



From the Podium to the Floor: Applying Interactive Learning in Teaching Theology and Religious Instruction

Dr Kelebogile Thomas Resane
Centre for Teaching and Learning
University of the Free State
South Africa
resanekt@ufs.ac.za

Abstract

Theological educators are now nurturing dialogue, schemes, and practices that are intended to recognize the myriad of challenges and opportunities resulting in teaching Theology and Religious Instruction in a racially, religiously, culturally and ethnically diverse demographic environment. The article highlights the effectiveness of interactive learning as opposed to direct classical style teaching in Theology and Religious Instruction. The traditional method makes a teacher or lecturer the centre of teaching and learning: the master over didactics and pedagogics. Direct teaching can still be effective in some instances, though research shows that interactive learning promotes students towards self-directed learning. While there are various methodological approaches such as the historical, literary, cultural and traditions based studies approach, teaching about religion is required to convey three central premises of academic education, namely, that religions are within their own dogmas relatively diverse, dynamic and entrenched in a particular ethos. This is where interactive learning becomes important since it is a useful approach. It is variously called computer-based learning, cooperative, blended, active, and collaborative learning. It is deemed as the opposite of passive learning - a pedagogical approach that incorporates social networking and computing into course design and delivery. The primary reasons for applying this method of teaching is to assist with summation, formativeness, and it serves as motivation during the learning processes. In teaching theology, this approach promotes the students' capacity to work independently and cooperatively. It further sharpens and hones excellent teaching abilities and skills. Above all, it develops students into self-directed learners.

Key Words: Teaching, Religion, Theology, Learning, Interactive.

Introduction: A Matter of Definitions

The podium is one of the conspicuous furniture items in public places such as churches, lecture halls, auditoriums etc. It has taken varieties of names from time immemorial. These names include pulpit, from the Latin *pulpitum*, which means platform or stage. These days one hears of the lectern, from the Latin word *lectus*, which means the reading stand. In church history, one comes across the Greek *ambo*, meaning an elevation; but prior to this, the Greek used a *bema*, which was the platform or step from which public address was made. This continued into the synagogue tradition that is still practised today.

The Old Testament referral to the pulpit or podium is found in 2 Chronicles 6:13 and Nehemiah 8:4. These were the elevated stands where God was entreated or the Word was elucidated. To a certain degree, the pulpit was the place of authority on which only authorised figures or leaders could stand to make a public announcement. Some preachers and teachers feel insubstantial when not standing on the pulpit. The pulpit gives the sense of the



authority over the message, the recipients of the message, and the environment in which the message is communicated. In other words, from the podium the teacher senses mastery over the subject, the learners, and the classroom. Let it be known that:

Most of the universities were built in the previous century when the Greatest Generation (born 1901 -1924) and their preceding generation were in charge of education. These were the conventional generations whose proclivity was conference room and sloping auditorium. Didactics and the pedagogy of the time were centred on the professor. This professor had the authority of the subject matter and had to master the learning environment, especially the classroom. Since the tutor was the central figure in a learning environment, the students had to face her at the front (Resane 2015, 6).

John Wesley's biographer, Wood warned of the encroaching technology by asserting that:

we live in an age which is familiar with advanced techniques in the realm of evangelism. The twentieth century Church is aware that a haphazard approach to this most vital of all tasks is inadequate and indeed unworthy (1967, 186).

These teaching technologies should be embraced to enhance interaction and cooperative learning in the classroom. Teaching from the podium enhances passive learning. It is in the higher percentage, a one-way communication. A learner becomes a passive recipient of teaching or learning content. She finds it difficult to comprehend, assess, and apply. This defeats the primary purpose of teaching and learning, which is to enact or produce change.

