in learning with the learning biases of current faculty and administration?	Survey Items 9-19	Educational Philosophy and Faculty Teaching Practices (10,13-all,15,18,19)
Research Question 3: How are CCCU and ABHE institutions adapting to meet the Millennial learning styles and the strategic use of a student-centered learning paradigm and digital media to improve the effectiveness of their mission?	Survey Items 9-19	Educational Philosophy and Faculty Professional Development (9,11) Mission(12,14,16,17)
Research Question 4: Do stakeholders view these adaptations as compromise to their constituents and a threat to their institutional mission of spiritual formation?	Survey Items 9-19	Educational Philosophy and Faculty Teaching Practices (10,13-all,15,18,19) Mission (12,14,16,17)
Research Question 5: If CCCU and ABHE institutions develop a strategic plan that includes distance-learning programs, what would be the impact on their missional environments and objectives?	Survey Items 4-19, 20-22	University Advancement (20,21) Mission (22)