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Executive Summary

The evangelical Christian Higher Education Movement (CHEM) began in the late nineteenth century providing practical ministry training and theological education from an evangelical Christian perspective. At a time when few Canadians graduated from high school and university was for the elites, Bible schools filled a gap in higher education and provided opportunities for those of modest education or modest means. Pre-World War II (WWII), the university and college system offered CHEM schools very little competition for students as they tended to draw from different social classes.

Post-WWII, Canada was experiencing rapid urbanization and a new wave of industrialization prompted by technological advances. At the same time, the Cold War and a culturally and economically confident America presented Canada with ideological, economic and cultural challenges to its national cohesion. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, also known as the Massey Commission, released its report in 1951 recommending that the federal government take bold new steps to shape the morals and tastes of the nation. The Massey Commission looked to the government to undertake these tasks because conflict among church colleges and among Christian religious radio broadcasters had left the impression that religious groups could not provide the cohesion the nation needed.

Immediately following the release of the 1951 Massey Report the Canadian government began investing heavily in universities and colleges. This new investment opened up postsecondary education to the lower-income Canadians and created incentives to complete high school as a prerequisite to postsecondary education. Canada shifted from having only half its students graduate from high school in 1950, to having more than 9 in 10 young adults graduate from high school and 3 in 4 go on to some kind of postsecondary education in 2016. Postsecondary education has become the normative experience for young adults. The CHEM now has abundant competition for students – even evangelical students.

This new government investment in education raised education expectations and attainment and pushed the CHEM to improve its academic standards. In the 1960s, many CHEM institutions began looking to American bodies for accreditation. At a time when Canada was following the Massey Commission prescription for extracting Canadians from American cultural domination, historian Bruce Guenther believes the pursuit of accreditation from American bodies may have further isolated the CHEM from the Canadian academy.

The new government funding for higher education did not flow as generously to CHEM institutions as to secular ones. Consequently, CHEM institutions had to raise funds from their evangelical constituencies and, significantly, from their students through tuition in order to meet accreditation standards and to field competitive academic programs. The result is that the once affordable CHEM institutions have come to be seen as more expensive than secular alternatives.
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At the same time portions of the CHEM were pursuing accreditation, liberal arts colleges were being founded and some Bible colleges were transitioning to liberal arts colleges. This move to liberal arts models was prompted by different philosophies of education, by an emerging sense that a distinctive Christian approach to university studies was needed, by responses to changing job requirements, and to compete with new and well-funded secular higher education programs.

Christian Higher Education Canada (CHEC) formed in 2005 as a merger of three other CHE associations. CHEC is an association of accredited, degree granting CHE institutions that seeks to foster members’ cooperation in various areas, including marketing and student recruitment.

The large 2007 Ipsos-CHEC marketing survey described CHEC’s student body as primarily comprised of “Evangelical Enthusiasts,” and our Young Adult Transition Research (YATR) study confirms this is still the primary composition of the student body. Respondents from the CHEC YATR sample tended to be more orthodox than respondents from the Main YATR sample. CHEC respondents were more likely to have been active in church, youth group and Christian camps as teens, and these higher levels of participation in Christian communities tended to continue into their young adult years (ages 18 to 28). CHEC respondents reported high levels of religious persistence even without having had home church teen mentors as teens. It appears that being part of CHEC communities tends to compensate for some of the religious integration Main sample respondents tend to find through home church mentors. Although CHEC and Main sample respondents use social media at the same rates, CHEC respondents reported less social isolation and comparison anxiety.

The idea of emerging adulthood arising from the psychosocial development theories of Erik Erikson and Jeffrey Arnett offer a framework for understanding how young adults make decisions about postsecondary education. Emerging adulthood is characterized by delays in identity formation and the forming of adult commitments – including faith commitments. The prevalence and duration of emerging adulthood have grown over the past few decades so that entry into adulthood now typically happens 5-7 years later.

Emerging adulthood tends to coincide with the typical ages of undergraduate students. As emerging adulthood grows in prevalence and duration, undergraduates are becoming less likely to be ready to make faith commitments. Although some CHEC institutions have taken steps to make admission more “open” to those who do not share the Christian faith, emerging adults may feel there is an implicit faith commitment that goes along with attending a Christian higher education (CHE) institution, and this may be enough to discourage enrolment.

The YATR study and CHEC’s 2007 study showed that young adults who choose CHE tend to be more committed to the Christian faith than other young adults who identify as Christian affiliates – even other evangelical affiliates. These CHEC respondents seem to have passed through emerging adulthood more quickly than their peers and made faith commitments that contributed to their selection of Christian postsecondary education.
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The CHEM has moved to compete with secular higher education institutions on the basis of program and academic excellence, but its institutions may have missed the ways in which secular higher education was competing with them in the area of character formation. As secular higher education with its character formation components became an increasingly normative experience for Canadians, the understanding of character formation and what constitutes a good citizen shifted – even within the evangelical community. At the same time, the increasing prevalence of emerging adulthood among the traditional young adult undergraduate student market has created a population that is resistant to the implicit Christian commitment that goes along with attending a CHE institution.
Introduction

This is the second document in the Young Adult Transition Research (YATR) series and is an addendum to the first report titled *Renegotiating Faith: The Delay in Young Adult Identity Formation and What It Means for the Church in Canada*.1

The YATR study’s young adult survey was screened by polling firm MARU/Matchbox with two samples resulting in two quantitative datasets for young adults. The first dataset, which we will call the “Main” dataset and on which the *Renegotiating Faith* report is based, was screened with 1,998 young adults between the ages of 18 and 28 who had a Christian religious affiliation as a teen and who attended religious services at least monthly at some point during their teen years.2 The second dataset, which we will call the “Christian Higher Education Canada (CHEC)” dataset, was screened with a population of 773 current or former CHEC students between the ages of 18 and 28 who had a Christian religious affiliation as a teen and who attended religious services at least monthly at some point during their teen years (see appendix A for more information about the CHEC dataset).

**Christian Higher Education Canada (CHEC),** a part of the Christian higher education landscape in Canada, is:

a non-profit association of higher education institutions ... Members include 34 fully accredited, degree-granting, Christ-centered institutions representing a broad spectrum of undergraduate and graduate Christian higher education within Canada working together to further the CHEC Mission3

At this point it is important to describe how I am using several terms.

- **Christian higher education in Canada** (not to be confused with Christian Higher Education Canada which is the associative body described above) is broadly used, encompassing all Christian traditions (i.e. Catholic, Mainline, Orthodox and Evangelical) and all types of higher education institutions (i.e. Bible schools, Bible institutes, Bible colleges, seminaries, graduate schools, liberal arts colleges, etc.).
- **The Christian Higher Education Movement (CHEM)** means evangelical, English-speaking, Bible schools, Bible institutes, Bible colleges, Christian liberal arts colleges, seminaries and graduate schools.4 CHEC institutions form an *accredited* subset of the

2 Hiemstra, Dueck, and Blackaby, 177.
3 See https://www.checanada.ca/chec/about_us.
4 I recognize that there are problems with using both the terms evangelical and English-speaking to describe a CHEM here. For example, it is anachronistic to include Mennonite Bible schools and institutes from the late 1800s and early 1990s as part of an evangelical movement. In the intervening years, however, many Mennonites (but not all) have come to associate with the wider evangelical movement through participation in organizations like The
CHEM. The “movement” language is borrowed from the term “Bible college movement” (BCM) used by historian Robert Burkinshaw to describe the early phase of CHEM beginning in 1885. These early Bible schools, institutes or colleges were sometimes founded as a reaction to Modernism and at other times founded by immigrant groups seeking to pass on their religious and cultural heritage to their children. Bible schools, Bible institutes and the different forms of Christian higher education that would follow them constitute a movement in the sense that they share a common conviction that their faith (and sometimes their cultural traditions) were at odds with either the dominant religious groups or the wider Canadian society, and that higher education was an important way to pass on their faith and traditions to their children.

I could have simply compared and contrasted the CHEC and Main samples from the YATR study and that, in itself, would have been good news for CHEC and the CHEM. For example, CHEC respondents were more likely to maintain their teenage religious affiliation, more likely attend religious services as young adults and more likely to hold orthodox Christian views. This good news is better understood, however, when it is set in the context of the change and challenge the CHEM has had to navigate over more than a century. If the reader is just interested in the YATR data, she can move directly to section 10 of this report.

This report tells a story about how the competitive environment has changed for the CHEM over the last century or so, and about how the CHEM has tried to compete. It is an attempt to help explain why a movement that has such positive faith outcomes in the lives of its students nevertheless has difficulty making the case for Christian higher education – even among Evangelicals who are their natural constituency. I also hope this report challenges Evangelicals who may have been reluctant to consider Christian higher education (CHE) to reconsider.

Anything that I write in this report about the history of the BCM or the CHEM in Canada will necessarily be an over-simplification of a rich and complex story. The works of historians such as Robert T. Burkinshaw, “Evangelical Bible Colleges in Twentieth-Century Canada,” in Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1997), 367.
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as Bruce Guenther, John G. Stackhouse Jr. and Robert Burkinshaw should be consulted for more nuanced accounts.6

There are many factors that affect higher education enrolment including demographic shifts, economic cycles, government policy and cultural trends. This report will touch on several of these, but it will repeatedly return to the idea of emerging adulthood which is the interpretive frame for the Renegotiating Faith report.7 Economic and demographic factors will tend to affect CHE institutions and secular institutions in similar ways, but emerging adulthood works differently for CHE institutions and secular ones.

Psychologist Erik Erikson proposed the idea of the emerging individual in the late 1960s which psychologist Jeffrey Arnett then developed into the idea of the emerging adult in 2000.8 Emerging adulthood is a break or moratorium in psychosocial development

Erikson is known for his eight-stage theory of psychosocial development and emerging adulthood, which is based on Erikson’s idea of a psychosocial moratorium, interrupts a young adult’s psychosocial development between Erikson’s fourth and fifth stages. Erikson described this moratorium as “almost a way of life” that is characterized by a “delay of adult commitments.”9 Moreover, Erikson said that one entered adulthood when they gained the virtue of fidelity, which is the capacity to make adult commitments.

Arnett places emerging adulthood between the ages of 18 to 29 and says it has the following characteristics:

1. **Identity exploration**: Answering the question “Who am I?” and trying out various life options, especially in love and work;
2. **Instability**: in love, work, and place of residence;
3. **Self-focus**: as obligations to others reach a life-span low point;
4. **Feeling in-between**: in transition, neither adolescent nor adult; and
5. **Possibilities/optimism**: when hopes flourish and people have an unparalleled opportunity to transform their lives.10

---

9 Erikson, Identity, 128, 156.
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Consistent with Erikson’s idea of a psychosocial moratorium, Arnett’s emerging adults have not yet formed a persistent adult identity, and significantly for a discussion on higher education, they have not yet made enduring decisions about “occupation, romantic relationships, and religious or political beliefs.” [Emphasis added] 11

Strong religious commitment has been, and continues to be, a defining characteristic of students attending CHEM institutions. This suggests that CHEC students, the segment of the CHEM that we are focusing on in this report, are more likely to have passed through emerging adulthood (or to have skipped it altogether) than students in other postsecondary institutions who do not have strong religious beliefs. It also means that, as emerging adulthood becomes a normative experience, we can expect to see a shrinking pool of prospective students for CHE institutions in the traditional undergraduate age range (18-24).

It is difficult to interpret Canadian education enrolment statistics because of shifting definitions and measurements. Depending on the measures used and points of comparison chosen one will come to very different conclusions about growth or decline. This is especially true of Christian higher education in Canada because the types of institutions have changed over the decades, and many schools have transitioned from one type of institution to another, making comparisons with earlier data less meaningful.

Notwithstanding a recent stabilization of CHEC enrolment, CHEC enrolment is down since the early 2000s. This decline has occurred despite the very positive outcomes, both academically and spiritually, associated with Christian higher education (CHE).

Sections 1-9 will look at the changes in the competitive environment for the CHEM and then move to compare and contrast the CHEC and Main young adult survey samples in section 10.

1. The Christian Higher Education Movement

In a broad historical sense, the evangelical Christian Higher Education Movement (CHEM) in Canada is very young, and the rate at which new schools were founded, especially in its first few decades, was astonishing. According to historian John G. Stackhouse Jr., “The first Bible school in North America was started in 1882 by the former Canadian A.B. Simpson of the Christian and Missionary Alliance at Nyack, New York.” Al Hiebert, Char Bates and Paul Magnus cite historian Bruce Guenther in their 2005 survey of the Canadian CHEM, reporting that 340 “Bible schools-institutes-colleges” have opened in Canada starting in 1885 just a few years after the Nyack school in New York.

Most of the rapid CHEM expansion occurred in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries before the release of the 1951 Massey Commission report that led to the rapid expansion of secular higher education in Canada. Many of the 340 colleges that make up Guenther’s database have since merged with other schools or closed. Of the current 34 Christian Higher Education Canada (CHEC) institutions, 26 were founded between 1920 and 1950 and none after 1990. McMaster Divinity College and Acadia Divinity College were founded prior to the 1882 start of the CHEM in Canada but stood outside the movement’s associative structures until they joined CHEC in 2005 and 2013 respectively.