On the other hand, the modern day didactics and pedagogics thrive on interactive teaching and learning. This is teaching and learning approach that uses a computer technology or other stakeholders, in order to teach or learn a certain content of the subject. In other words, interactive learning is a hands-on learning style where a human authority and a teaching tool such as a computer become participants in learning processes. Interactive learning is generally seen as the opposite of passive learning. It is a pedagogical approach that incorporates social networking and computing into course design and delivery. It therefore changes the teaching approach of the teacher and the learning style of a learner. Tapscott (1998) highlights that interactive learning as a pedagogical technique requires a fundamental change whereby learning shifts from linear to hypermedia learning; and from the teacher as transmitter to the teacher as facilitator.

Teachers of theology should remember that interactive teaching is not new or mysterious, therefore must be welcomed *a bras ouverts* and *a deux mains* (with open arms and with both hands). From time immemorial:

teachers use a range of pedagogics – from simple exposition to computer-based methods. They also appropriate whatever tools are available – from blackboards to Bluetooth devices. Teachers have always blended methodologies and technologies (Jordan, Carlile & Stack 2009, 227).

This calls for *callida junctura* (a skilful connection) that can facilitate learning towards some maximum output. Interactive approach to teaching comes in diverse manners such as asking questions, dividing a class into discussion groups, assigning study or research groups, assigning study mates or peer learners. Basically, interactive teaching is involving students in the learning processes where they do exercises either as individuals, in pairs, triplets, or small groups. They give the feedback and require your input and charting the way forward. Students are engaged in learning and acclimatize easily to the learning environment.

An engaged student is completely occupied, or caught up, in what is going on in class. An engaged student is committed to learn – and to support and encourage others as well (Kanar 2014, 120).



Education is *eschatological* by nature. It is continually changing and the educators must be geared to these changes. Education by its meaning and nature is always *dynamic* and in progress all the time. The fundamental fact is that education pre-exists in students' minds and educators' task is to revive it. Boyung Lee (in Fernandez 2014, 166) captures it rightly that:

Education is to help people find a truth that is already within them. It is not just a teacher transmitting knowledge to the young, but, rather, it is helping learners to be the subject of their own learning, and thus to be transformative agents in the world

In seeking the truth in their studies, theology and religious studies students an approach to religion that is entirely academic and not devotional in which the institution strives to boost student awareness the subject areas but does not steer the student in any direction as far as their religion is concerned. The study of religion becomes a paramount aspect in interactive studies and students discover for themselves a diversity of religious views. No theology or religion should be denigrated. It is the case in theology and religious studies that the students appreciate that religions are dynamic and shifting in dogma as opposed to being static and immovable. Students must be taught within historical contexts, as it "is easy for students to view the rituals or stories as having one meaning that persists for all times and places. Religions, however, exist in time and space and are constantly interpreted and reinterpreted by believers" (Moore, 2010).

Comparisons and contrasts

Teaching from the Podium – Direct Teaching

Teaching from the podium is defined differently to mean direct teaching or direct instruction. It is principally the presentation methods, with the teacher delivering the content of learning, expecting the students to absorb this content passively. It is traditionally a lecture method, which:

involves the flow of information through a continuous delivery of factual material by the teacher. Those listening note important facts and ideas, or are given these in written form. Apart from an occasional question there is little intercommunication between student and teacher (Skinner 1979, 179).

This common method of instruction makes the teacher the center of teaching and learning. The teacher is expected to master or manage the whole teaching and learning process. In many cases, the teacher is referred to as good, if he manages the classroom well. The teacher becomes the central figure, always behind the podium or lectern. He is expected to master the subject and answer all the questions. Students must be seated in a meticulously arranged chairs to face the teacher. In some cases, this archaic method is referred to as passive learning. In the olden days, the master of teaching was not to be interrogated with questions either for clarity or assessment. The learners are least involved in this method of teaching.

