Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2015

Curriculum-Related Trends in K-12 Adventist Education in the North American Division: An Inductive Analysis of the Profile Surveys--1987-2007

Monica Desir

Andrews University, desir@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Desir, Monica, "Curriculum-Related Trends in K-12 Adventist Education in the North American Division: An Inductive Analysis of the Profile Surveys--1987-2007" (2015). *Dissertations*. 1589.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/1589>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/1589>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

ABSTRACT

CURRICULUM-RELATED TRENDS IN K-12 ADVENTIST
EDUCATION IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION:
AN INDUCTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROFILE
SURVEYS—1987-2007

by

Monica Desir

Co-Chairs: Larry D. Burton; Faith-Ann A. McGarrell

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: CURRICULUM-RELATED TRENDS IN K-12 ADVENTIST EDUCATION
IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION: AN INDUCTIVE ANALYSIS
OF THE PROFILE SURVEYS—1987-2007

Name of researcher: Monica Desir

Names and degrees of faculty co-chairs: Larry D. Burton, Ph.D., and
Faith-Ann A. McGarrell, Ph.D.

Date completed: March 2015

Problem

For several years, curriculum developers in the North American Division (NAD) have used the biennial results from the Profile Surveys to help guide their decisions in terms of educational policy. While some comparisons have been made between individual studies and ensuing results have been used to influence curriculum development, overall trends in the 10 studies up to 2007 have not been identified. As the studies increased in number, an integrative effort was needed in order help reveal the trends in the combined results and to make them available in more compact form for use by curriculum developers.

Method

The database for this inductive analysis was generated from various secondary sources, primarily written reports, articles, and SPSS files containing results from the 10 Profile Studies conducted from 1987 to 2007. These were supplemented with archived data from CDs and other hard copy sources, and personal communication with L. D. Burton, principal investigator for the last two Profile Studies conducted in 2004 and 2007.

The following four research questions guided this study:

1. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what trends emerge in K-12 teacher responses with regard to curriculum guides?
2. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what trends emerge in K-12 teacher responses with regard to textbooks?
3. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what K-12 technology issues feature most prominently?
4. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what other system-wide issues feature most prominently in K-12 Adventist education?

Data analysis involved a quantitative approach using descriptive statistics. Further, data were viewed through the lens of institutional theory. In addition to quantitative data, some qualitative responses from key stakeholders were integrated into the research to strengthen or clarify findings based on quantitative data.

Results

Data analysis indicated that the fragmentation issue which initially gave rise to the Profile Surveys has been resolved. Results based on analysis of the four research

questions indicated that many of the concerns related to curriculum guides, textbooks, technology in schools, and other system-wide issues including the Journey to Excellence (J2E) initiative have been resolved. However, as curriculum development is an on-going process, many more issues still need to be further studied and addressed. Those include integrating faith with learning, teaching critical thinking skills, and adopting and implementing professional development strategies that work.

Conclusions

Based on the findings from this study, condensed information on curriculum-related issues that matter to teachers is now available to curriculum developers in the NAD. With respect to curriculum guides, for example, results reveal that format and user-friendliness do matter to teachers. In addition, the findings from this study can serve to acquaint system-level administrators with trends such as a rift in professional development methods among K-12 teachers. Moreover, this research provided evidence that, while room remains for improvement, teachers have been advancing in their knowledge of the J2E initiative, the foundation of the vision for excellence in Adventist education.

Andrews University

School of Education

CURRICULUM-RELATED TRENDS IN K-12 ADVENTIST
EDUCATION IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION:
AN INDUCTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROFILE
SURVEYS—1987-2007

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Monica Desir

March 2015

© Copyright by Monica Desir 2015
All Rights Reserved

CURRICULUM-RELATED TRENDS IN K-12 ADVENTIST
EDUCATION IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION:
AN INDUCTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROFILE
SURVEYS—1987-2007

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Monica Desir

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Co-Chair: Larry D. Burton

Dean, School of Education
James R. Jeffery

Co-Chair: Faith-Ann A. McGarrell

Member: R. Lee Davidson

Member: Douglas A. Jones

External: Sunimal Kulasekere

Date approved

To my family in appreciation of their love and support . . .
and to all the K-12 students and teachers
of the North American Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xiii
Chapter	
I. THE PROFILE SURVEYS: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	1
Statement of Problem	5
Purpose of Study	5
Research Questions	7
Theoretical Framework	7
Delimiters	14
Conceptual Definitions.....	15
Organization of Dissertation	17
II. METHODOLOGY	20
Introduction	20
Research Design: Description and Rationale	21
The Model Described.....	23
The Data Tabulation Process	28
III. CURRICULUM GUIDES AND RELATED INNOVATIONS	30
Introduction	30
Reactions to Imposition in the Public School Arena.....	32
Curriculum-related Concerns: Curriculum Delivery and Availability.....	34
Availability of Curriculum Guides to K-12 Teachers.....	34
Delivery of Curriculum Guides to K-12 Teachers.....	38
Use of Curriculum Guides by Elementary Teachers.....	51
Use of Curriculum Guides by Academy Teachers.....	55
Use of Curriculum Guides in Public Schools.....	59
Professional Development Impacts Ratings.....	60