CHEM schools were founded to pass the evangelical Christian faith on to the next generation in the face of Modernism, and to prepare young adults for ministry service either in churches or on the mission field. Historian Robert Burkinshaw says these “twin purposes” are key to understanding the Bible College Movement’s (BCM, a subset of the CHEM) growth:

Conservative biblical doctrines appealed to many Canadians, especially in the Prairies, and in a period when many evangelicals had lost confidence in, for example, the theological departments in Brandon, Acadia, and McMaster, large numbers saw Bible schools as trustworthy in terms of traditional evangelical doctrines and emphases.

Bible schools sprang up to serve the conservative evangelical community that felt either abandoned by the established seminaries or shut out of other forms of higher education by money or class.

Stackhouse gives this account of an organizational meeting for the Toronto Bible Training School (TBTS), an antecedent of Tyndale University College and Seminary.

---

12 See the introduction for how I am using terms in this report.
13 Stackhouse, Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character, 55.
14 Al Hiebert, Char Bates, and Paul Magnus, Character with Competence Education: The Bible College Movement in Canada (Steinbach, Manitoba: Association of Canadian Bible Colleges, 2005), 1.
15 ACTS Seminaries is a consortium of four seminaries. For the purpose of this statistic the consortium was treated as a single institution and its founding date was taken to be 1985 the year the consortium was formed.
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Convening a meeting on 14 May 1894, [Elmore] Harris set out before a group of church leaders, clerical and lay, his vision for a Bible school that would train laypeople as “Sunday school teachers, as Pastors’ Assistants, and as City, Home and Foreign Missionaries. It is intended for those who believe that they have been called of God to Christian service, and who from age or other reasons, cannot pursue a full collegiate or theological course of study.”

Some of the contours of the BCM can be seen in this short paragraph. The Bible training school was to prepare students to take on roles either within the church or roles that flowed from the church’s ministry. The training was academically below a “full collegiate or theological course of study” but nevertheless was sufficient to prepare students to take on responsible roles within their respective churches. It is important to remember that in 1894 high school graduation was rare. The 1891 Canadian census simply asked whether people could read or write, not what level of education or grade of school they had attained. TBTS and Bible training schools like it, were organized to fill a market place gap or a need that the established seminaries either could not or would not meet.

Stackhouse writing about the TBTS states:

Admission standards were academically low, if spiritually high: ‘Candidates for admission to the full course of study must be recommended by their Pastors, Churches, or other responsible persons as possessing an approved Christian character, and giving promise of usefulness in the Lord’s service.’

While the seminaries of the day concentrated on training clergy, Burkinshaw writes that Bible schools,

displayed a great deal of flexibility by accepting students not usually admitted to theological colleges. While many schools encouraged students to consider entering full-time ministry, such a vocational goal was not a criterion of admission, and thousands of individuals planning on lay vocations enrolled.”

These “thousands of students” could afford Bible schools because of “very low or, in some cases, non-existent tuition fees” which were made possible because of relatively modest facilities and “the availability of faculty willing to work for very low stipends.” Many of these early faculty did not have advanced training themselves, and most early Bible schools or institutes operated in an academic zone above high school but below university or college.

18 Stackhouse, 55–56.
20 Burkinshaw, 375.
Bible college students often returned to serve in the churches that sent them or to be part of the sending church’s missionary ministry. Burkinshaw talks about the high esteem in which Bible colleges and their students were held in the evangelical community:

The Bible school’s practical, ministry-oriented approach was also well received, as can be seen in the regular reports in institutional publications of the extent of students’ activities in various ministries. This included detailed statistics of the number of evangelistic tracts distributed, of homes and hospital beds visited, of street sermons preached, and of Sunday school and mid-week Bible classes taught. The statistics most proudly presented by many schools, however, were those indicating the number of graduates entering some kind of full-time ministry, whether on the foreign mission field or at home.\footnote{Burkinshaw, “Evangelical Bible Colleges in Twentieth-Century Canada,” 374.}

Earning a Bible college degree conferred status in the evangelical community and the institutions themselves were held in high regard by the evangelical community.

In a 2015 commencement address to the last graduating class of Bethany College in Hepburn, Saskatchewan, Bruce Guenther reflected on the impact of the BCM, echoing similar themes as Burkinshaw:


Guenther went on in this same address to talk about how churches saw Bible college filling a vital role in faith transmission:

Our forbearers in the faith believed that the future of the church depended on how successfully they would transmit their religious and cultural [Mennonite in this case] heritage to their children.”\footnote{Guenther, 2.}

It is difficult to interpret Canadian education enrolment statistics because of shifting definitions and measurements. Depending on the measures used and points of comparison chosen one will come to very different conclusions about growth or decline. This is especially true of Christian higher education in Canada because the types of institutions have changed over the decades, and many schools have transitioned from one type of institution to another making comparisons with earlier data less meaningful.
Writing for a volume published in 1997, Burkinshaw wrote that Canadian BCM enrolment peaked in the mid-1980s at 8,300 full-time equivalents (FTE) before falling to about 7,000 students by the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{25} It is not clear which institutions contributed to the numbers quoted by Burkinshaw. What is clear, however, is that he believed enrolment in BCM schools was in decline.

CHEC publishes headcount (HC) enrolment statistics, not FTEs. A comparison of its published 2013 and 2016 figures suggests that while graduate/seminary enrolment is growing, overall enrolment continues to decline (see table 1 below). There are differing views of growth trajectories and trends. For example, Stanley Porter has published several articles showing an opposite trajectory to what we see in table 1.\textsuperscript{26} CHEC seminary enrolment numbers for 2003, 2012 and 2017 show head counts of 2,996, 2,472 and 2,748 respectively.\textsuperscript{27} If 2003 is chosen as the point of reference then seminary enrolment is in decline, however, if 2012 is chosen as the year of reference it is growing.

\textbf{Table 1.1 CHEC Undergraduate and Graduate Enrolment (Headcount), 2013 and 2016}

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Enrolment & 2013 & 2016 & Change \% \\
\hline
Undergraduate & 14,000 & 11,900 & -15 \\
Graduate & 3,500 & 4,200 & +20 \\
Total & 17,500 & 16,100 & -8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sources: “CHEC The Facts (2016)” \url{https://www.checanada.ca/chec/about_us/chec_the_facts} and data provided by CHEC.
CHEC’s website listed 33 member institutions in 2013 and 35 in 2016.

Assuming the mid-1980s was an inflection point for the BCM, and perhaps the CHEM as well, it also marked the beginning of significant changes in the timing of young adult transitions and the growth of what we now call \textit{emerging adulthood}.

\textsuperscript{25} Burkinshaw, “Evangelical Bible Colleges in Twentieth-Century Canada,” 369–70.
\textsuperscript{27} Seminary enrolment data provided by CHEC for CHEC member institutions.
2. Competition for Students Pre-WWII

When the CHEM began in the late nineteenth century, high school graduation was rare and postsecondary education was generally reserved for Canada’s elites.

In his history of higher education in Canada, Glen Jones, professor of Higher Education and Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), cites H.B. Neatby’s description of the “common understanding of the role of the public university” prior to the Second World War:

 Universities trained the children of the politicas [sic]; they served as a finishing school for their daughters and prepared their sons for admission to the liberal professions. These social functions were understood by governments and university officials; there were no major confrontations over admissions, over course content or over student discipline because both groups shared the same social values. Cabinet ministers and members of the Board of Governors might belong to different parties but they were all men of substance with similar views of the social order.28

High school graduation, usually an admission requirement for university, was rare even in the 1930s. Historian Robert Burkinshaw writes:

During the 1920s and 1930s only about 15 per cent of Canadian students graduated from high school. This figure did not rise above 25 percent until several years after the end of the Second World War and just reached 50 per cent by 1960.”29

These low levels of high school graduation can seem shocking to contemporary Canadians. The 2016 Canadian census found that 91.3% of 25- to 34-year-olds had had attained a high school diploma or equivalency. Moreover, 69.3% of 25- to 34-year-olds had attained at least some postsecondary education (college, university, CEGEP or apprenticeship), and more than three-quarters of high school graduates (76%) went on to some kind of postsecondary education.30

Burkinshaw writes that Bible colleges were “open, at least until the 1960s, to students without high-school graduation. Entry standards thus were low, but they reflected the realities of the
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educational context in Canada.”

Although Bible colleges served a primarily evangelical Christian market, prior to the 1951 Massey Commission report they were generally not competing with other kinds of higher education institutions for evangelical students. Part of the reason for this lack of competition was the relative scarcity of competing higher education institutions. In 1901, for example, there were only 18 degree granting institutions in the entire country.

By comparison, Universities Canada currently lists 98 member institutions, and Colleges and Institutes Canada lists 129 member institutions.

Of course, the founding of Bible schools starting in the late nineteenth century did not represent the first instances of CHE in Canada. Theological colleges and seminaries in the east in major urban centres such as Toronto, Montreal and Halifax pre-dated the CHEM. These seminaries were usually affiliated with Mainline Protestant denominations or the Roman Catholic Church and tended not to reflect evangelical Protestant theological emphases or ministry concerns. Differences in theological outlooks meant Bible colleges and established seminaries were generally not competing for the same students.

Disputes between theological colleges associated with the University of Toronto were part of what led to the 1905-1906 Ontario Royal Commission on the University of Toronto, also known as the Flavelle Commission. The Commission was called to enquire into and report on, among other things, “such changes as in the opinion of the Commissioners should be brought about in the relations between the said University of Toronto and the several Colleges affiliated or federated therewith, having regard to the provisions of the Federation Act.” See Andrew Boggs’ “Ontario’s Royal Commission on the University of Toronto, 1905-06: Political and Historical Factors That Influenced the Final Report of the Flavelle Commission” for a discussion of these disputes and their political implications.

Jones notes how this context affected the establishment of universities in the western provinces:

Recognizing the importance of higher education for the development of these new jurisdictions [the western provinces], and attempting to avoid the denominational disputes that had emerged in the east, each of the new western provinces decided to

---
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create a single ‘provincial’ university with a monopoly over the authority to grant degrees.\textsuperscript{36} [Emphasis added]

The monopoly power granted to these western provincial universities was, in part, an attempt to head off the kind of denominational college disputes that had been witnessed in Ontario and precluded the establishment of denominational universities with independent degree granting power. Although these western provincial universities would go on to have affiliated or federated denominational colleges, when the CHEM emerged, western Bible colleges were unaccredited from the government’s perspective. Theological education in western Canada into the early twentieth century existed outside a public university system, meaning that western Bible colleges and seminaries were not competing against theological educational institutions backed by public funds.

The 1928-1929 Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, otherwise known as the Aird Commission, also dealt with religious conflict – this time dealing with religious radio programming – and formed part of the back drop for the 1949-1951 Massey Commission.

Historian Mark McGowan writes about “the new religious interest in radio” in the late 1920s stating that “religiously inspired radio programming emerged as a new weapon with which one religious group could bludgeon another.”\textsuperscript{37} In response to this “bludgeon[ing]” the Aird Commission recommended:

That where religious broadcasting is allowed, there should be regulations prohibiting statements of a controversial nature or one religion making an attack upon the leaders or doctrine of another.\textsuperscript{38}

Religious radio broadcasting licences were phased out after 1932 a few years after the release of the Aird Commission report, and none were granted again until 1983.\textsuperscript{39}

Denominational college squabbles and radio broadcast squabbles had marked religion as a divisive force in society and inclined governments to non-sectarian or secular governmental solutions. We see this in the establishment of secular provincial universities in the western provinces, and we will see this in the recommendations of the Massey Commission which dramatically expanded funding for public postsecondary education.


The CHEM did not have significant competition from public postsecondary institutions prior to the 1950s because universities were for the elite. This was about to change.

3. Competition for Students Post-WWII

In the post-WWII years several factors started to change the higher education landscape. First, returning veterans were given an opportunity to have their university education funded by the federal government. Second, Canada was moving from an agrarian to an urban society. Third, the report of the *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*, otherwise known as the report of the *Massey Commission*, radically reshaped the government’s relationship with higher education.

After WWII, the veterans benefit program “provided qualified returning soldiers with the option of receiving a free university education; tuition fees and basic living costs would be paid for by the federal government.”40 Thirty-five thousand veterans enrolled in the first year of the program, effectively doubling university enrolment.

The post war period was also a significant period of urbanization for a country whose population had been predominantly rural. Chart 3.1 below shows the Canadian rural and urban populations from 1851 to 2011. The urban population grew faster in the post-war years while the rural population remained essentially flat growing only by approximately one million since the end of WWII to the present. Where previously agricultural skills acquired on the farm might have been sufficient, now new skills were needed for the jobs opening up in the towns and cities.

---

Chart 3.1. Canadian urban and rural populations, 1851 to 2011

Chart 3.2 below shows the growth in full-time university enrolment and enrolled students as a percentage of the population. The cohort of veterans entering university almost doubled the number of undergraduate students between 1940 and 1945, from 34,817 to 61,861. Even so, undergraduates remained a very small 0.5% of the population. More dramatic increases in enrolment came in the 1950s going forward when increases in enrolment also drove up the share of the population enrolled in university. By 2016, more than half (55%) of Canadians age 15 and over had at least some post-secondary education, up from just 32% in 1986.

In 2015, 2.82% of the population was enrolled full-time in a university undergraduate program – and this is just full-time university enrolment. Total enrolment in all Canadian postsecondary higher education institutions in 2015-2016 was 2,034,957 or 5.7% of the population. In 2016, CHEC total enrolment (head count) was just 16,100, or less than one percent of total postsecondary enrolment.