Teaching from the podium regards interaction as reactive, expecting minimal students' response to the teacher; while interactive teaching and learning focuses on students interacting, interfacing and responding with and to each other. Teaching from the podium makes the teacher to maintain some tight control whereby positive or negative responses are sought. In interactive teaching and learning, the teacher stimulates activities that are more open and less controlled. From the podium, the teacher does more talking and focuses on content and cognitive processes; while in interactive learning, the teacher often encourages sharing of experiences and feelings. Teaching from the podium is a traditional



approach that elevates the teacher as an expert of the content. “The teacher stands and delivers the content, while students sit and receive” (Newby et al 2000, 6). Bates and Poole (2003, 111) capture the idea that it is “a lecture with a very heavy emphasis on information transmission and would reflect a strongly objectivist epistemology.”

The podium teaching withholds data related to inner state or modelling; while in interactive learning, the teacher expresses data related to inner states or modelling. In essence, conventional pedagogy from the front (podium):

centres on a teacher who does little more than deliver conclusions to students. It assumes that the teacher has all the knowledge and the students have little or none, and that the teacher must give and the students must take, that the teacher sets all the standards and the students must measure up (Parker 2007, 118).

Teaching from the Floor – Interactive Learning

On the other hand in interactive learning, the teacher is a role model – a participant who shares ideas with students. She is a facilitator of the learning process as opposed to the driver or director thereof. In other words, in interactive learning, the teacher models and sets the tone for learning. He lays the tracks for students to manoeuvre through the learning processes. “Students observe as the teacher models and then they try the task themselves as they work in pairs to collaboratively solve the problem” (Frey 2011, 7). Interactive learning has different names and what makes it distinctive is the student’s full participation in the process of learning. The goal of teaching and learning should focus on the learning activity (what and how) of students and not on the silo teachings of the lecturer’s preferred themes (Biggs & Tang 2007, 52). As stipulated below, interactive learning is diversely titled in education literature.

Computer-based learning

The modern teacher knows that teaching is not telling, but involving. This article does not discredit teaching from the front, but aims to promote the effectiveness of interactive learning as opposed to direct teaching.

Telling is certainly an active part of teaching, although teaching can occur without telling. Demonstrating is one method of teaching without telling. But merely telling and demonstrating is not enough. For learning to occur, it is necessary for trainees to actually practice (simulate) doing the task being taught (Fournies 1999, 12-13).

The student may be interacting technologically with gadgets such as computer, mobile phone, iPad, or any technological device. Not only with a machine does the student interact, but may also be with any form of instructional design; and or with other students, community, or facilitators. The postmodern cultural shifts necessitate new approaches in instructional designs. So, change in teaching is inevitable. Lawson and Choun (1992, 57) call teachers and learners to the fact that “the key cultural issues today include the role of technology, the need for more human interaction and sharing, and the impact of relativistic thinking.”

The educationists whose proclivity is instructional technology are of a strong opinion that interactive learning is or should be computer –assisted. For instance, according to Barker (1989, 7) interactive learning is

when multi-media computer assisted learning techniques can be used to create a wide variety of different interactive learning environments. These environments are usually designed in such a way that learning processes are (1) learner controlled, (2) participative, and (3) highly motivating



Bates and Poole (2003) refers to technology-based materials and the call for video conferencing where students' learning processes are not confined to the classroom but spills over into the community or interactions out there. Moreno (in Pytlik Zillig, Bodvarsson & Bruning 2005, 9) carries the same notion further that "many human-computer interactions involve a one-on-one learning scenario, consisting of a student interacting with a computer."

Cooperative Learning

In some literature, interactive learning is called cooperative learning. This, according to Newby et al (2000, 93) is when students participate in designing, developing, and delivering instructional materials... In other words, cooperative learning involves students in active learning. Samal et al (in Pytlik Zillig 2005, 66) see cooperative learning as "working together to accomplish shared goal." Muijs and Reynolds (2002, 127) attribute a greater advantage played by cooperative learning for gifted students who may be used as mentors in collaborative groups. These students sense part of the learning process instead of getting bored as in a normal classroom situation.

