

and the average couple experienced freedom from economic pressures, was attached to its material possessions, and felt that what it possessed was in line with its neighbors. Due to certain sampling restrictions, the authors did not claim the respondents to be a "representative sample" of Seventh-day Adventists, but the respondents did represent a sample of Adventist marriages and families.

The survey revealed that couples tended to see themselves and each other in a favorable light as individuals, but were likely to have an unfavorable view of their marriages. Such perceptions provide important indicators of the nature of the marital relationship, shed light upon the functioning of the family system, and can highlight possible marital and family problem areas for later support and development. The authors appropriately pointed out the need to develop specific programs of enrichment and growth to help Adventist couples create more meaningful marital relationships.

In contrast to the patterns of American society, the authors discovered a direct relationship between occupational status and marital happiness and religiosity, and noted that non-mobile couples have a slightly higher divorce rate than do mobile ones. The authors explored the reasons for this somewhat unusual finding in terms of motivation for mobility, for example, to pursue higher education or to work at an Adventist institution. The majority of the respondents reported that they were "married once and living with that spouse." However, the authors pointed to the possibility that the rate of family disorganization and divorce might be as high as 15 to 17 percent for the overall church membership.

The authors concluded their book with comments from their respondents concerning family life. One-third commented on factors contributing to success or failure. Factors leading to a successful family life included adherence to counsels of the Bible and the writings of Ellen G. White, a happy

childhood, consistency and firm discipline for children, warmth, and deep companionship with one's mate. Included among the 10 factors that contribute to failure are lack of family worship, not living up to the standards of the church, living in a religiously divided home, unfaithfulness to one's companion, and sexual incompatibility.

My favorable reaction to this study carries with it several reservations about its sampling procedures and measurement devices, but these are in part recognized by the authors and in no way detract from its significant contribution to literature on the family. The volume deserves reading not only by Adventists but also by students of marriage and the family who wish to better understand the dynamics of marital and family relationships within the North American Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

Herbert L. Smith is an assistant professor of sociology at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich.

The Influence of Beliefs about Truth and Reality on Educational Goals

George R. Knight. *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*. 244 pp., bibl., index. Berrin Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1980. \$9.95 (paper).

reviewed by F. E. J. Harder

The conjunction "and" in the title of George R. Knight's *Philosophy and Education* makes the title descriptive of the book's contents; the preposition "of" in its place would have been inappropriate. However, since the author did not develop a philosophy within the Christian perspective, the subtitle can mislead until one reads the preface. What Knight intended, and achieved with considerable success, was to show the relevance

to educational practice of beliefs about reality, truth, values, and goals. He wrote the book as an introductory textbook to supplement readings in philosophy and educational theory, and to provide the essentials for developing a Christian philosophical perspective.

Knight began by defining philosophy as an activity, a set of attitudes, and a body of content, differentiated among education, learning, schooling, and training, and followed with concise and lucid discussions of metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. He attempted to show how one's beliefs will determine one's basic educational goals and also how the dynamics of a particular society will modify both goals and practice. It is especially important, Knight concluded, that "Christian educators who have sought to develop an alternative system based on supernatural assumptions in the context of a society that is largely operating on naturalistic premises" establish practices within an environment in harmony with their basic beliefs.

Building upon this foundation, Knight followed a procedure quite standard in introductory texts by presenting abstracts and brief critiques of 14 schools of philosophy, occasionally noting their implications for education, and reminding us that although each may have some contribution to make toward a Christian philosophy, none is adequate, and eclecticism is unsatisfactory. "The better way is for each educator and each educational system to examine its own basic beliefs in terms of reality, truth, and then consciously to build a personal educational philosophy upon that platform." True, and the reader will wish that Knight had revealed his own.

Although anyone seeking such a concise survey is unlikely to find a better one, Knight devoted three times more pages to recent, splintered theories than to idealism, realism, and neo-scholasticism—traditions of much greater importance to the development of Christian philosophy. Of the 14, only these three have a primary concern

with metaphysics—a concern that is basic to Christian belief and is determinative for the development of Christian answers to the questions: What is real? What is true? What is good? What is the nature of the learner? What are the aims of education? and What should be taught?