Chart 3.2. Full-time university undergraduate enrolment in Canada, 1861 to 1975\(^a\) and 1995/1996 to 2015/2016\(^b\)

![Graph showing historical university enrolment and percent of population from 1861 to 2015.]

Sources: “Table W430-455, Full-time university undergraduate enrolment, by field of specialization and sex, Canada, selected years, 1861 to 1975” [link](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-516-x/sectionw/W439_455-eng.csv), and “Table 37-10-0018-01 Postsecondary enrolments, by registration status, institution type, sex and student status” [link](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/cv.action?pid=3710001801), and “Estimated population of Canada, 1605 to present,” [link](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/98-187-x/4151287-eng.htm).

\(^a\) Undergraduate full-time enrolments only.

\(^b\) All full-time university enrolments. Academic years spanning calendar years for data from 1992/1993 to 2015/2016 are represented by the calendar year the school year started in.

The 1951 Massey Commission, more formally known as the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, recommended the federal government provide direct grants to universities based on provincial population.\(^{44}\) The federal government acted swiftly extending new and ongoing grants beginning with the 1951-1952 academic year.\(^{45}\) These direct federal transfers to universities provoked a constitutional crisis with the provinces who saw the transfers as an interference in their constitutional sphere of responsibility. This federal-provincial dispute was resolved by 1976 with the federal government providing transfer payments for education to the provinces which the provinces then administered. The dispute about which level of government should fund education solidified the understanding that some

---


\(^{45}\) Clark, “100 Years of Education,” 6.
Competition for Character Education

level of government should fund education, and with a stable funding base the provinces rapidly developed their postsecondary education systems.\textsuperscript{46}

Chart 3.2, above, shows the growth in full-time university undergraduate enrolment in Canada. Chart 3.3, below, shows the corresponding rise in government \textit{university} expenditures. Of course, postsecondary education is broader than just university. In 1974, government expenditures on all postsecondary education were $3.8 billion compared to just $134.9 million in 1950. By 2013-2014, postsecondary education in Canada was a $35.1 billion industry with $17.2 billion, or 48.9%, coming directly from different levels of government and $8.7 billion or 24.7% coming from tuition and fees.\textsuperscript{47}

\textbf{Chart 3.3. Total government expenditures on university education in Canada, 1950 to 1974, thousands of dollars}
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Source: “Table W41-46 Total expenditures on education, by level, Canada, selected years, 1950 to 1974”
\url{https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-516-x/sectionW/W41_46-eng.csv}. Includes operating and capital expenditures of institutions, federal and provincial departmental expenditures and student aid.

In recent decades, postsecondary education has become a normative experience for Canadians, and particularly younger ones. Chart 3.4 below shows the growth in the percentage of 20- to 24-year-olds that were full-time students between 1911 and 1981. Even as recently as 1981

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{46} Jones, “An Introduction to Higher Education in Canada,” 17.
\end{itemize}
fewer than one in five (18.6%) Canadian 20- to 24-year-olds were full-time students, however, by 2015/2016 almost one in three (32.4%) Canadians age 20 to 24 were full-time students and another 6.3% were part-time students.\textsuperscript{48}

\textbf{Chart 3.4. Percent of 20- to 24-year-olds that were full-time students, 1911 to 1981}

In 1981, the normative experience for 20- to 24-year-olds was work, not school. In 1981, 72.5\% of 20- to 24-year-olds were part of the labor force (working or being available for work) and 85.1\% of these were employed.\textsuperscript{49}

Following the release of the 1951 Massey Commission report, the postsecondary education market in Canada expanded dramatically with the infusion of government funds. This new funding began to reshape the postsecondary education landscape.


\textsuperscript{49} 1981 Canadian census.
4. The Massey Commission

The Massey Commission was called in 1949 in the wake of the WWII and at the onset of the Cold War. In Canadian society there were fears about American economic and cultural influence. As well, those concerned about totalitarian regimes’ use of propaganda and cultural institutions during WWII were advocating for the government to support art and culture as a way to protect democracy, and there were lingering anxieties “about the return of economic depression; and a reconfigured world order.”

The Massey Commission consciously understood education as an instrument for the development of morals and cultural taste. The Commission wrote:

Education is the progressive development of the individual in all his faculties, physical and intellectual, aesthetic and moral. As a result of the disciplined growth of the entire personality, the educated man shows a balanced development of all his powers; he has fully realized his human possibilities.

The Commission argued for a central role for the federal and provincial governments in “formal education” which it defined as “schools and universities.” It also argued for a government interest in “general non-academic education through books, periodicals, radio, films, museums, art galleries, lectures and study groups,” on the basis that “these are instruments of education” which when they are “used by the school, they are a part of formal education.” In this way, the Commission articulated a superintending role for “schools and universities” over the vehicles of culture.

The Commission defined culture as an outworking of education.

Culture is that part of education which enriches the mind and refines the taste. It is the development of the intelligence through the arts, letters and sciences. This development, of course, occurs in formal education. It is continued, and it bears fruit during adult life largely through the instruments of general education; and general or adult education we are called upon to investigate.

53 Canada. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pts. 1, Chapter 1, The Mandate.
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So, the Commission set out to establish a role for the government in formal education which included all of a person’s faculties and aimed to enrich the mind and refine Canadians’ “taste.”

Perhaps recognizing what an alarmingly broad claim they were making, the Commission almost immediately turned to reassure Canadians of their freedoms.

In a country which boasts of freedom based on law and inspired by Christian principles, it is perhaps unnecessary to say that education is not primarily a responsibility of the state at all, whether provincial or federal. Education is primarily a personal responsibility, as well as a fundamental right of the individual considered as a free and rational being.  

Having just given this “unnecessary” reassurance the Commission pivoted to reassert the government’s “natural and permanent interest in the education of the individual”:

Naturally, however, the individual becomes entirely himself only as a member of society; and for his education he must depend first on his parents and then on various more or less formal social groups, including those controlled by Municipal, Provincial and Federal Governments. To maintain that education must always be primarily a personal and family responsibility is not to deny the supplementary but essential functions of these groups and their governments, nor their natural and permanent interest in the education of the individual. These functions in each country are determined by law.

In this last excerpt from the Commission’s report, it evidences an Eriksonian understanding of identity formation: “the individual becomes entirely himself only as a member of society.” Erikson said that identity is formed when a role is negotiated in a community and here the commission is arguing for a more robust and enduring government interest in both the shape of the national community and the means by which its citizens negotiate membership.

The Massey Commission’s vision of education was subsequently adopted by the federal and then provincial governments and placed public education in direct competition with the BCM in character formation, refinement of taste and the process of situating the individual in a community. It claimed an interest in “formal education” but also over books, media and culture. In fact, the Massey Commission envisioned the government as the guarantor of the “intellectual and moral purpose” of society and its “conception of the common good.”

There is no general prohibition in Canadian law against any group, governmental or voluntary, contributing to the education of the individual in its broadest sense. Thus, the

54 Canada. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pts. 1, Chapter 1, The Mandate.
55 Canada. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pts. 1, Chapter 1, The Mandate.
activities of the Federal Government and of other bodies in broadcasting, films, museums, libraries, research institutions and similar fields are not in conflict with any existing law. All civilized societies strive for a common good, including not only material but intellectual and moral elements. If the Federal Government is to renounce its right to associate itself with other social groups, public and private, in the general education of Canadian citizens, it denies its intellectual and moral purpose, the complete conception of the common good is lost, and Canada, as such, becomes a materialistic society.  

This articulation of education as the superintending instrument of culture placed public education institutions in a position to influence what Erikson called the “ideal prototypes of the day” corresponding to the “wave of technological, economic or ideological” trends.

Prior to the Massey Commission the government did not have a robust postsecondary public education system or a national television broadcast network like CBC television which could be used to shape a national understanding of culture, taste, or ideal prototypes. Local communities and local churches had greater influence over these. Indeed, because of the perceived threat of Modernism many evangelical congregations and denominations formed insular communities which had strong internal cultures and ideal prototypes all their own.

It is important to mention the role of technologies like television which began reshaping the notion of communities. The creation of CBC television was also a recommendation of the Massey Commission and it first went on the air September 6, 1952. The Commission found that radio and television could be used for:

> Education, for enlightenment and for the cultivation of taste ... [radio and television] may be regarded as a social influence too potent and too perilous to be ignored by the state which, in modern times, increasingly has assumed responsibility for the welfare of its citizens.

Implicit in the CBC’s radio and television mandates then were the goals of educating, enlightening and cultivating a national “taste.” CBC has had an important role in shaping Canadian ideal prototypes.

Although much of the literature about the mid-twentieth century expansion of higher education in Canada focuses on program and enrolment growth, the Massey Commission report reminds us of the moral purpose the government sought in education. Although the

---

56 Canada. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pts. 1, Chapter 1, The Mandate.
57 Erikson, Identity, 128.
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report tips its hat to the place of Christianity in the nation, the reality was that the Flavelle, Aird and Massey Commissions all saw religion as a political and social problem to be managed rather than the guarantor of public morals. Moreover, the fragmentation of and competition between Christian denominations caused political headaches for politicians.

Facing threats such as Communism and American cultural domination, the government of Canada decided that the character formation of the nation was too important to leave in the hands of churches or Christian ministries such as Bible Colleges. The investment in education was an investment in the character development of the nation, and as such, it directly competed with the BCM.

The thesis advanced by Hiebert et al and others is that the primary point of competition with secular, public universities was the expanded range of programs in the arts and sciences. Hiebert et al makes this explicit in their discussion of declining Bible college enrolment:

[Contemporary] parents and students are much more pragmatic and therefore concerned about making a living, rather than learning about a transformed life.60

Implicit in Hiebert et al’s thesis is the assumption that there is no life-transforming vision in public higher education. A concern for “making a living” driven by pragmatism is an alternative vision of a transformed life. Certainly, the new economy required new skills, but the skills taught at university are often irrelevant for the jobs many people take.

Canadian sociologist Reginald Bibby in his 2009 book Emerging Millennials ends his discussion of Millennial education expectations with this note about the job market:

A cause for pause in all this? [University of Western Ontario professors James] Côté and [Anton] Allahar remind us that only about 15% of jobs require university credentials.61

If Côté and Allahar are correct, then many of today’s young adults are educated beyond what is required to participate in the work force. A rational system aimed only at preparation for the job market would not continue to encourage skills development that cannot be used. Skills development, however, may not the main point of higher education, but character development which will allow the individual to function frictionlessly in the workplace and society.

Bible Colleges were not so much outcompeted in their scope of course offerings as they were in the contest of visions of the well-formed individual. The state wanted a certain kind of character to be developed in its citizens and it vigorously pursued its program. The Massey

60 Hiebert, Bates, and Magnus, Character with Competence Education: The Bible College Movement in Canada, 70.
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Commission originally had a vision of a citizen that would resist communist and other totalitarian propaganda, as well as the cultural commodities flowing up from the United States. Forming this kind of citizen is a moral exercise.

5. Access to Government Funding

Post-Massey Commission government funding has not been as accessible for CHEM institutions as for secular institutions.

Ontario had secularized postsecondary education funding in 1849, but when more generous government funding became available “a number of denominational institutions in Ontario” who had hitherto forgone government funding, “transitioned into secular institutions in order to access government support and address the needs of local populations.”

Using 2012, the total revenue of CHEC’s 36 full members was $264,987,823, according to Charitable Information Return (T3010) data. Of that total revenue, $22,144,195, or 8.3%, came directly from different levels of government. By comparison, secular higher education institutions received 48.9% of their revenue from government sources in 2013-14. Only 20 of the 36 CHEC institutions reported receiving government money of any kind, with 14 institutions receiving a total of $6.7 million from the federal government, 10 institutions receiving $15.1 million from their respective provincial governments and 4 institutions receiving $256,701 from municipal governments.

Charitable Information Returns (CIR) do not record tuition revenues; however, these are most likely reflected in “Total revenue from sale of goods and services” (line number 4640). In 2012, 30 of the 36 CHEC members recorded values for line 4640 that averaged 45.7% of total revenues. Assuming line 4640 data substantially represents tuition and fee revenue, CHEC institutions on average generate almost twice as much of their budget (45.7% in 2012) from tuition and fees compared to secular universities (24.7% in 2013-14).

CIR and Parliamentary Budget Officer reports on education come from different datasets and there are likely discrepancies in budget line item definitions, so some caution should be exercised in drawing conclusions about CHEC institutions and government funding. Some CHEC institutions also received research grants and funding for specific programs that may or may not be reflected in the CIR data. Even allowing for these discrepancies, it is clear that CHEC institutions are at a funding disadvantage compared with secular higher education institutions.

63 2012 Charitable Information Returns (T3010).
64 “Federal Spending on Postsecondary Education.”
65 “Federal Spending on Postsecondary Education.”
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This new funding began to remove the market segment barriers of class and income that had previously kept public education from being a viable option for Evangelicals. This changed the landscape for the CHEM because evangelical students now had more viable options.

6. The Move to Liberal Arts and Accreditation

Bruce Guenther begins his account of the CHEM’s pursuit of “a new level of respectability and recognition for their schools among public universities in Canada” in the “turbulent 1960s.” 66 The turbulence of the 1960’s is usually located in the cultural revolution, but it was also a decade when post-Massey Commission funds were reshaping higher education in Canada – which caused turbulence all its own for the CHEM.

The CHEM responded to this turbulence by taking on new forms and pursuing accreditation.