Co-operative learning can further be defined as "an instructional technique in which learners work together in small groups to maximise their own learning and the learning of their peers" (Killen 2000, 100). In a theology class, co-operative learning enhances teamwork and promotes appreciation of differing ideas as contribution towards understanding and acceptance. This is attested by the definition that

cooperative learning involves small heterogeneous groups of students working together to learn collaborative and social skills while working toward a common academic goal or task (Newby et al 2000, 92).

Blended Learning

There is also some abounding discussions on blended learning. This term refers to teachers' usage of a wide range of pedagogies from simple direct instruction to instructional designs that are computer-based. In pedagogy, there are always blended methodologies and instructional technologies. Jordan et al (2009, 227) refer to blended learning as:

- A range of delivery media
- Face-to-face class-based methods (synchronous)
- Distance-learning methods (both synchronous and asynchronous)
- Self-directed learning.

This is in agreement with Mokoena and Materechera (in Taole 2015, 48) that "Blended learning is a collaborative approach that involves students, tutors and teachers at design and implementation stage across a range of delivery of media." Bates and Poole (2003) tend to employ the term mixed-mode to encapsulate distributed, blended or hybrid learning.

Blended learning has various advantages such as capacity to accommodate a wider audience who bring into the classroom different needs, styles, and interests. It also exposes students to variety of learning materials and technologies. It holds and enhances the importance of feedback and accountability among the students. Blended learning, if properly applied into the learning situation calls teachers into the realisation of importance that "teaching is not something you do naturally, it requires specific skills" (Fournies 1999, 13).

Active Learning

Another term popularly used for effective student learning by participation is active learning. This is always accompanied by the anonymous scribe often heard and found within didactic circles: *Tell me and I will forget. Show me and I may remember. Involve me and I'll understand.* As the term describes, active learning is a total involvement of a learner in the learning processes through learning activities such as simulation games, role plays, service



projects, experiments, research projects, group discussions, mock trials, purposeful games, and field trips. Through these learning activities, students “begin to open up. Light bulbs click on in their heads. They begin to understand... They learn. And their behaviour changes” (Schultz & Schultz 1993, 107). There are no passive spectators in active learning. Active learning propels students into the future by instilling the attitude of self-directedness. Education acquired this way serves students with brighter future of taking responsibility. Active learning, by its nature of community connectedness, exposes and leads students to social justice (Marshall & Oliva 2010). This is impressed by Sizer (2004, 94) that:

When education, under the influence of a scholastic conception of knowledge which ignores everything but scientifically formulated facts and truths, fails to recognize that primary or initial subject matter always exists as a matter of an active doing... the subject matter of instruction is isolated from the needs and purposes of the learner, and so becomes just a something to be memorized and reproduced upon demand... Knowledge which is mainly second-hand, other men’s knowledge, tends to become merely verbal.

This is emphasis in theological teaching. Outcomes must go beyond knowledge. Active learning encourages active living. It is not just a matter of knowing the right things, but also doing the right things. Bednar (2011, 74) correctly illustrates this that

You and I may know the right things to do, but intelligence involves more than just knowing. If you and I are intelligent we will consistently do the right things.

Teaching theology should be finding some ways to help students learn in terms of knowledge, doing, and becoming. Students should be allocated activities of learning in order to discover themselves and the world they inhabit. It is for this reason that Chubbuck (2007, 243) points to the fact that

knowledge is not to be acquired with abstract, objective detachment; rather students are asked to engage their learning as whole persons – in heart, mind, and will.

Collaborative Learning

Some education literature speaks of collaborative learning. One comes across this concept of effectiveness of student collaboration in the works of Johnson & Johnson, and Maruyana (1983), Slavin (1996), and Frey, Fisher & Everlove (2009). These authors are all in agreement that when students work collaboratively, learning becomes productive and improves significantly. The approach enhances interaction and participation during the classroom discussions. Frey (2011, 16) points out that collaborative learning

is intended to foster higher-quality responses by allowing students to try out their answers on a partner before sharing them with the whole class. This lowers the risk for learners while raising accountability and engagement because every student is actively involved.

