

Editor's Introduction

Kenneth Nehrbass, Editor

California Baptist University

I thought that AI was a gimmick until I asked it to create a podcast based on a *JFAP* article. Typically, ChatGPT is about as interesting as vanilla ice cream: it provides trite responses with lots of equivocation. But when I ran my article “How degree programs define, measure and assess faith integration” (Nehrbass, 2024) through NotebookLM, it generated an 18-minute podcast with the voices of a male and female who not only summarized, but *critiqued* and *evaluated* the article. What’s amazing is that those critiques are not otherwise found on the internet—the AI model applied faith integration concepts that are “out there” in the literature to critique my article. Some examples where the AI podcast hosts came up with thoughtful responses:

1. They wondered about the feasibility of using conversion as a “criterion of success” for faith integration;
2. They wondered about the ethics of measuring involvement in church as a criterion for faith development among faculty; and,
3. They belittled the notion that professors teach young-earth creationism in biology courses.

I say “they,” because the podcast was so convincing, you would think two people are actually discussing this article. It’s not just that the quality of the voice generator was superb, but the high level “thinking” was human as well. Does this mean AI is replacing you as authors and readers of *JFAP*? No. In fact, the only reason the AI-generated podcast was so meaty is that it *started* with an 8000-word research article that analyzed how 80 professors spent the last six years teaching and measuring faith integration, and it drew on other publications about Christianity and academia. So keep generating that original research on how scripture intersects with your academic discipline!

And as you can see, we have a strong community of authors who are doing just that. This issue of *JFAP* has two articles and two book reviews on the subject of AI (if you hadn’t guessed that already). Auh and Kim’s theoretical article argues that if AI aligns with the *imago Dei* (the image of God), it must promote human flourishing. And Mun and Shields designed a research study to confirm the hypothesis that a stronger commitment to Christian ethics is correlated with more ethical use of AI (hint: yes, it is).

If AI is not a pressing issue for you, we have a number of articles and book reviews in this issue that go beyond that topic. Martin and Harrison have an ingenious way to test whether students’ commitment to Christ impacts the degree to which they respond to faith integration context in the classroom (hint: yes, the more committed a student is to Christianity, the more she agrees with integrative concepts like the theology of work). And Sullivan, a professor of kinesiology, deployed a quantitative study that showed a positive correlation between Christian faith and the belief that we need to be good stewards of our bodies. This suggests that the Christian worldview can strengthen education in health-related fields.

There are also several practical papers here as well. Nursing professors at CBU (Pearce, Valentine and Mead) share ideas for integrating Christianity into three different delivery modalities. Neipp suggests four curricular improvements you can make to ensure the measurability of faith integration in your courses. Murcay and Nehrbass present a general rubric that you can adapt to course assignments to measure the integration your discipline with Christian perspectives and practices.

Lastly, the body of FI literature is thin when it comes to the integration of Christianity and teaching practices in higher education. Purper et al. have innovatively shown that three aspects of Fink's (2003) FiDeLity model (frequent, immediate and discriminating) align with aspects of Christian discipleship. If you teach at a Christian university, you may find it helpful to make the Christian impetus of these practices clear in your syllabus.

I trust that you will find something useful and inspiring here, that can benefit your own work related to faith in the academic profession.

References

Fink, L. (2003). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. Jossey-Bass.

Nehrbass (2024). How degree programs define, measure, and improve Faith Integration: An analysis of 80 program reviews. *Journal of Faith in the Academic Profession*, 3(1), 12-24.
<https://cbuopenpublishing.org/index.php/jfap/article/view/57>