In a paper about the CHEM in the four western provinces, Guenther captures both these responses:

The decade following 1952 marks a significant watershed in the development of the movement: post-secondary schools started by evangelicals after this date – and there were none for almost a decade – are mostly liberal arts colleges, graduate schools and Bible schools for Native peoples. During the 1950s and 60s many of the older schools were closed or consolidated with others. These larger, more central institutions became increasingly preoccupied with accreditation and academic respectability. 67

Guenther’s “significant [1952] watershed” comes just after the release of the 1951 Massey Commission report.

There were several kinds of postsecondary institutions that fell under the umbrella of the CHEM at this time. First there were Bible schools or Bible institutes. These had “typically offered a Bible-centred, intensely practical, lay-oriented program of post-secondary theological training,” and they “operated in a zone between the upper years of secondary education and the undergraduate years of post-secondary education.” 68 Bible colleges, however, were “accredited, conferred degrees, and possessed curricula including significantly more liberal arts or general education courses alongside course offerings in religious studies.” 69

In the 1960’s evangelical liberal arts colleges started to be founded in Canada. These liberal arts colleges were founded in either American liberal arts or Reformed liberal arts traditions.

---

66 Guenther, “Slithering Down the Plank of Intellectualism?,” 197.
69 Guenther, 199.
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The story of the founding of Trinity Western College (TWC), later Trinity Western University (TWU), provides an example of this new liberal arts stream within the CHEM and the motivations for founding liberal arts colleges within the CHEM.

TWC was founded in 1962 as a 2-year liberal arts college in the American liberal arts tradition, not as a Bible college. TWC was to be a “church-related junior college in Canada” to Trinity College and Seminary in Deerfield, Illinois.70

In 1958, the exploratory committee for TWC presented the Evangelical Free Church, TWC’s denominational sponsor, with the following reasons for establishing a liberal arts college in Canada:

- There are [Evangelical] Free Church young people in Canada seeking Christian Higher Education
- This higher education is not being provided by non-Free Church Bible Institutes and colleges
- Many of these young people are experiencing frustration in failing to achieve their desired goals
- Many are unsuccessful in finding a satisfactory place in their local communities after a period of time in these Institutions
- Many of the young people are being led away from service in the Free Church after training in these Institutions
- The distances involved in traveling from their homes in Canada to Chicago militate against their enrolling at Trinity immediately after completing their High School courses.71

That the exploratory committee identified the “frustration” of Evangelical Free young people with their Christian higher education options in 1958 when only about 50% of the Canadian adult population had graduated from high school shows how quickly young adult attitudes toward higher education were changing.72

However, not everyone in the Canadian Evangelical Free church was as anxious to have access to a liberal arts education. Calvin Hanson, founding TWC president, writes about early opposition to the idea of a liberal arts college among Evangelical Free adults who were, themselves, “without the benefit of a university education”:

There was a general spirit of skepticism concerning the value of higher education as evidenced by flippancy and disparaging remarks which made fun of college degrees. It was apparently felt by many that a university education was quite incompatible with a

70 Calvin B. Hanson, On the Raw Edge of Faith: The Miracle of Trinity Western College (Langley, BC: Trinity Western University, 1977), 23.
71 Hanson, 29.
strong and warm commitment to Jesus Christ. Furthermore, because many of the university educated clergy were within the liberal church element a kind of cause and effect relationship was summarily assumed between one’s training and one’s doctrine.”

A February 23, 1960 article by Dr. Arnold Olson in the denominational publication the *Beacon* sought to address opposition to TWC head on:

First of all, it should be stated that the proposed school for Canada will not be another Bible Institute. The country is blessed with a number of such outstanding schools. But these schools are set up, as they indicated in their own advertising, to train missionaries, pastors, and other church workers. We must face the fact that not every young person is led to these areas of service and, further, that there is an urgent need for consecrated and well-trained Christian men and women in our public schools, hospitals, industry, business – in every area of our economy.

Olson’s plea for a Christian liberal arts institution that can prepare young adults for “consecrated” service “in every area of our economy” nicely addressed the “frustrations” of young people that the TWC exploratory committee had identified. It also implicitly, highlighted what Olson, Hanson and others saw as the limited focus of Bible college training.

TWC was founded as a college in the American liberal arts tradition which emphasizes breadth of learning along with a focus on critical thinking, analysis and communication skills. Other Christian liberal arts institutions such as the Institute for Christian Studies (1967), The King’s University College (1979) and Redeemer University College (1982) were founded in a Reformed liberal arts tradition. The Reformed tradition also emphasizes breadth of learning, however, the Reformed motivation for breadth grows more out of the conviction that all of human existence falls under the sovereignty of God than a concern to form well-rounding individuals. This Reformed conviction is famously expressed by Abraham Kuyper:

> There is not a square inch in the whole domain of our human existence over which Christ, who is Sovereign over all, does not cry, Mine!

Some CHEM institutions were founded as liberal arts colleges while others began to transition to become liberal arts colleges.

In email correspondence, Brian Stiller, past Evangelical Fellowship of Canada president and past Tyndale University College and Seminary president, pointed out that:

---

73 Hanson, *On the Raw Edge of Faith: The Miracle of Trinity Western College*, 47.
74 Hanson, 50–51.
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Until the 70s, Evangelicals lived under the assumption that both our civic life and public universities were working out of a complementary Christian approach, or at least enough so that our colleges could focus on the Bible and let civic leaders and public universities take care of the rest. On education, we assumed that one could start out studying at a Bible college and then transfer to a public university. For many a Bible college education was a principal place for Christian higher education.\textsuperscript{76}

Justin Cooper, CHEC Executive Director and past president of Redeemer University College, follows on Stiller’s observation:

It was only in the late 80s that this [assumption that secular universities were working out of a complementary Christian approach] began to shift so that Bible colleges began adding the liberal arts majors and seeking university degrees and names. By the late 90s they were the majority model in terms of student enrolment, with the Bible colleges steadily sliding from their apex in the mid-80s.

The Evangelical community began to realize that the public university education and character formation was a brand of secularism that was undermining Christianity, not complementary. Hence the move to compete for this ground.\textsuperscript{77}

This shift of Bible colleges toward a liberal arts model can be seen in CHEC institution name changes. More than three-quarters (76%) of current CHEC institutions have changed their names since their founding.\textsuperscript{78} There have been three principal kinds of name changes. First, some signalled an improvement in academic standards by upgrading their institution type. An institute, for example, might become a college, or a college might become a university. Second, some institutions moved to drop references to the Bible from their names. Third, some institutions moved to drop or soften references to a denominational affiliation.

1. Eighteen out of thirty-three (55%) CHEC institutions upgraded their institution type since their founding, and twelve of these did so since 2000.
2. Twenty-one out of thirty-three (64%) CHEC institutions at one time had a reference to the Bible in their name. Fourteen of these twenty-one have since dropped their names’ references to the Bible, and ten of these did so since 2000.
3. Thirteen out of thirty-three (39%) CHEC institutions had a reference in their name to a denominational tradition. Ten of these thirteen have since dropped or softened their names’ denominational references, and six of these have done so since 2000.

Chart 6.1 below shows the year current CHEC member institutions were founded along with the year of last name change for institutions that changed their names. The rate of name changes peaked in the last few decades.

\textsuperscript{76} Email correspondence from November 16, 2018.
\textsuperscript{77} Email correspondence from November 16, 2018.
\textsuperscript{78} CHEC affiliate member Acts Seminaries in British Columbia, which is itself a partnership of four denominational seminaries, is not included in this name change analysis.
Bruce Guenther identifies two impulses behind the drive for accreditation:

- A perceived link between higher education and the technological and economic growth of the country; and
- Student and parent demands for “more recognition in the form of degrees and transferable credit for the time and money spent at Bible schools” as the impulse behind the pursuit of accreditation.\textsuperscript{79}

“Accreditation,” according to Guenther, “has been used in a general sense to describe the improvement of academic standards for the purpose of granting degrees and for obtaining recognition by other post-secondary institutions.”\textsuperscript{80}

When the Canadian CHEM initially sought accreditation, it looked south to the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges (AABC) founded in 1947 during the annual meeting of the American National Association of Evangelicals (NAE).\textsuperscript{81} The AABC sought to preserve the “distinctive and indispensable elements of a Bible institute education” while being committed to “sound collegiate standards.”\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{79} Guenther, “Slithering Down the Plank of Intellectualism?,” 199.
\textsuperscript{80} Guenther, 199–200.
\textsuperscript{81} Guenther, 208.
\textsuperscript{82} Guenther, 209.
Guenther argues that rather than providing the sought after “respectability and recognition for their schools among public universities in Canada,” AABC accreditation may have further isolated BCM schools:

This link to a network of conservative evangelical theological institutions south of the boarder connected Canadian evangelical educators to an expression of American evangelicalism that was intentionally distancing itself from fundamentalism. Moreover, it meant that faculty members from Canadian Bible schools and colleges seldom had opportunity to establish personal relationships with professors and leaders within Canadian seminaries (which were largely in secular universities at the time) and universities, thereby reinforcing the isolation of the private evangelical schools within the Canadian evangelical landscape.83

Moreover, accreditation through AABC, and later the Association of Biblical Higher Education (ABHE), facilitated the transfer of credits between member institutions and significantly with American institutions, but not with the wider Canadian public postsecondary education system.84

Accreditation has not been without controversy, and not all CHEM schools, even to this day, have chosen to be accredited. The title for Guenther’s paper on accreditation “Slithering Down the Plank of Intellectualism” is drawn from a letter written by Prairie Bible Institute founding president L.E. Maxwell where he criticized another Bible college for its pursuit of accreditation. The letter illustrates how some felt about accreditation:

Certainly the plank of intellectualism is that over which fundamental and evangelical men slither finally and almost imperceptibly [sic] into the school of liberal thought.”85

Sometimes name changes upgrading an institution type have been accompanied or followed by name changes distancing the institution from its Bible college roots or its denominational tradition. These changes have attracted some criticism.

Hiebert et al writing in 2005, and likely responding to such criticism, urge caution when criticizing school name changes:

84 Individual CHEM institutions went on to have transfer credit arrangements with secular Canadian universities and colleges, but these arrangements were not a consequence of AABC or ABHE accreditation. However, the academic improvements made because of accreditation may have placed these schools in a better position to make transfer credit arrangements.
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We also need to guard against a rather shallow expectation that institutional name-changes reliably and definitively signal significant changes of the fundamental character of any schools.  

Hiebert et al go on to explain that name changes removing Bible references can be understood as expanding missional opportunities for schools.

Schools without the red-flag term ‘Bible’ in their names simply have more such missional opportunities than do schools who retain that term in their name.

The authors’ point is that dropping references to the Bible in the school’s name makes the school’s degree more useful to its students, and several CHEC institutions make this very argument on their websites. Indeed, the energies directed toward accreditation and the general elevation of academic standards point to a conviction that young adults choose a college primarily for the utility of the degree. This conviction, however, runs counter to CHEC’s own 2007 market research which we will look at in section 8 of this report.

Given emerging adulthood is the usual life state for undergraduate age students, it would be natural to see CHEM schools change their self-presentation to become more attractive to emerging adults.

Although many postsecondary education programs are geared toward training for specific careers, teenagers and emerging adults often have not decided on a career. Often, they choose a postsecondary program that they believe will maximize their options for when they do decide on a career. Liberal arts programs, and university programs more generally, are seen as offering more career options than a curriculum that focuses on the Bible or ministry training.

A name is often the first opportunity a school has to create an impression on a prospective student. For example, a student may reasonably conclude that she will find a curricular emphasis on the Bible at a school that describes itself as a Bible college. Whatever reasons a particular CHEC institution may have had for changing its name, it is clear that name changes as a whole, especially in the last two decades, have sought to present CHEC institutions as more academically rigorous and less tied to denominational traditions or a Bible focus.

Given the CHEM’s strenuous efforts to improve academic standards, we would expect prospective students’ impressions of the quality of the movement’s degrees to be improving. It is likely that downward trends in undergraduate CHEC enrolment have other explanations than concerns about academic rigor or reputation. It may be that changes in what Erikson calls

86 Hiebert, Bates, and Magnus, Character with Competence Education: The Bible College Movement in Canada, 65.
87 Hiebert, Bates, and Magnus, 66.
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Societal ideal prototypes have produced a kind of prospective student less likely to choose a school with implicit or explicit religious commitments.

7. The Formation of Christian Higher Education Canada

The Christian Higher Education Movement (CHEM) also responded to increased competition from secular institutions by forming cooperative, associative structures for professional development, enrolment and marketing.

Christian Higher Education Canada (CHEC), was formed in 2005 as the union of three other CHEM associative structures: The Association of Canadian Bible Colleges (ACBC), the Christian Higher Education Enrollment Association (CHEEA) and the Christian Higher Education Roundtable (CHEd).

CHEC is “a non-profit association of higher education institutions ... Members include 34 fully accredited, degree-granting, Christ-centered institutions representing a broad spectrum of undergraduate and graduate Christian higher education within Canada working together to further the CHEC Mission.”

CHEC’s mission is “to advance the efficiency and effectiveness of Christian higher education at member schools, including fostering institutional cooperation, and to raise public awareness of the value of Christian higher education in Canada.”

Here are brief descriptions of the three organizations that merged to form CHEC in 2005.