There is some extensive interaction accompanied by questioning, providing feedback, coordinating, evaluating, and participation. This is instigated, as Erasmus and van Dyk (1999, 100) indicate, by the fact that collaborative learning “may occur if the learner has some knowledge or ideas and would like to share them or try them out.” The basic elements of collaborative learning are positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual accountability, group processing, and social skills (Falcó & Huertas 2012, 1334–1335).

In collaborative learning, balance must be struck between the power of the teacher and that of the students. Too much control by the teacher minimizes the effectiveness of collaboration. On the other hand, too much control by students without teacher’s guidance could create



confusion and bewilderment. This may derail the teaching objectives and disturb the learning processes.

The Rationale behind Interactive Teaching and Learning

Summation: The results of teaching theology is changed lives. Changed lives is the measuring standard that learning has taken place. Summation is an endeavour to see what actually happens in the brains of the students. Teachers must always remember that students come to theology class with some baggage due to their cultural and denominational backgrounds. One of the strongest influences on the way teachers plan their lessons is their set of beliefs about teaching and students. Learning can also be influenced by what learners believe about school and about learning. The teachers and the students come to the class with these beliefs or influences and these impact enormously on how teaching and learning processes will or should be conducted. There are interwoven complexes in their brains that need to be penetrated and assessed somehow. Elmore (1992, 45) brings this to attention that:

Learners bring quite complex, sometimes incorrect, prior knowledge to their learning of any subject. Understanding any complex subject requires not simply teaching new knowledge, but also diagnosing, capitalising on, and, when necessary, changing learners' existing conceptions.

This conceptualisation or prior knowledge of students' cognitive status contributes immensely towards instructional organisations and methods of teaching to be employed. Interactive teaching and learning rests and falls on this knowledge. It is broadly understood within the education field that :

Summative evaluation is meant to give a picture of how well a student (or group of students) has done over a time period on a set of learning goals in a particular subject (Muijs & Reynolds 2002, 186).

This can be detected when students collaborate with each other and the teacher observes the interactive processes in order to assess the emergence of intended learning outcomes. Through learning activities, students start to change the kind of person they are becoming.

Formativeness: This aims through the assigned tasks to direct students' mental processes along an appropriate path in 'concept space.' In other words, it gives students the opportunity to discover along the way of learning, some truths intended in the learning activity. It is for this reason that

Formative evaluation is designed to inform the teachers about their students' performance, prior knowledge and skills, and this information is then used to plan lessons or remediation to improve students' performance (Muijs & Reynolds 2002, 186)

Questions receive answers along the way as students interact or collaborate for purpose of learning. One of the characteristics of interactive learning is the continuous interjectory questions as a way of intervention to ensure that all participants are on track and on board. The interactive processes must be monitored carefully as some learners may waste time discussing irrelevant issues. This may be caused particularly if learning is not in students' first language; or even by high-ability learners who may lose their incentive to learn when placed in mixed-ability groups (Curry, 1997).

The seasoned teacher always discerns where and when guidance or intervention is needed. She directs students' mental processes as a way of stimulating their creativity in acquiring knowledge by discovering the truth to be learned. This enables the teacher to plan and design



assessment approach. The formative intervention is very crucial in interactive learning as it informs both the teacher and the students' progress during learning activities. It is crucial to note that formativeness directs and impacts learning towards positive achievement, while summation is more useful for systemic quality of students' becoming.

Motivation: The famous African Education psychologist, Mwamwenda sees motivation as an energiser or a driving force, a desire or an urge that causes an individual to engage in a certain behaviour" (1996, 259). This is like a sudden injection that spurs one out of indifference. It can be done by posing an inquisitive question that can kick students into action or speech. It enhances interactive learning by arousing interest and excitement. The researchers are correct in finding motivation as a tool for behaviour modification, induced and driven by needs, and focused on the realisation of goals (le Roux, 1994). During interactive learning, the motivational teacher can galvanise the students' focus on the subject under discussion. Students normally leave learning area with excitement on what they have learned through and with others.

