Dr. Myra Perrine, Adjunct Professor since 1990 who most recently teaches in the Haggard School of Theology, enhances our awareness of the variety of ways Christians best relate to God in her What’s Your God Language? Connecting with God through Your Unique Spiritual Temperament (Tyndale/Saltriver 2007). Dr. Perrine provides a Spiritual Temperament Inventory that can be taken in order to identify which of the nine spiritual temperaments most encourages the reader’s worship of God. Then each spiritual temperament is discussed—the Activist, Ascetic, Caregiver, Contemplative, Enthusiast, Intellectual, Naturalist, Sensate, and Traditionalist—followed by concrete exercises that encourage both acting on the most natural temperaments as well as shoring up one’s spiritual formation by utilizing new and unfamiliar exercises. She explains, “None of us function with only one spiritual temperament, but we all have a primary way that we find most meaningful when relating to God—one or two ways that help us encounter Him best.” The author states that while one’s secondary preferences may evolve or fluctuate during different stages of life, one’s primary spiritual temperaments remain the same.

Thus her study of spiritual temperaments allows the reader both greater self-awareness as well as compassionate comprehension of other Christians who connect with God differently. Dr. Perrine cautions, “Since each temperament makes a significant contribution to the Kingdom of God, applauding one spiritual temperament above another not only damages Christ’s body, it harms the cause of the gospel as well.”

Acknowledging Gary Thomas for creating the nine spiritual temperament categories, Dr. Perrine expands their possibilities through her detailed analysis of each type, her Spiritual Preference & Practices Inventories, her Spiritual Practices Exercises, and access to Tyndale’s website where she has compiled subsequent intermediate and advanced-level exercises. Her clearly written text and practical activities will appeal to all who want to understand better their own and others’ spiritual life as they attempt to deepen their walk with God and contribute more fully to His Kingdom.—Carole Lambert
Dr. Alan Oda, Associate Professor of Undergraduate Psychology, cogently explores the strengths and weaknesses of David Elkind’s theories of adolescent psychology, carefully noting comparisons and contrasts to the findings of other scholars in this field. Elkind affirms, “The teen years are no longer seen as a training period for adult life; they are considered, to be, rather a different form of adult life, with its own unique indices of maturity.” Hence Elkind describes the current phenomenon of the stressed “hurried child”, accentuated by the “permeable family” wherein boundaries between public and private life are blurred, working parents have less time and energy to supervise their teenagers, and joint custody plus blended families force adolescents “to mature earlier and become competent—at least in appearance.”

Dr. Oda summarizes the criticisms of Elkind’s analysis of adolescents made by D. K. Lapsley, M. N. Murphy, L. R. Vartanian, T. Riley, G. Adams, E. Nielsen, B. P. O’Connor, M. C. Aalsma, and D. J. Flannery. Dr. Oda briefly notes some of Elkind’s responses to these critics, but then wisely moves on to his own observations resulting from his study: “1. The underlying processes affecting how adolescents perceive and experience their lives is multifaceted, defying simplistic theory. . . . 2. Media access has transformed the parent-child relationship. . . . 3. Cultural differences are central in understanding adolescents. . . . 4. The dynamic nature of adolescence is further intensified by the dynamic nature of the permeable family.”

Interesting discussion of these important affirmations is found in his “David Elkind and the Crisis of Adolescence: Review, Critique, and Applications” (Journal of Psychology and Christianity 26.1 (2007): 251-256).

—Carole Lambert
Dr. Carol A. Lundberg, Associate Professor of Higher Education, provides insightful understanding into the lives of first generation college students in her article, “A Bleacher-seat View of Cultural Capital: How Bad Is a Dented Bat?” (About Campus, Jan-Feb 2007: 8-12). Utilizing examples from her own experiences as a parent, she correlates the unfamiliarity she felt about Little League baseball to how first generation college students must feel entering a new realm of higher education with less “cultural capital”. What is learned “culturally” from the family or a social environment forms a foundation of knowledge and familiarity with one’s surroundings. Without a background in baseball, Lundberg explains that it was a challenge to determine how to support her son, Ian, and to understand the peculiarities of the sport and its culture. She shares how one time Ian’s bat had a dent in it, and the bat was disqualified from the game. This made Ian feel “a bit disqualified himself.” Not fully comprehending this rule, Lundberg emphasizes her appreciation for other parents who came alongside her to help her understand the Little League culture. The unfamiliar territory she found herself in helped Lundberg identify with first generation college students and their experience in a new realm, as well as their parents. These students have rich cultural heritages and backgrounds. By virtue of familiarity, those involved with higher education (i.e. faculty), may not realize the ways in which our culture tells first generation college students that they don’t fit into the higher education realm. Ways to overcome these obstacles are to have faculty and student affairs professionals “share their capital” with first generation college students and establish relationships with them and their families. These relationships can be a critical component to a student’s persistence and success. Experiencing feelings of discouragement or doubt about whether they will be able to be successful in higher education, can be common thoughts running through the minds of the students; yet, when someone comes alongside them to offer encouragement and support, their chances of maintaining the course are even better. Students need to “feel safe” in asking questions and relaying their fears and struggles. By investing time, faculty can also “provide the perspective of one who has played longer, who understands the game better.” We all have probably had experiences in our lives where we lacked “cultural capital,” but this can only help us better understand people from different backgrounds. Lundberg’s encouraging article reminds us that as educators and student affairs professionals, we need to take the time to be “good company,” good listeners, and intentional with the first generation college student. We can help them succeed.—Abbylin Sellers
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