- The Association of Canadian Bible Colleges (ACBC) was founded in 1960 as “an association ... that encouraged professional development for faculty and administrators through an annual conference with speakers, workshops and the like.”
- The Christian Higher Education Enrollment Association was founded in 2000. CHEEA organized annual CHE recruitment fairs in key locations across Canada and put together the annual recruitment tour package that allowed admissions officers from Bible colleges and Christian universities to participate in the tour. Secondarily, CHEEA provided training and professional development for recruitment or enrolment officers.
- The Christian Higher Education Roundtable (CHEd) was founded on The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada’s platform with the first meeting taking place in October 2001. Of the 19 founding institutions, 14 were either liberal arts colleges, had significant liberal arts programs, or had graduate or seminary programs. In 2003, CHEd changed its name to CHEC, however, this represented the evolution of CHEd, not the organization created in 2005 as the merger of CHEC (CHEd), ACBC, and CHEEA.

References:

89 See https://www.checanada.ca/chec/about_us.
90 Ibid.
91 Email correspondence from Justin Cooper from November 27, 2018.
92 Email correspondence from Justin Cooper from November 27 and 28, 2018.
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The 2002, 2003 and 2004 CHEC (CHEd) annual general meeting (AGM) minutes demonstrate that the motivation for forming CHEC was cooperation in marketing and in recruiting students. Years before the 2007 Ipsos Reid — CHEC Marketing study, which we will look at in section 8 of this report, the 2002 CHEC AGM minutes noted that a study was needed to answer questions such as:

- What does the average Christian know about Christian higher education?
- Why do Christian parents and students decide on secular education?93

It is clear from these questions posed at the 2002 AGM that CHEd was concerned about a perceived lack of awareness of CHE among Christians and with competition from secular higher education institutions.

The early CHEd AGM meeting minutes divided their member institutions into “sectors.” The transformation of Bible colleges to liberal arts colleges can be seen in the changing list of sectors in these minutes.

In the 2002 AGM minutes, the listed sectors were:

- Bible college,
- seminary/graduate school, and
- Christian liberal arts.

In 2003, by comparison, the list included:

- Liberal arts and sciences institutions,
- graduate schools,
- seminaries,
- Bible colleges, and
- Bible colleges in transition [to become liberal arts colleges].94

By 2003 CHEC felt that “Bible colleges in transition” to liberal arts colleges were a large enough portion of its membership to warrant its own sector.95

CHEC institutions that shifted to a liberal arts model did so for a variety reasons. In almost all cases, however, the bundle of reasons included a concern to be more competitive in attracting students. Put another way, there was a common conviction that the liberal arts model was more likely to be successful in attracting students than Bible college, Bible institute or Bible school models.

---

93 2002 CHEd AGM minutes, p. 3.
94 2002 CHEd AGM minutes and 2003 CHEC AGM minutes.
95 2003 was the year CHEd changed its name to CHEC.
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CHEC is an association of accredited schools. There are, however, other non-accredited evangelical Christian postsecondary schools or training institutions. These include discipleship training schools such as Capernwray or Youth With A Mission (YWAM), Bible schools hosted in large evangelical congregations, and seminars offered by ministry organizations such as the Canadian Council of Christian Charities and the Willow Creek Global Leadership Summit. In addition, many global mission sending agencies, such as WEC International - Canada and denominational agencies, do at least some of the missionary training that might previously have been offered through CHE institutions. Competency-based education is another CHE model that is gaining traction in North America. Finally there are non-accredited Bible colleges and Bible schools. All these non-accredited models share a greater focus on practical Christian ministry training and discipleship than is possible at a liberal arts school.

The scope and scale of these non-accredited CHEM options in Canada is not well understood. In many cases, these alternatives have arisen to fill a market accredited CHEM schools left underserved as they moved toward liberal arts models.

Some CHEC institutions moved toward liberal arts models out of both philosophical convictions about education and in order to compete with secular higher education institutions. They formed associative structures that helped them work cooperatively in areas such as recruitment and marketing.

8. The 2007 Ipsos Reid CHEC Marketing Study

Ipsos Reid conducted a marketing study for CHEC in 2007 with the following objectives:

- Compare and contrast the core set of values and principles of Canadian Christians in relation to Canadian society as a whole.
- Explore the characteristics and define the size and scope of CHE market(s).
- Examine motivations for and barriers against choosing CHE institutions.
- Determine the impact of institutional offerings on the decisions to choose/not choose CHE institutions.
- Determine the nature and scope of the impact of “influencers” on educational choice.
- Identify opportunities for enhancing CHE’s profile through messaging and positioning information dissemination.

---


97 See, for example, [https://wec-canada.org/index.php/training/](https://wec-canada.org/index.php/training/) and [https://www.cmacan.org/education/#additional](https://www.cmacan.org/education/#additional)
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- Determine perceptions of and markets for various types of CHE institutions.\(^9\)

The Ipsos study identified six market segments or “mindsets” (see table 8.1 below). Nine-tenths of current CHEC students (90%) and nearly 19 in 20 (94%) of CHEC high school prospects were from just two segments: Evangelical Enthusiasts and Cultural Christians. Close to 17 in 20 of the high school prospects were Evangelical Enthusiasts.

Table 8.1. Market segments among various target audiences, 2007 Ipsos Reid – CHEC Marketing Study, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Gen Pop.</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>18- to 24-year-olds</th>
<th>H.S. Students</th>
<th>CHEC Students</th>
<th>CHEC HS Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Enthusiasts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Christians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Believers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church &amp; State</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeply Disinterested</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent Agnostics</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Evangelical Enthusiasts** were described as having the following characteristics:

- **Very committed Christians** with **very strong beliefs** in Christian doctrine and values.
- **High church attendance**, and **strong views** that church and religion have a role to play in Canadian society.
- Characterized by **very favorable views of CHE**, and strong commitment to attending a CHE institution.
- **Believe that CHE offers opportunities for personal and spiritual growth not available elsewhere outside CHE institutions.**\(^10\) [Emphasis added]

**Cultural Christians** were described as having the following characteristics:

- **Very committed Christians** with **solid doctrinal beliefs/values**
- Not frequent church goers, because they value private beliefs over what’s taught in church, and don’t believe it’s essential to attend church to be a good Christian.
- Still, they do feel church plays an important role in Canadian society.

---


\(^10\) Grenville, 14.
Competition for Character Education

- Like the idea of CHE for what it gives in terms of learning about and growing in one’s faith.
- But, they’re not that open to attending a CHE institution; they believe it’s more for those interested in seeking a career in religion, which they’re not.
- Convinced they can get spiritual growth outside the CHE system.
- And, they have concerns about single-perspective bias in what is being taught in Christian education.101 [Emphasis added]

The Ipsos study concluded that 80% of the “captive” CHEC market came from Evangelical Enthusiasts and Cultural Christians, and that 44% of the “probably attend” and 48% of the “might attend” growth markets came from these two market segments as well.102

When CHEC students were asked for the main reason they decided to attend a CHEC institution the top two responses were “Faith-based education” (38%) and “Christian oriented/focused (education)” (27%). In fact, of the 14 responses listed only 5 did not have an explicit link to the Christian faith.103 The study found that CHEC schools scored more poorly on perceptions of course selection, accreditation, job placement record, and location. These factors, however, were usually not cited as important factors in school selection for students who actually chose CHEC institutions.

Significantly, accreditation was not a top factor in school choice for high school students or 18- to 24-year-olds, which typically make up the undergraduate market.104 Rather, for all respondents, these were the top 6 factors affecting school choice:

1. Reputation
2. Teachers / Instructors
3. Education / Learning Environment
4. Program / Curriculum
5. Location
6. Cost105

Strong Christian commitment and a prior belief in the value of CHE are what defined actual and potential CHEC markets in 2007. These strong belief and community commitments are consistent with having achieved the Eriksonian virtue of fidelity and having formed an adult identity, that is, with having moved past emerging adulthood. In fact, Grenville notes that 81% of CHEC students describe their faith commitment prior to attending a CHEC institution as either “very strong” (39%) or “somewhat strong” (42%).106 Strong religious commitments are inconsistent with emerging adulthood.

101 Grenville, 15.
102 Grenville, 24.
103 Grenville, 33.
104 Grenville, 34.
105 Grenville, 37.
106 Grenville, 34.
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The study identified some “key challenges” for the CHE market:

- Many self-identified Christians would not consider attending a CHE institution.
- Two key target audiences – high school prospects and 18- to 24-year-old prospects – are less inclined than others to attend CHE institutions.
- CHE more generally, and its institutions more specifically, are generally unknown in Canada among the key target audiences and segments.
- In 3 of the 4 [Christian] segments, there are specific challenges tied to perceptions of Christian postsecondary education, personal faith commitment, and the competitive context of higher education in Canada. Some effort will be required on both the marketing and strategic communications fronts to take full advantage of growth opportunities.  

These key challenges are with the “non-captive” market. The “self-identified Christians” who would not consider attending a CHE institution are not among the religiously “very committed.” Most high school and 18- to 24-year-olds are emerging adults who have not yet formed adult identities and faith commitments that might incline them to choose a CHE institution.

There is an implicit commitment to the Christian faith in choosing to attend CHE institution. This implicit faith commitment may be what is being referenced in the fourth bullet from the above list as a specific challenge tied to “personal faith commitment.” Emerging adults, by definition, have not yet made an adult, enduring, faith commitment.

The challenge of awareness is, in part, a reflection of how embedded prospective students are in their Christian communities. The Ipsos study concluded that “People across all target audiences are more likely to seek (or have sought) information about post-secondary education through personal contacts – family, friends, parents (but not employers/colleagues).”  

Prospective students who have access to “family, friends and parents” who can provide information about CHEC institutions will have a greater chance to learn about CHEC institutions. Those who know about CHEC institutions are more likely to be Evangelical Enthusiasts themselves or Evangelical Enthusiasts who attended a CHEC institution. Local churches are a natural place for prospective students and those with knowledge about CHEC institutions to meet.

---

107 Grenville, 68.
108 Grenville, 58.
9. Admissions and Openness

In the past, and in some cases in the present, Christian faith commitment was not just implicit in attending a CHEC institution, it was a condition of admission. Many CHEM schools made this commitment explicit either in their application process or in community covenants grounded in the school’s understanding of the Christian faith.

In 2012, Trinity Western University finalized its proposal for a new law school. After receiving approval from the British Columbia Minister of Advanced Education and the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, three provincial law societies, the Law Society of British Columbia (LSBC), the Law Society of Upper Canada (LSUC) and the Nova Scotia Barristers’ Society (NSBS), refused to recognize the proposed law school. The provincial law societies’ objections to the proposed law school were moral in nature, not about academic rigor. Trinity Western had a mandatory community covenant for students and faculty that was informed by the school’s understanding of the Christian faith. For the law societies, the objectionable part of the community covenant was the requirement that sexual activity for staff and students be limited to heterosexual married couples. The law societies contended that this covenant would, in effect, exclude LGBTQ students from the proposed law school. The BC and Ontario cases eventually went to the Supreme Court of Canada.109

This case illustrates how prospective students – or law societies – may view the implicit or explicit Christian commitments that go along with attending a CHE institution. The law societies argued that the community covenant, which represented a commitment to a Christian code of conduct and not a declaration of faith, would nevertheless constitute a barrier to participation in a law school.

CHEC institutions have a variety of admission practices: open, selective, or faith-based admissions. In an unpublished discussion paper, CHEC Executive Director, Justin Cooper, outlines these three approaches:

- **Open** – To all students. Students are admitted from all faith backgrounds or no faith background (atheist or agnostic). Explicit support for the faith-based academic mission of the institution may be required. This can be paired with a comprehensive, aspirational, voluntary or ethical approach to community standards (comprehensive/mandatory standards may be the least compatible).
- **Selective** – Mission-related selection. Students are asked to submit a pastor’s recommendation and often an essay about their desire to study at a Christian university; those without a pastor’s recommendation are usually interviewed. Students with a suitable recommendation and essay, as well as searching agnostics and those from other world religions with a positive interview (interest in the mission), are admitted;

109 Law Society of British Columbia v. Trinity Western University, No. 37318 (Supreme Court of Canada June 15, 2018); Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada, No. 37209 (Supreme Court of Canada June 15, 2018).
committed atheists and adherents of other world religions are not admitted. Those admitted also commit to the community standards of the institution.

- **Faith-Based ("Closed")** – Only Christian students are admitted. Students are asked to submit a faith statement or sign the institution’s statement of faith as part of the admission process; it may include a commitment to the institution’s faith-based community standards or may take the faith statement to include a commitment to moral and lifestyle standards. Historically, this was the approach taken by most faith-based institutions (TWU has open admission by charter provision).  

Selective and faith-based admission practices either require explicit commitment to the Christian faith and/or a commitment to the “community standards of the institution” that are informed by the institutions understanding of the Christian faith. Even open admission practices, the least restrictive practice, often require “explicit support for the faith-based academic mission of the institution.” In most cases CHEC institution admission policies either explicitly or implicitly require a commitment to the Christian faith, a willingness to live by some Christian community standards or support for the faith-based academic mission of the institution.

The apprehension that enrolling in a CHEC institution might imply or require some kind of Christian faith commitment can be seen in the arguments advanced by the law societies in the *LSBC v. TWU* and *TWU v. LSUC* cases. Open admissions is the newest form of admission practice for CHEC schools and is usually practiced by liberal arts institutions that are trying to broaden their appeal beyond the Christian community. The openness of the practice relates to religion. This means not sharing the Christian faith or being uncertain about one’s faith commitments are not impediments to admission. CHEC institutions may believe open admission policies removed religious impediments to admission, however, emerging adults considering the Christian providence and character of the institution may still consider the institution to be closed.