Benefits of Interactive Learning

In a nutshell, interactive teaching and learning *promote the students' capacity to work independently and cooperatively*. It develops the students' creative skills, critical thinking, and effective communication. This is all about students' development regarding skills of collaboration, because "communication and collaboration with peers and teachers or experts enhance and develop learning and knowledge" (Jordan, Carlile & Stack 2009, 228). In modern times, interactive learning is symbiotic with, and synergises with networked learning viz. learning based on the use of internet. It is broadly acknowledged in pedagogics that networked learning

allows students to develop critical thinking skills and to construct new knowledge through argument and discussion. It also encourages the development of a community of learners, without the need for physical presence (Bates & Poole 2003, 160).

Unlike passive teaching where some students can be marginalised, interactive learning "can be adapted to meet the needs, styles and interests of a wide variety of learners" (Jordan, Carlile & Stack 2009, 228).

It can further be observed that interactive learning combats what education psychologist, Piaget termed *egocentrism* in learning. This is what the famous American Christian educationist, Richards (1980, 183) observes:

the young child's inability to perceive others as existing independently of himself... to see that they have perspectives, beliefs, feelings, and experiences different from his own.

Interactive learning contributes enormously to moral development since it enables a learner to cooperate with others in discovering potentials and significances of and in others. Moral growth is the heart of learning which is facilitated through group collaboration. This summate with theological understanding of education, which is

divinely instigated and humanly cooperative process whereby persons grow and develop in life, that is, in godly knowledge, faith, hope, and love through Christ (Pazmiño 1997, 87).

Teachers of theology are compelled to develop strategies for encouraging moral growth and comprehension that is quite different from the direct instructional approach to teaching. Students easily adapt to strategies that fit completely with their prior knowledge; or how they actively construct their own perception of reality. Students more likely build moral awareness



through interactive experiences in which moral acts are modelled and encouraged. Fundamentally, students, especially at the younger age, “rely on others to define the right and wrong for them” (Richards 1983, 162).

For theology teacher, interactive teaching *sharpens and hones excellent teaching abilities and skills*. It expands the teacher’s creativity and enables the discovery of cognitive processes of the students during and through the learning processes. This is attested by Dames (2012, 50) that “Contemporary lecturers are required to become “reflective practitioners” to compare their own teaching with respective educational experience and student-centred learning.” Interactive learning expands the teacher’s mental horizon where international cooperation is inevitable. As teachers of theology, the reminder is that

we live in a global village. Changes in economics, politics, transportation, and communication have resulted in greater and greater interdependence among individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and societies (Johnson & Johnson 1997, 446).

The circle of referees on teaching and learning matters had become wider and is increasing exponentially *audax et cautus* (boldly and cautiously). Education specialists are no more scattered members (*disjecta membra*) like centuries ago. Interaction with stakeholders glides smoother and faster than ever before. There is no more space for *axioma medium* (generalisation from experience). Technology and globalisation had made teaching and learning to go *extra muros* (beyond the limit) and *extra modum* (beyond measure).

One of the fundamental benefits of interactive learning is that *it develops students into self-directed learners*. Students’ interaction with media and peers propels them to be initiative takers and become responsible for their own learning. This is made possible because interactive learning is in most cases, self-regulatory, pedagogical, blended, and learning outcome based. Interactive teaching and learning environment offers, accumulates and articulates towards realisation that one is or can become an increasing resource for learning. This is famously known as *andragogy*, the term that was coined by Malcolm Knowles (1984).

Conclusion

The time is now for traditional approach to teaching to *reculer pour mieux sauter* (retreat in order to advance). Self-examination in *sancta simplicitas* (holy simplicity i.e. child-like innocence) is a virtue for teaching and learning success. This article calls for mind-shift regarding methodology of teaching. The podium must be taken over by the floor occupancy by learners in order to develop the whole being. Teaching and learning must be connected to positive outcomes in terms of what students are becoming. Active involvement of and by students is internationally acclaimed as the better teaching approach. The teacher’s role has shifted from that of controller of learning to that of facilitator of the learning processes with students’ maximum participation.