Quality of Curriculum Guides	66
Innovations Seldom Adopted in Classroom Practice	81
Curriculum Guides: Preferred Formats	82
Advantages and Disadvantages of Curriculum Guides	84
Relationship to Institutional Factors: Curriculum Guides	89
Summary of Major Findings Related to Curriculum Guides	92
IV. TEXTBOOKS	95
Introduction	95
Textbook Use Ratings	98
Textbook Quality: Overview	101
Textbook Quality: Elementary	103
Textbook Quality: Academy	111
Newer Textbooks: Higher Ratings	114
Relationship to Institutional Factors: Textbooks	115
Summary of Major Findings Related to Textbooks	118
V. TECHNOLOGY	120
Introduction	120
Availability of Educational Technologies	121
Computer Access	124
Computer Networking	127
Computer Accessories	128
Multimedia Technologies	129
Computer Applications and Other Technologies	131
Confidence levels in Using Technology in Education	133
Regular Use of Technology for Instruction/Administration	139
Frequent Use of Computers for Specific Tasks	142
Relationship to Institutional Factors: Technology in Education	144
Summary of Major Findings Related to Technology	151
VI. OTHER SYSTEM-WIDE ISSUES	152
Introduction	152
Journey to Excellence: Historical Overview	153
FACT-21 in the Profile Surveys	154
Approval of J2E: 2002	156
Components of the J2E Framework	157
Access to J2E Report	159
The J2E Preferred Practices	160
“Never Heard of/Heard About”	165
“Attempted/Have Basic Understanding”	169
“Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers”	174
Perspectives on J2E Best Practices	179

Teacher Concerns	180
Spirituality in Adventist Schools	184
Instruction-related Concerns	189
Students With Special Needs	189
Teaching Critical Thinking Skills	196
Improving Student Achievement	200
Professional Development	201
Teacher Burnout	204
Relationship to Institutional Factors: Other System-wide Issues	207
Summary of Major Findings Related to Other System-wide Issues	216
 VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	218
Introduction..	218
Purpose of Study	219
Research Questions	219
Research Design	220
Data Sources	221
Sample/Data Collection Procedures	221
Data Analysis	222
Delimitations	223
Results and Discussion	224
Curriculum Guides	224
Textbooks	227
Technology	230
Other System-wide Issues	233
Journey to Excellence	234
Spirituality in Schools	236
Other Teacher Concerns	237
Limitations	241
Conclusions	244
Recommendations for Policy and Practice	246
Recommendations for Future Research	248
 Appendix	
A. CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE SURVEYS	251
B. LETTERS OF PERMISSION	253
C. CURRICULUM GUIDE ADOPTION DATES	257
D. TEXTBOOK ADOPTION DATES	262
E. SAMPLES: PROFILE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	267

REFERENCE LIST.....	286
VITA	305

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers: 1987-2007.....	8
2. Leaders' Preparedness to Help Teachers With Innovations.....	41
3. Teachers' Perceptions of Innovative Educational Practices.....	44
4. Cumulative Mean of Elementary Teachers' Use of Curriculum Guides for Each Subject Represented	53
5. Cumulative Mean of Academy Teachers' Use of Curriculum Guides for Each Subject Represented	58
6. Use of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately and Inadequately Inserved	62
7. Perceived Helpfulness of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Were and Were Not Adequately Inserved	63
8. Cumulative Mean of Elementary Teachers' Quality Ratings of Curriculum Guides for Each Subject Represented	69
9. Cumulative Mean of Academy Teachers' Quality Ratings of Selected Curriculum Guides	72
10. Averages of K-12 Teacher Ratings of Quality of Selected Curriculum Guides: Profile 2004 and 2007... ..	74
11. Averages of K-12 Teacher Ratings of the Extent to Which NAD Curriculum Materials Reflect Spiritual, Cognitive, Physical, and Social Goals for Students: Profile 2004 and 2007... ..	75
12. Cumulative Mean of Elementary and Academy Teachers' Use Ratings of Textbooks for Each Subject Represented	100
13. Cumulative Mean of Elementary Teachers' Textbooks Quality Ratings for Each Subject Represented	106