---


10. Comparison of the CHEC and Main Datasets

The Young Adult Transition Research (YATR) study’s young adult survey was screened by polling firm MARU/Matchbox with two samples resulting in two datasets. The first dataset, which we will call the Main dataset and on which the *Renegotiating Faith* report is based, was screened with 1,998 young adults between the ages of 18 and 28 who had a Christian religious affiliation as a teen and who attended religious services at least monthly at some point during their teen years.\(^\text{112}\) The second dataset, which we will call the Christian Higher Education Canada (CHEC) dataset, was screened with a population 773 current or former CHEC students between the ages of 18 and 28 who had a Christian religious affiliation as a teen and who attended religious services at least monthly at some point during their teen years (see Appendix A for more information about the CHEC dataset).

CHEC students who did not identify as Christian during their teen years or who did not attend religious services at least monthly at some point during their teen years were excluded from the sample. This means that we surveyed a portion of the CHEC student body, and one that is more likely to be religiously engaged than the entire student body.

Apart from a modified survey introduction, one additional question dealing with consent and two additional questions dealing with CHEC respondents’ status as CHEC students, the CHEC and Main sample surveys were identical.

In this section, we will compare the CHEC and Main responses to several survey questions.\(^\text{113}\) Generally speaking, CHEC respondents were more likely to have been religiously engaged as a teen and to continue to have been engaged as young adults than Main sample respondents. The same is true if we compare CHEC respondents with just the teen evangelical affiliates from the Main sample. Although CHEC respondents were just as likely to use social media as Main sample respondents, they tended to have more positive mental health and social outcomes. CHEC students tended to persist in their faith somewhat irrespective of the presence of a home church mentor in their lives, whereas, the presence of a local church teen mentor is more strongly correlated with Christian religious persistence for Main sample respondents.

10.1. Youth Group

There was little difference in how CHEC and Main sample respondents viewed the focus of their home church youth groups. Almost nine in ten (87%) of CHEC sample respondents agreed that “Learning about Jesus, the Christian faith and how to live out the Christian faith was the focus of the church youth group I attended as a teenager” compared to eight in ten (80%) of those from the Main sample.\(^\text{114}\)

\(^{112}\) Hiemstra, Dueck, and Blackaby, “Renegotiating Faith,” 177.
\(^{113}\) For more about the datasets see appendix A and Hiemstra, Dueck, and Blackaby, 175–78.
\(^{114}\) For those whose average youth group attendance as a teen was more often than “never.”
There was a significant difference, however, in how often CHEC respondents attended their church youth group as a teen. CHEC respondents were almost twice as likely (55%) as Main sample respondents (28%) to say they attended youth group weekly as a teen (see chart 10.1 below).

**Table 10.1. “During your teenage years (age 14 to 17), on average, how often did you attend a church youth group?”, CHEC and Main samples, percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 times a month</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

### 10.2. Christian Camp

Our survey had two measures of Christian camp participation. First, respondents were asked if they attended a Christian camp as a teen. Second, they were asked if they had worked on staff at a Christian camp. Subsection 10.2 will look at the relationships between Christian camp participation and various measures of religious persistence.

CHEC respondents were more likely to have attended a Christian camp as a teen (66%) than Main sample respondents (44%), or teen evangelical affiliates from the Main sample (52%). CHEC respondents were more likely (58%) to have worked at a Christian camp than Main sample respondents (26%) or teen evangelical affiliates from the Main sample (31%).

#### 10.2.1. Christian Camp and Mentors

CHEC respondents were more likely (62%) to have had a home church mentor than respondents from the Main sample (43%). Although CHEC respondents who participated in Christian camps were slightly more likely to have had a home church mentor (10% higher for campers and 7% higher for camp staff), the spread was much smaller than for Main sample respondents who were 38% more likely to report having had a mentor if they had been a camper and 43% more likely to report having had a mentor if they had been on camp staff (see table 10.2 below).
Table 10.2. Had a home church mentor by Christian\textsuperscript{a} camp participation, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Participation</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen Camper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>+32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camp Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+43</td>
<td>+33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.

10.2.2. Christian Camp and Gap Years

For those who continued on to postsecondary education, slightly more than a third of both CHEC respondents (35%) and Main sample respondents (37%) reported taking a gap year.\textsuperscript{115} For CHEC respondents, camp participation was not strongly correlated with taking a gap year. By comparison, Main sample respondents who participated in Christian camps as campers were 20% more likely to take a gap year, and those who participated as camp staff were 21% more likely to take a gap year (see table 10.3 below).

Table 10.3. Took a gap year by Christian\textsuperscript{a} camp participation, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Participation</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen Camper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camp Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.

\textsuperscript{b}Only asked of those who attained at least some postsecondary education.

\textsuperscript{115}Our study defined a gap year as a year or more away from school between finishing high school and starting postsecondary education.
10.2.3. Christian Camp and Young Adult Religious Service Attendance

More than three-quarters (76%) of CHEC respondents reported attending religious services at least weekly as a young adult compared to just under a quarter (24%) of Main sample respondents. For CHEC respondents, camp participation was not strongly correlated with young adult religious service attendance. For Main sample respondents, however, those who participated as campers were 18% more likely to attend religious services at least weekly as a young adult compared to non-campers, and those who had participated as camp staff were 29% more likely to be weekly attenders compared to non-camp staff (see table 10.4 below).

Table 10.4. Young adult religious service attendance by Christian* participation, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Participation</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>At least monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Camper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2.4. Christian Camp and “Next Christian Community” Connections

*Next Christian Communities (NCC) is a shorthand way to talk about the Christian campus groups, churches and other Christian communities that young adults will participate in after they have left their home churches or started postsecondary education. In this sub-section we will look at the relationships between Christian camp participation connections to next Christian communities.

Christian campus groups at CHEC institutions tend to be organized by the CHEC institutions themselves and student participation is usually directly encouraged by the administration. By comparison, Christian campus groups on secular campuses are usually independent of the school administration (see discussion in section 10.5.2.).

For those who went on to postsecondary education, three-fifths of CHEC respondents (60%) said that they connected with a Christian campus group compared to less than three-tenths (28%) of Main sample respondents.
Both CHEC and Main sample Christian camp participants were more likely to connect with a Christian campus group than non-participants.\textsuperscript{116} CHEC respondents who participated as campers were 16% more likely to connect with a Christian campus group, and those who participated as camp staff were 17% more likely connect (see table 10.5 below). Main sample respondents who participated as campers were 29% more likely to connect with a Christian campus group, and those who participated as camp staff were 37% more likely to connect.

### Table 10.5. Connected with a Christian\textsuperscript{a} campus group by Christian\textsuperscript{a} camp participation, CHEC and Main samples\textsuperscript{b}, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Participation</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen Camper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camp Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.

\textsuperscript{b} Only asked of those who attained at least some postsecondary education.

Five in six (83\%) CHEC respondents who moved out of their parents’ home connected with a new local church after moving out compared to just over one third (35\%) of Main sample respondents.

CHEC respondents who had participated as campers were 5\% more likely to make a new church connection after having moved out of their parents’ home while those who participated as staff were 9\% more likely to make a connection. Main sample camp participants, however, were far more likely to make a connection. Main sample teen campers were 23\% more likely to connect with a different local church after having moved out, and camp staff were 40\% more likely to make the connection (see table 10.6 below).

\textsuperscript{116} For those who went on to postsecondary education.
Table 10.6. Connected with a different local church/parish after having first moved out of parents’ home by Christian\textsuperscript{a} camp participation, CHEC and Main samples\textsuperscript{b}, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Participation</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen Camper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camp Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.
\textsuperscript{b} Only asked of those who had moved out of their parents’ home. Does not include those who continued to attend the same church after having moved out of their parents’ home.

10.3. Encouragement

Young adult respondents were provided with a list of possible encouragers compiled from our qualitative interviews with young adults and asked, “Which of the following people identified your gifts and talents and encouraged you to consider a career that made use of them.” CHEC respondents were more likely than Main sample respondents to report having had people identify their gifts for all listed encouragers (see chart 10.1 below).

Over the range of listed encouragers, on average, 47% of CHEC respondents reported having received encouragement compared to just 28% of Main sample respondents. The largest differences between CHEC and Main sample responses were in the rates of reported encouragement from mentors and local church religious leaders (Pastors, youth pastors, or other youth leaders). On average CHEC respondents were 27% more likely to report having been encouraged by mentors and local church religious leaders than Main sample respondents (see chart 10.1)

These results suggest that, as a group, CHEC respondents tend to come from families and communities that provide more encouragement compared to Main sample respondents.
Chart 10.1. “Which of the following people identified your gifts and talents and encouraged you to consider a career that made use of them?”, CHEC and Main samples, percent

10.4. Sharing Parents’ Faith

In *Renegotiating Faith*, we found evidence that young adults were more likely to say their parents did not understand their real religious views when there was greater potential for religious conflict.\(^{117}\) CHEC respondents were less likely to agree that their father (the data for mothers are similar) does not understand their real religious views which suggests CHEC respondents are more likely to share the religious beliefs of their parents (see table 10.7 below).

Competition for Character Education

Table 10.7. Agreement with “My father does not understand my real views about religion,” CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

10.5. Connections after High School

In this section we will look at connections to new churches, Christian campus groups and local church young adult groups.

10.5.1. Connections with a New Church

Five in six (83%) CHEC respondents who moved out of their parents’ home connected with a new local church after moving out compared to just over one third (35%) of Main sample respondents.

The *Renegotiating Faith* report found a strong correlation between having a home church mentor and making connections to new local congregations after moving out of the parental home. Main sample respondents were more than twice as likely to connect with a new local church if they had a home church mentor a teen (53%) than if they did not (20%) (see chart 10.2 below). Main sample respondents were also almost three times as likely to make this connection (68%) if someone from their home church made a connection or introduction for them with a new local church than if no one from their home church made a connection for them (23%).

For CHEC respondents, however, the presence or absence of a teen home church mentor is not correlated with the same dramatic differences in connection rates. Seventeen in twenty (85%) CHEC respondents who had a teen home church mentor connected with a new local church after moving out of their parents’ home compared to about sixteen in twenty (79%) of those who did not have a home church mentor.

---

118 Hiemstra, Dueck, and Blackaby, 131–42.
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CHEC respondents who moved out of their parents’ home and had some from their home church help them with an introduction to a new church were more likely to make the connection, but the difference was comparatively slight. Nine in ten (92%) who had this home church help connecting to a new church went on to connect with another local church compared to eight in ten (81%) who did not have this home church help.

When CHEC respondents first moved out of their parents’ home, almost seven-tenths (69%) did so to attend school compared to just 40% of Main sample respondents. In many cases, CHEC respondents who moved out of their parents’ home would have been moving to attend a CHEC institution where they would have been likely to receive encouragement to connect with a local church.
Chart 10.2. Young adults who made connections with a new local church, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Church Connection</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Home Church Connection</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor, Regular Contact</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor, No Regular Contact</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mentor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For those who had moved out of their parents’ home.

"Home Church Connection" means someone from the young adult’s home church tried to make a connection for them either to a new local church/parish or a Christian campus group. "Mentor" means they had a local church/parish mentor as a teen. "Regular contact" means they are still in regular contact with their home church mentor. "No Regular Contact" means they are not in regular contact with their home church mentor.
10.5.2. Connections with a Christian Campus Group

We asked both CHEC and Main sample respondents about their connections with Christian campus groups. Christian campus groups will mean something quite different on a secular college or university campuses than on a CHEC campus. On secular campuses it usually means groups like InterVarsity, Power to Change – Students, Navigators or a chaplaincy. Notwithstanding the three CHEC institutions that are affiliate colleges of Canadian secular universities and have InterVarsity and/or Power to Change – Student clubs, no CHEC schools have InterVarsity, Power to Change – Students or Navigators campus clubs.\(^{119}\)

CHEC schools organize their own Christian groups for campus service, witnessing off campus, campus worship, and other purposes. In many ways these CHEC Christian campus groups are extensions of CHEC institutions’ programs.

CHEC respondents were more likely to connect with Christian campus groups than Main respondents. Although CHEC respondents connected with local churches at similar rates irrespective of the presence of mentors in their lives, the presence of teen, home church mentors in the lives of CHEC students was correlated with different rates of connection with Christian campus groups, as was having some from one’s home church make a connection with a Christian campus group (see chart 10.3. below).

Main sample respondents were four times (66%) as likely to connect with a Christian campus group if someone from their home church made a connection than if no connection was made for them (16%). By comparison, four in five (80%) CHEC respondents connected with a Christian campus group with the help of an introduction and just 56% made the connection without the benefit of an introduction.

Main sample respondents were more than three times as likely (48%) to connect with a Christian campus group if they had a home church mentor than if they did not (13%). Similarly, CHEC respondents were more likely to connect with a Christian campus group (63%) having had a home church mentor than not having had one (54%).