"Although Knight did not develop a philosophy of Christian education, he outlined instructive principles to aid anyone endeavoring to build his own."

In chapters eight and nine Knight discussed a Christian approach to philosophy and education, but he failed to outline a structure for such an approach. Rather, he offered suggestions, raised questions, indicated issues, and stated principles that can heighten an educator's "sensitivity to the challenges of professional responsibility." Knight then reflected on Christian views of metaphysics, epistemology, axiology, the nature of a student, the role of a teacher, curriculum, methodology, and the social function of Christian education. Although Knight did not develop a philosophy of Christian education, he outlined instructive principles to aid anyone endeavoring to build his own, and made it clear that a Christian philosophy of education and a theology of education find common ground in their biblical bases.

I was disappointed that although the credits given for frequent (perhaps too frequent) quotations and idea sources required a bibliography of nine pages, not one reference appeared in either the text or the bibliography to the Ellen G. White literature, which obviously had been highly influential in the author's thinking. Since such a major omission could not have been unintentional, one wonders what considerations prompted it.

The author demonstrated a broad understanding of philosophical thought, an ability to make precise conceptual distinctions, and a firm grasp of theoretical implications for educational practice. I encourage him to produce a second volume in which he constructs an integrated Seventh-day Adventist educational philosophy in harmony with the principles he enunciated. This could be a significant contribution to teachers, students, trustees, and patrons who, for over a century, have operated denominational schools without such a guide.

F.E.J. Harder is a retired executive secretary of the North American Division Board of Higher Education, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C. He received a bachelors degree from Andrews University and a Ph.D. from New York University.

A Psychological Test for Christians?

Peter Blitchington; Robert J. Cruise. *Understanding Your Temperament: A Self-Analysis with a Christian Viewpoint*. 38pp., with tables. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979.

reviewed by Ronald Geraty

Based on Peter Blitchington and Robert J. Cruise's *Understanding Your Temperament*, I am a phlegmatic, sanguine, choleric who is bold, insensitive, and scatterbrained. In the first part of my discussion of this newly developed psychological test, I will hope to live up to those descriptors. In the second part, I will hope to make up for it by being sociable, cheerful and carefree, tactful, diplomatic, and even flexible without being bland and unorganized.

Blitchington and Cruise describe their psychological test as having a Christian viewpoint, but I wonder what makes it Christian. The authors are Christians, the

validation studies appear to have been done on Christians, and the authors discuss how various temperamental traits may impact on moral and spiritual development, but none of these characteristics make the test "Christian." Andrews University Press even published the test, but I doubt that makes it Christian, and none of the test questions, analyses, or findings have anything to do with Christianity or spirituality. I conclude that the test does not have a Christian viewpoint, though some of the authors' discussions of the test do. I further suggest that a Christian psychological test is probably no better than a non-Christian one. Would a Christian microscope be better than a non-Christian microscope? It might be interesting to develop a moral and spiritual development scale and have it standardized to measure the maturity of Christians, but even then it may be difficult to find agreement on what characteristics constitute Christian maturity.

Leaving the Christian issue aside, I do not understand why the authors use Hippocratic terms such as sanguine, melancholic, choleric, and phlegmatic. Though they do try to equate them with adjectives in current usage, their attempt fails and merely evokes images of an ancient human physiology with its "evil humours" lurking in body cavities and pulsing through tubes with blood and other liquids. Equally problematical are technical difficulties with the temperament inventory. It took me two tries to fill out the questionnaire due to its length and confusing repetitive questions. On the important issues of validity and reliability, which are dealt with elsewhere in a more scientific presentation of the inventory, it appears that the test has been well validated and has been shown to be reliable except for one important issue. The authors do not adequately describe the population they used to standardize the test.

I differ with the authors' implication, in their discussion of the inventory, that since temperament is due to heredity, it is unchangeable. Recent developmental studies