Many students want to question what they read and they want to challenge ideas, and they can only do this if they are armed with the religious literacy and conceptual detail of non-religious, as well as religious world understandings which become evident through carefully crafted interactive learning activities.

Students should receive a challenge at the end of each learning activity; and sometimes given an opportunity in class to share experiences gained during interactions or collaborations, including how this has influenced their lives. Their experiences can be a catalyst for change in some circumstances. Students hunger for invitation from teachers to participate in a learning activity. They long to be invited to take action. Hilton and Aramaki (2014, 108), in their research at Brigham Young University conclude by saying: “As teachers find various ways to invite students to act, students will be more likely to learn, do, and



become.” Interactive teaching and learning is *vestigia nulla retrorsum* (no going back) for didactics and pedagogics.

It is academically logical to conclude that:

Postmodern students cannot only be taught the facts of science. They have to reflect on their own cognitive, attitudinal, affective, behavioural experiences and practical knowledge. Participative learning in action may enable students to solve scientific and pragmatic problems” (Dames 2012, 37).

The study of theology and religion is vital to an understanding of world history, current affairs and even human inspiration. However if students are to study theology or religion it is vital that they be exposed to the views, opinions and observances of more than merely one theology or religion. Invariably, students acquire learning through participation. This participation is variously known as computer-based, cooperative, blended, active, and collaborative learning. The approach is encouraged and welcome in the academia since it builds towards summation when students end up *becoming* better products. In the process of active learning, the students continue to *formatively* discover, evaluate and re-visit their learning progress. It gives them *motivation* to learn more as it kicks them out of indifference.

References

- Bates, A.W. & Poole, G. (2003). *Effective Teaching with Technology in Higher Education: Foundations for Success*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.
- Barker, P. (1989). *Multi-Media Computer Assisted Learning*. London, Kogan Page Ltd.
- Bednar, D.A. (2011). *Increase in Learning*. Salt Lake City, Utah, Deseret Book.
- Biggs, J. & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. (3rd Ed). McGraw Hill: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Chibbuck, S.M. (2007). Socially just teaching and the complementarity of Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy. *Christian Higher Education*, 6, 239-265.
- Curry, A. (1997). “Mixed ability groups in mathematical classrooms.” Unpublished Independent Study, Faculty of Education, University of Newcastle.
- Dames, G.E. (2012). “Enhancing of Teaching and Learning through Constructive Alignment.” *Acta Theologica* 32(2): 35-53. Available at <http://www.uovs.ac.za/ActaTheologica> [Retrieved 3 May 2016]
- Elmore, R.F. (1992). Why restructuring alone won't improve teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 49 (7), 44-46.
- Falcó, J.M. & Huertas, J.L. (2012). Use of wiki as a postgraduate education learning tool: A case study. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 28, 1334–1340. <http://www.ijee.ie/contents/c280612.html> [Retrieved 4 May 2016]
- Fernandez, E.S. (2014). *Teaching for Culturally Diverse and Racially Just World*. Eugene, Cascade Books.
- Fournies, F.F. (1999). *Why Employees don't do what they are Supposed to Do and What to Do About it*. New York, McGraw-Hill Books.