\(^{119}\) Regent College is an affiliate college of the University of British Columbia, McMaster Divinity College is an affiliate college of McMaster University and Acadia Divinity College is an affiliate college of Acadia University. See https://ivcf.ca/campus/connectoncampus/, https://p2c.com/students/ (Campuses), http://www.navigators.ca/about_us.php (Students) and https://www.checanada.ca/chec/members.
Chart 10.3. Young adults who made connections with a Christian\textsuperscript{a} campus group, CHEC and Main samples\textsuperscript{b}, percent

\textsuperscript{a}Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.
\textsuperscript{b}For those who had gone on to postsecondary education.

"Home Church Connection" means someone from the young adult’s home church tried to make a connection for them either to a new local church/parish or a Christian campus group. "Mentor" means they had a local church/parish mentor as a teen. "Regular contact" means they are still in regular contact with their home church mentor. "No Regular Contact" means they are not in regular contact with their home church mentor.
10.5.3. Timing of Connections

The first month after a transition such as starting university or college is critical for making Next Christian Community connections. This was true for both CHEC and Main sample respondents. Almost four-fifths of both CHEC respondents (79%) and Main sample respondents (78%) who connected with a new local church after having moved out of their parents’ home did so within four weeks of moving out (see table 10.8 below). Similarly, majorities of both CHEC (88%) and Main (74%) sample respondents who connected to a Christian campus group did so within four weeks of starting their postsecondary program.

Table 10.8. How long before connecting with new local church or Christian campus group, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Connected with a new local church</th>
<th>Connected with a Christian campus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEC</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the first two weeks</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the first month</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the first four months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the first year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer than a year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First four weeks</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a For those who had moved out of their parents’ home and connected with a different (local church/parish).

*b Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.

+c For those who had attended university or college and made a connection.

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

10.5.4. Explanations for Not Connecting with Christian Communities

We asked those who did not connected with either a Christian campus group or a local church young adult group why they did not make these connections. Respondents were presented with lists of explanations that were drawn from our earlier interviews with young adults (see listed explanations in table 10.9 below).

CHEC respondents’ three most common explanations for not connecting with a local church young adult group were not having enough time (41%), the local church not having a young adult group (39%) and not knowing anyone in the group (38%). By comparison, the most common explanations given by Main sample respondents were not being interested (49%), not having enough time (25%) and not knowing anyone there (24%). Two of the top three reasons (not having enough time and not knowing anyone there) were shared by both groups.

CHEC respondents’ most common explanations for not connecting with a Christian campus group were not being aware of any (43%), not having enough time (40%) and not being
interested (35%). By comparison the top three explanations given by Main sample respondents were not being interested (50%), not having enough time (33%) and not knowing anyone there (23%). Although the order is the different, these two sets of top-three explanations are otherwise the same.

Table 10.9. Explanations for not connecting with a local church\textsuperscript{d} young adult group since high school and for not connecting with a Christian\textsuperscript{a} campus group\textsuperscript{b}, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanations</th>
<th>Did not connect with a local church young adult group</th>
<th>Did not connect with a Christian\textsuperscript{a} campus group\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEC</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local church\textsuperscript{d} did not have one</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of any</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know anyone there</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not comfortable around religious people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrinal conflict\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate groups\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Catholic or Orthodox or other Christian.
\textsuperscript{b}For those who had attended university or college and made a connection.
\textsuperscript{c}Did not feel my religious views would be welcome / Doctrinal conflict.
\textsuperscript{d}Local church or parish
\textsuperscript{e}Don’t want to be associated with groups that promote hate
Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

In spite of time pressures, two-fifths (40%) of CHEC students connected with both a local church young adult group and a Christian campus group compared to just under one-fifth (19%) of Main sample respondents (see chart 10.4 below). More than four-fifths (83%) of CHEC students connected with either a Christian campus group or a local church young adult group, compared to under half (45%) of Main sample respondents.
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Chart 10.4. Connected with local church young adult group since high school and/or connected with a Christian campus group, CHEC and Main samples\(^a\), percent

![Chart showing percentages of students connected with local church young adult group and/or Christian campus group.]

\(^a\)For those who had gone on to postsecondary education.

10.6. Social Media

Social media has become a pervasive part of contemporary Western experience.\(^{120}\) Most CHEC and Main sample respondents (97% and 95% respectively) reported using social media, and about two-thirds described themselves as frequent users (see table 10.10 below).

Table 10.10. “Are you on social media – such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.?” CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, frequently</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a lighter user</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not on social media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

\(^{120}\)Hiemstra, Dueck, and Blackaby, “Renegotiating Faith,” 75–76.
10.6.1. Social Media Use and Psychosocial Development

Gerald Kane, Professor at the Boston College Carroll School of Management, theorizes that people use social media differently in different psychosocial development stages. He uses a modified version of Erikson’s stages and identifies unique social media content and structure for each of these stages. By content Kane means “the information resources that users contribute and retrieve through the network,” and by structure he means the “user’s types and patterns of relationships established on social media platforms.”

Table 10.11 below outlines three different sets of content and structure pertaining to the three psychosocial development stages young adults age 18 to 28 are most likely to be in. Kane does not deal directly with emerging adulthood in his theory of social media use, but the vocalizing content and the exploring structure associated with the Individual Identity vs. Identity Confusion stage are consistent with Arnett’s description of emerging adulthood which emphasizes identity exploration.

Table 10.11. Kane’s social media content and structure for select psychosocial development stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial Development Stage</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity vs. Alienation (Ages 12 to 18)</td>
<td><strong>Affirmation:</strong> “The tendency to transfer or repeat content that others contribute.”</td>
<td><strong>Affiliation:</strong> “Associating and disassociating with certain referent peer groups.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Identity vs. Identity Confusion (Ages 18 to 24)</td>
<td><strong>Vocalizing:</strong> “Making independent or distinct contributions.”</td>
<td><strong>Exploring:</strong> “Increasing the number of relationships, the types of people contacted, or the types of relationships developed and maintained on the platform.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation (Ages 24 to 34)</td>
<td><strong>Targeting:</strong> “Sending different content to relationships of different strength.”</td>
<td><strong>Prioritizing:</strong> “Selecting a small group of relationships from one’s wider network for special attention.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

121 Gerald C. Kane, “Psychosocial Stages of Symbolic Action In Social Media” (Thirty Fourth International Conference on Information Systems, Milan, 2013), 3, https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7afd/4e6a10850f1d012e783db73791d1bcbccd06.pdf.

122 Arnett, Emerging Adulthood, 7–9.

123 Kane, “Psychosocial Stages of Symbolic Action In Social Media,” 7.

124 Kane, 8.
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In order to test Kane’s theory and to see if social media use could be used to identify emerging adults, we asked both CHEC and Main sample respondents to describe their current social media use. Respondents were given the responses found in the first column of table 10.12 which were written to correspond to Kane’s stages listed in table 10.11. Respondents who reported using social media were asked to choose the option that best described their current social media use.

Table 10.12. “Which of the following best describes your current social media posts?” CHEC and Main samples*, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually post photos of events I’ve been at and re-post things my friends have shared</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually post new, unique or eclectic things that reflect who I am.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually post so my close friends or family can keep up with what I’m doing.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.
* For those who indicated they were on social media.

CHEC respondents were somewhat more likely (+13%) to choose the “I usually post so my close friends or family can keep up with what I am doing response” which is what Kane would have predicted for those who had moved past identity formation and into the *Intimacy v. Isolation* psychosocial development stage. This is not a very large difference, but it is perhaps slightly more significant when you consider that CHEC sample respondents were on average 1.8 years younger than Main sample respondents, and we would generally expect more advanced stages of psychosocial development to coincide with older ages. Overall, we found only weak evidence that posting for close family and friends increases with age. Looking at those 18 to 24 and those 25 and older, we found that older CHEC and Main sample respondents were only 4% more likely to post for close friends and family.

Our study found only weak support for Kane’s theory of social media use and psychosocial development stages.

10.6.2. Social Media and Mental Health

The literature and our young adult interviews suggest a correlation between frequent or heavy social media use and depression and anxiety. We asked respondents several questions about social media and mental health.

126 See Methodology and Data Appendix.
CHEC respondents were 19% less likely to say they would feel socially isolated without social media than Main sample respondents (see table 10.13 below). A possible explanation for this difference lies in the proportion of each sample that are full-time students. Nine-tenths (91%) of CHEC respondents were full-time students compared to less than half (44%) of Main sample respondents. A full-time student environment would tend to provide immediate social alternatives to social media. Looking just at full-time students in each sample, however, CHEC respondents were still more likely (69%) to say they would not feel isolated without social media than Main sample respondents (42%). It may be that CHEC campuses provide richer social environments than secular ones.

Table 10.13. Agreement with “Without social media I would feel socially isolated,” CHEC and Main samplesa, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

For those who indicated they were on social media.

Just under half of CHEC (48%) and Main (45%) sample respondents agreed that they tend to get depressed if they spent too much time on social media (see table 10.14 below).

---

Majorities of CHEC (68%) and Main (58%) sample respondents agreed that they sometimes take a break from social media to get themselves grounded again (see table 10.15 below). Those who agreed that they tend to get depressed if they spend too much time on social media were more likely to also agree they sometimes take a break from social media. Four-fifths (81%) of CHEC students who agreed that heavy social media use tended to make them depressed also agreed that they sometimes took breaks from social media compared to just over half (53%) of those who said heavy social media use did not tend to make them depressed. The corresponding numbers for Main sample respondents were 75% and 44% respectively.

The literature and our interviews pointed to social media as a cause of comparison anxiety. Comparison anxiety can happen when one compares oneself negatively to the lives portrayed by ones peers on social media. To measure the prevalence of comparison anxiety, we asked those who reported using social media their agreement with “My friend’s lives are more exciting than mine.” CHEC respondents, despite having a similar levels of social media use, were
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20% less likely to agree their friends’ lives were more exciting than their own (see table 10.16 below).

Table 10.16. Agreement with “My friends’ lives are more exciting than mine,” CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

This CHEC-Main sample difference in the perceived excitement of friends’ lives held for both frequent social media users and light social media users.

10.7. Religion

CHEC respondents were more likely to persist in their teen religious affiliation into young adulthood and in their religious participation patterns than Main sample respondents. They were also more likely to hold Christian orthodox religious views.

10.7.1. Change in Religious Affiliation

Only 3% of CHEC respondents reported an Atheist, Agnostic, Spiritual or None (AASN) religious affiliation as a young adult compared to one third (33%) of Main sample respondents (see tables 10.17 and 10.18 below).
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Table 10.17. Religious affiliation change teen to young adult, CHEC sample, counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young adult Affiliation</th>
<th>Teen Affiliation</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
<th>Orth.</th>
<th>OWR</th>
<th>AASN</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evang.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orth.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"AASN" is Atheist, Agnostic, Spiritual or None. "OWR" is Other World Religions. "Orth" is Orthodox Christian.

Table 10.18. Religious affiliation change teen to young adult, Main sample, counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young adult Affiliation</th>
<th>Teen Affiliation</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Evang.</th>
<th>Orth.</th>
<th>OWR</th>
<th>AASN</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evang.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orth.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASN</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"AASN" is Atheist, Agnostic, Spiritual or None. "OWR" is Other World Religions. "Orth" is Orthodox Christian.

Of CHEC respondents who were evangelical teen affiliates only 2% became AASN affiliates as a young adult and 95% continued to identify as evangelical. By comparison, one quarter (25%) of teen evangelical affiliates from the Main sample identified as AASN as a young adult and only about two-thirds (64%) continued to identify as evangelical.

10.7.2. Change in Religious Service Attendance

As teens, four-fifths (81%) of CHEC respondents attended religious service at least weekly, and nearly all (97%) attended at least monthly (see table 10.19 below). By comparison, just under two-fifths (38%) of Main sample respondents attended at religious services at least weekly as teens, and four-fifths (80%) attended at least monthly.
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Table 10.19. Teen and young adult attendance, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teen</td>
<td>YA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a month</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or so</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or a few times a year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least monthly</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YA is Young Adult.
Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

We asked the young adults we surveyed how often, on average, they had attended religious services both as a teen and in the last 12 months. For each question they could choose one of the following five ordered categories: At least weekly, 2–3 times a month, Once a month or so, Once or a few times a year, Never.

Clearly, the changes from one frequency category to the next are not directly comparable in magnitude or in personal significance. Nevertheless, we can get a measure of religious service attendance change by measuring the category movement along this ordered scale from their teen to young adult responses. For example, if a young adult’s attendance in the last 12 months was “Once a month or so” and their teen attendance was at “At least weekly,” we would say that their attendance was down two categories.

Nearly three-quarters (74%) of CHEC respondents continued attending religious services as young adults at the same frequency they had when they were teens (see chart 10.5 below). Only 17% of CHEC respondents’ teen religious service attendance fell while 10% increased their religious service attendance. Where CHEC respondents’ teen-to-young-adult attendance fell, it was usually down just one attendance category. By comparison, only about half (49%) of Main sample respondents continued to attend religious services at the same frequency they did as a teen, almost the same share (45%) reduced their religious service attendance and a small minority (6%) increased their religious service attendance.
10.7.3. Christian Doctrinal Specifics

We asked respondents three Christian doctrine questions drawn from Andrew Grenville’s Christian Evangelical Scale (CES). The CES has been used in Canadian polling to identify evangelical Christians since the early 1990s. Using these CES questions leaves open the possibility of making historical comparisons, although for the sake of brevity I will not make those here.

The first two questions deal with Christology. In the first instance, respondents were asked for their agreement with “In my view, Jesus Christ was not the divine Son of God.” Most CHEC respondents (94%) disagreed with the statement compared to just over half (57%) of Main sample respondents (see table 10.20 below). It is important to remember that to qualify for the study respondents had to be Christian affiliates as a teen. By comparison, only 71% of teen evangelical affiliates from the Main sample disagreed with the statement.

---

Table 10.20. “In my view, Jesus Christ was not the divine Son of God”, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question dealing with Christology (and soteriology) asked for their agreement with “I believe that through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided the way for the forgiveness of sins.” Almost all CHEC respondents (97%) agreed compared to just three-fifth (61%) from the Main sample (see table 10.21 below). By comparison, only 78% of teen evangelical affiliates from the Main sample agreed with the statement.

Table 10.21. “I believe that through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided the way for the forgiveness of my sins.” CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third CES question asked agreement with “I believe the Bible to be the Word of God and is reliable and trustworthy.” Almost all CHEC respondents (97%) agreed with the statement compared to just 58% of Main sample respondents (see table 10.22 below). By comparison, only 74% of Main sample respondents who had a teen evangelical religious affiliation disagreed with the statement.
Table 10.22. “I believe the Bible to be the Word of God and is reliable and trustworthy”, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.7.4. The Universal Gnostic Religious Ethic

The Renegotiating Faith report found a new Universal Gnostic Religious Ethic (UGRE). The UGRE can be summarized as follows:

- All religions are the same, if you can get behind their external trappings. This realization is understood as a special knowledge for the enlightened.
- Religion is functional. It fulfills a set of psychosocial functions.
- The most important thing is to preserve social harmony.
- Good human beings preserve social harmony.
- A “higher power” is not necessary, nor is a notion of heaven or hell.

We asked respondents for their agreement with “Despite their apparent differences, all world religions share the same goal of helping people to be good human beings,” which is a sentiment consistent with the UGRE. Almost two-thirds (65%) of CHEC respondents disagreed with the statement compared to just under one-third (31%) of Main sample respondents (see table 10.23 below).

---
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**Table 10.23. Agreement with “Despite their apparent differences, all world religions share the same goal of helping people to be good human beings,” CHEC and Main samples, percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Just under three-fifths (57%) of both CHEC and Main sample respondents reported taking a world religions course, but there was a difference in when they took the course (see table 10.24 below). CHEC students were less likely (26%) to have taken a world religions course in high school compared to Main sample respondents (42%). The percent taking a world religions course in college or university were reversed. Two-fifths (41%) of CHEC students reported having taken a world religions course in college or university compared to under a quarter (23%) of Main sample respondents.

**Table 10.24. Took a world religions course either in high school or college or university, CHEC and Main samples, percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taken a world religions course?</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in high school</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in college or university</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, either pre- or post-secondary</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our interviews with young adults, they often talked about world religions courses being the occasion when they realized that the exclusive claims of the Christian faith were wrong. Only one tenth (10%) of CHEC respondents agreed that “My world religions course helped me realized that much of what I had been taught about my faith growing up was wrong” compared to more than one-third (36%) of Main sample respondents (see table 10.25 below). Some of this difference can likely be attributed to when and where CHEC respondents and Main sample respondents receive their world religions education. CHEC respondents are more likely to receive their world religions education at a CHE institution as a young adult, whereas Main sample respondents are more likely to receive their world religions education in high school as a teen. This suggests that world religions education is being taught differently in high schools than in CHE institutions.
Table 10.25. Agreement with “My world religions course helped me realize that much of what I had been taught about my faith growing up was wrong,” CHEC and Main samples\textsuperscript{a}, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} For those who took a world religions course. Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

10.7.5. Christian Community

In our young adult interviews, several young adults who had stopped participating in a local church or other Christian communities nevertheless expressed confidence that should they ever need community – not God – they could always return to the church they left.

We tested the prevalence of this conviction by asking agreement with “I can always return to church if I find myself in need of community.” CHEC and Main sample respondents were equally likely to agree (55%) with the statement, however, CHEC respondents were more likely to strongly agree (40%) than Main sample respondents (25%) (see table 10.26 below).

Table 10.26. “I can always return to church if I find myself in need of community,” CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that this sentiment was most often expressed in the interviews by those who had ceased participating in a local church and who expressed heterodox Christian views, we looked at how these answers varied by agreement with “I believe that through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided the way for the forgiveness of my sins.” There were not enough CHEC respondents who either moderately agreed, or who disagreed that forgiveness of sins is found...
in through Jesus to present these data, but there were for the Main sample respondents (see table 10.27). As Main sample respondents’ confidence in the atoning work of Christ wanes so does their confidence that there will be a church that they can return to in order to enjoy the benefits of Christian community.

**Table 10.27. Percent agreement “I can always return to church if I find myself in need of community” by agreement with “I believe that through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided the way for the forgiveness of my sins.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement with “I believe that through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided the way for the forgiveness of my sins.”</th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Not enough observation*
Conclusion

When the CHEM began in Canada at the end of the nineteenth century, it concentrated on passing on the faith on to the next generation and preparing young adults for practical ministry service. At the time, it faced little competition from secular higher education institutions. CHEM programs were flexible, affordable and geared to serve the needs of their constituencies.

After the end of WWII, in response to a number of economic, political and cultural threats, the Government of Canada struck the Massey Commission. The Massey Commission recommended an unprecedented investment in higher education as part of a strategy to meet these perceived threats. Past squabbles between religious colleges and religious groups on radio broadcasts were part of what convinced the government that it needed to take the character formation of the nation into its own hands. Higher education became the government’s primary instrument.

The CHEM responded to this new secular competition by raising academic standards and pursuing accreditation as a way to certify their improvements. As this new government funding was largely unavailable to CHEM schools, these once very affordable schools raised their tuition in attempts to compete with their more generously funded secular competitors.

Accreditation raised academic standards at CHEC institutions. At the same time, it has made a CHEC education more expensive, less accessible and less responsive to the needs of the local church on which it relies. Low-cost, practical ministry training is now more likely to be delivered by ministry organizations like the Canadian Council of Christian Charities, The Global Leadership Summit or the growing phenomenon of church-based Bible colleges.

As an ever-increasing portion of the population accessed secular higher education, it became both the normative experience for young adults and the normative path for character formation. Over time this has changed the meaning of character formation and the civic good in Canada, making it more challenging for Christian higher education and Christian character formation to be seen as a legitimate alternative.

The YATR study showed CHEC respondents tended to be more orthodox than Main sample respondents. They were also more likely to have been active in church, youth group and Christian camps during their teen years. These higher levels of participation in Christian communities tended to continue into their young adult years (18 to 28). CHEC respondents who did not have home church mentors during their teen years did not experience the same levels of attrition in religious affiliation and participation that we saw with Main sample respondents. Although CHEC respondents use social media at the same rates as Main sample respondents, they do not report the same levels of social isolation or comparison anxiety as main sample respondents.

Currently only a small minority of young adults from evangelical backgrounds attend CHEC institutions. Many of these young adults will spend a period of their lives as emerging adults,
not yet able to make adult commitments such as a faith commitment. Attending a CHE institution tends to imply at least some kind of Christian commitment, whereas, secular universities tend to discourage religious commitment. All other things being equal, a secular university that discourages religious commitment is likely a more comfortable fit for an emerging adult than a CHE institution that encourages one. While open admission policies remove the requirement for explicit Christian commitment, they do not completely remove an implied Christian commitment.

Our interviews revealed that when young adults choose a postsecondary program, they are often not choosing a career but a program that maximizes their potential career choices for when they do find themselves in a position to choose a career. Secular programs tend to be seen as expanding career choice, whereas, CHE programs tend to be seen as narrowing career choice. For many, post-secondary education is seen as a one-shot opportunity because of the cost and time commitment. All other things being equal, young adults will tend to choose the programs that expand their career choices.

The CHEM has always relied on “Evangelical Enthusiasts” for the majority of its student body. Trends such as the reshaping of the system of national character formation post-Massey Commission, the weakening of churches, the growth of the phenomenon of emerging adulthood and a demographic shift toward fewer young people have combined to shrink the share of the potential accessible market for CHEC institutions.

When the CHEM faced the flood of new competition post-Massey commission, it thought the principal competitive threat was in the area of academic rigour and program offerings. In hindsight, this seems to have been a strategic miscalculation. The Massey Commission plainly and publicly announced its recommendation that the government superintend character formation through the education system and other national institutions. With vast culture-shaping resources at its disposal the secular education system has reshaped the meaning of character education to the point where Christian community covenants are viewed with suspicion or as being un-Canadian.

CHE is often difficult to market because of the perceptions that:

- It narrows career options,
- It is expensive,
- It uses up a single opportunity for higher education, and
- It at least implies a Christian commitment or bias.

Several young adults we interviewed talked about one-year discipleship programs as gap years. There is an opportunity for CHEC institutions to create a new recruitment path in the distinction between discipleship/service gap years and degree programs.
An eight-month gap year program focusing on discipleship and service could address the marketing challenges outlined above in the following ways. First, it is not a three- or four-year choice. This means choosing a discipleship/service gap year does not entail using up the single opportunity for higher education. Second, if the program is designed to be affordable or revenue neutral, it is not competing for the nest-egg of funds a young adult may have earmarked for higher education. Third, if it is marketed as a way to become grounded in one’s faith and to help discern one’s life direction, the program directly addresses the questions emerging adults are asking. Fourth, by making it explicitly about exploring and getting grounded in the Christian faith, it signals that those with questions are welcome in the program. Fifth, by making it about discerning life direction, it helps young adults to become more targeted in their future choice of a degree-granting program.

From a faith development standpoint, a discipleship/service gap year places emerging adults in Christian communities with mentors who can speak into their lives. It helps build the capacity to make adult commitments as they take on responsibility and negotiate roles in a Christian community.

This study does not prove emerging adults are taking a pass on CHE, but along with CHEC’s own 2007 Ipsos study it shows that young adults who choose CHE tend to be more committed to the Christian faith than Main sample respondents. The enrolment challenges facing CHEM institutions are as much a consequence of the spiritual formation young adults receive in their homes and home churches as they are about the program offerings of CHEM institutions. Parents and churches must give more attention to the spiritual and character formation of young adults so that they gain the capacity to move past emerging adulthood into adulthood. This is not only about helping young adults have the capacity to possibly choose CHE, but to have the capacity to choose the Christian faith.

There is a need for the whole Canadian church, including CHEC institutions, to vigorously engage in character education. The secular culture has become dominant by intentionally investing heavily in character education. In part, the church’s influence on culture has waned because we have become less serious about our investments in character education.
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Appendix A. Methodology and Data

The Young Adult Transition Research (YATR) study looked at young adults between the ages of 18 and 28 who had a Christian religious affiliation as a teen (age 14 to 17) and who attended religious services at least monthly at some point during their teen years.\(^{131}\)

MARU/Matchbox collected 773 young adult responses for the CHEC sample between January 15 and February 11, 2018. Twenty-six of 34 CHEC institutions participated in this study (see table A.1 below). CHEC respondents were recruited by each participating school’s administration. Tri-Council ethics reviews were completed for Crandall, Acadia, Tyndale, Ambrose, Trinity Western, Redeemer, Briercrest, and Booth College. The CHEC sample was weighted by region and gender. Region weights were based on regional CHEC undergraduate enrollment numbers provided by CHEC.

### Table A.1. Participating CHEC institutions by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC (286)</th>
<th>AB (139)</th>
<th>SK / MB (175)</th>
<th>ON (99)</th>
<th>ATL (66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Bible College</td>
<td>Ambrose University College(^a)</td>
<td>Booth University College(^a)</td>
<td>Emmanuel Bible College</td>
<td>Acadia Divinity College(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Life Bible College</td>
<td>Canadian Lutheran Bible Institute</td>
<td>Briercrest College and Seminary(^a)</td>
<td>Heritage College and Seminary</td>
<td>Crandall University(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Pacific College</td>
<td>Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary and College</td>
<td>Eston College</td>
<td>Master’s College and Seminary</td>
<td>Kingswood University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Western University(^a)</td>
<td>Peace River Bible Institute</td>
<td>Horizon College and Seminary</td>
<td>Redeemer University College(^a)</td>
<td>St. Stephen’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prairie College</td>
<td>Providence University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor College and Seminary</td>
<td>Steinbach Bible College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanguard College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Tri-Council Ethics Review.

The average age for CHEC respondents was 21.8 compared to 23.6 for Main sample respondents (see chart A.1 below)

---

\(^{131}\) Although we asked MARU/Matchbox to survey young adults between the ages of 18 and 28, when we received the dataset there were 104 observations from 29-year-olds in the Main sample and 13 observations from 29-year-olds in the CHEC sample. We included these 29-year-olds’ observations in our analysis.
Chart A.1. Distribution respondents by age, CHEC and Main samples, percent

Distribution values may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A.2. Marital Status, CHEC and Main samples, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHEC</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Partnership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Chart A.2. Work status by student status, CHEC and Main samples, percent

FT is full-time, and PT is part-time.

Although we believe that CHEC respondents were recruited by CHEC administrators from their respective student bodies and alumni, a quarter of CHEC respondents reported high school or less as their highest level of education event when “At least some college / technical school” and “At least some university” were available options (see chart A.4 below). It may be that some CHEC students did not understand their CHEC institution to be a college, technical school or university.
Chart A.3. “What is the highest level of education that you have completed?”, CHEC sample, percent

Pie chart values may not add to 100 because of rounding.