- Frey, N., Fisher D. & Everlove, S. (2009). *Productive Group Work: How to Engage Students, Build Teamwork, and Promote Understanding*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Frey, N. (2011). *The Effective Teacher's Guide: 50 Ways to Engage Students and Promote Interactive Learning* (2nd Ed). New York, Guilford Press.
- Hilton, J & Aramaki, A. (2014). "Encouraging Students to Act: Helping Students Apply Principles Learned in a Religious Education Setting." *Teaching Theology and Religion*, Volume 17 (2). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Johnson, D.W & Johnson, F.P. (1997). *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills* (6th Ed). Needham Heights, Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, R. & Maruyama, G. (1983). "Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogenous individuals: A theoretical formulation and meta-analysis of the research." *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 5-54.
- Jordan, A, Carlile, O. & Stack A. (2009). *Approaches to Learning: A Guide for Teachers*. New York, McGraw Hill Open University Press.
- Kanar, CC. (2014). *The Confident Student* (8th Edition). Boston, Wadsworth Cengage Learning
- Killen, R. (2000). *Teaching Strategies for Outcomes Based Education*. Lansdowne, Juta & Co.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species* (3rd Ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Lawson, M.S. & Choun Jr, R.J. (1992). *Directing Christian Education: The Changing Role of the Christian Education Specialist*. Chicago, Moody Press.
- Lee, B. (2014). "Teaching Disruptively: Pedagogical Strategies to Teach Cultural Diversity and Race." In E.S. Fernandez (Ed), *Teaching for Culturally Diverse and Racially Just World* (pp 144-166). Eugene, Cascade Books.
- Le Roux, J. (Ed). (1994). *The Black Child in Crisis: A socio-Educational Perspective* (Vol 2). Pretoria, Van Schaik Academic.
- Marshall, C. & Oliva, M. (2010). *Leadership for Social Justice; Making Revolution in Education*. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall.
- Moore, D.L. (2010). Guidelines for Teaching About Religion in K-12 Public Schools in the United States, *AAR Religion in the Schools Task Force*, American Academy of Religion.
- Moreno, R. (2005). "Instructional Technology: Promise and Pitfalls." In PytlikZillig, L.M., Bodvarsson, M. & Bruning, R. (Eds). *Technology-Based Education: Bringing Researchers and Practitioners Together* (pp. 1-20). Greenwich, Information Age Publishing.
- Mwamwenda, T.S. (1996). *Educational Psychology: An African Perspective* (2nd Ed). Isando/Butterworth, Heinemann Publishers.
- Newby, T.J., Stepich, D.A., Lehman, J.D. & Russell, J.D. (2000). *Instructional Technology for Teaching and Learning: Designing Instruction, Integrating Computers, and Using Media*. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Palmer, P.J. (2007). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.



Pazmiño, R.W. (1997). *Foundational Issues in Christian Education* (2nd Ed). Grand Rapids, Baker Book House.

PytlikZillig, L.M., Bodvarsson, M. & Bruning, R. (Eds). (2005). *Technology-Based Education: Bringing Researchers and Practitioners Together*. Greenwich, Information Age Publishing.

Resane, K.T. (2015). Challenges for Teaching Theology through Technology in Institutions of Higher Learning. *Pharos Journal of Theology* ISSN 1018-9556 Vol. 96 - (2015). Open Access- Online @ <http://: www.pharosjot.com>).

Richards, L.O. (1980). *A Theology of Christian Education*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House.

_____ (1983). *Children's Ministry: Nurturing Faith within the Family of God*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House.

Samal, A., Nugent, G.C., Soh, L-K. & Lang, J. (2005). "Reinventing Computer Science Curriculum at the University of Nebraska." In PytlikZillig, L.M., Bodvarsson, M. & Bruning, R. (Eds). *Technology-Based Education: Bringing Researchers and Practitioners Together* (pp. 63-82). Greenwich, Information Age Publishing.

Schultz, T. & Schultz, J. (1993). *Why Nobody Learns Much of Anything at Church: And How to Fix It*. Loveland, Group Publishing Inc.

Sizer, T. (2004). *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. New York, Houghton Mafflin Harcourt.

Skinner, C. (1979). *The Teaching Ministry of the Pulpit: Its History, Theology, Psychology, and Practice for Today*. Grand Rapids, Baker Book House.

Slavin, R. (1996). Research on Co-operative Learning and Achievement: What we Know, What we Need to Know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 43-69.

Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing Up Digital: The Rise of the Net Generation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wood, AS. (1967). *The Burning Heart: John Wesley, Evangelist*. Devon, Paternoster Press.