14. Excellent Ratings of Textbooks by Elementary Teachers for Each Subject Represented	107
15. Cumulative Mean of Senior Academy Teachers' Quality Ratings of Textbooks for Each Subject Represented	113
16. Excellent Ratings of Textbooks by Senior Academy Teachers for Each Subject Represented.....	114
17. Computer Access Available in K-12 Schools by types	124
18. Computer Access and Technical Support Available in K-12 Schools	125
19. Computer Networking Available in K-12 Schools: Profile 1995-2007	127
20. Computer Accessories Available in K-12 Schools: Profile 1997-2007	129
21. Multimedia Technologies Available in K-12 Schools.....	130
22. Averages for Multimedia Technologies Available in K-12 Schools, Profile 2004 and 2007.....	131
23. Computer Applications Available in K-12 Schools	132
24. K-12 Teacher Perceptions of Their Position on the Information Superhighway.....	135
25. Cumulative Mean for Each Category—K-12 Teacher Perceptions of Their Positions on the information superhighway	135
26. Percentage Ratings Showing Frequent Use of Multimedia Technologies for Instruction /Administration or Communication by K-12 Teachers: Profile 2004 and 2007	141
27. Percentage Ratings Showing Frequent Use of Other Educational Technologies for Instruction/Administration or Communication by K-12 Teachers: Profile 2004 and 2007	141
28. Percentage Ratings Showing Frequent Use of Computers for Specific Tasks By K-12 Teachers: Profile 2004 and 2007	144
29. Brantley's Quality Cycles Model: Profile 1999.....	154
30. Journey to Excellence (J2E) Model: 2003	158
31. Percentage Ratings of K-12 Teachers Who "Never Heard of/Heard About" the J2E Preferred Practices	166

32. Highest and Lowest Statistics for K-12 Teachers Who “Never Heard of / Heard About” the J2E Preferred Practices	167
33. Aggregates of K-12 Teachers Who “Never Heard of/Heard About” the J2E Preferred Practices.....	168
34. Percentage Ratings of K-12 Teachers Who “Attempted/Have Basic Understanding” of the J2E Preferred Practices	171
35. Highest and Lowest Statistics for K-12 Teachers Who “Have Basic Understanding/Attempted” the J2E Preferred Practices.....	172
36. Aggregates of K-12 Teachers Who Have “Basic Understanding/Attempted” the J2E Preferred Practices	173
37. Percentage Ratings of K-12 Teachers Who are “Quite Knowledgeable of / Proficient in Helping Teachers” With the J2E Preferred Practices	175
38. Comparative Ratings of K-12 Teachers Who are “Quite Knowledgeable of /Proficient in Helping Teachers” with the J2E Preferred Practices: Profile 2004 vs. Profile 2007	176
39. Comparative Ratings of K-12 Teachers Who are “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” With the J2E Preferred Practices: Profile 1995-2004 vs. Profile 2007	177
40. Aggregates of K-12 Teachers Who are “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” With the J2E Preferred Practices.....	178

LIST OF TABLES

1. Comparative Sample Sizes, Return Rates, and Participant Data: Profile Surveys 1987-2007 (in Percentages)	4
2. Availability Ratings of NAD Curriculum Guides by Elementary and Secondary Teachers: Profile 1997, 2001, 2004, and 2007 (in Percentages).....	36
3. Leaders' Preparedness to Help Teachers With Innovations: Profile 1997.....	40
4. Teachers' Perceptions of Innovative Educational Practices: Profile 1997.....	43
5. Perceived Helpfulness of Various Resources by K-12 Teachers Arranged in Descending Order: Profile 1987.....	46
6. Training Components and Attainment of Outcomes in Terms of Percentage of Participants	48
7. Elementary Teacher Ratings of Use of Curriculum Guides—Profile 1987, 1989, 1991, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages).....	52
8. Academy Teacher Ratings of Use of Curriculum Guides—Profile 1989, 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages)	56
9. Use of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately or Inadequately Inserved: Profile 1995 (in Percentages).....	62
10. Helpfulness of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately or Inadequately Inserved: Profile 1995 (in Percentages).....	63
11. Elementary Teacher Ratings of the Quality of Curriculum Guides—Profiles 1991, 1997, 1999, & 2001	68
12. Academy Teacher Ratings of the Quality of Curriculum Guides—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004.....	70
13. K-12 Teacher Ratings of Quality of NAD Curriculum Guides in Selected Subjects—Profile 2004 and 2007	73

14. K-12 Teacher Ratings of the Extent to which NAD Curriculum Materials Reflect Spiritual, Cognitive, Physical, and Social Goals for Students: Profile 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages).....	75
15. Textbooks: Elementary and Secondary Teacher Ratings of Use—Profile 1987, 1993, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages).....	99
16. Quality Ratings of Textbooks by Subject Areas as Reported by Elementary Teachers—Profile 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (in Percentages).....	104
17. Ratings of Textbooks by Subject Areas as Reported by Senior Academy Teachers—Profile 1987, 1989, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (in Percentages).....	112
18. Educational Technology Available in Adventist Schools: K-12 Teacher Ratings—Profile 1993-2007 (in Percentages).....	122
19. K-12 Teacher Perceptions of Their Position on the Information Superhighway: Profile 1995-2001	134
20. Regular use of Technology for Instruction/Administration or Communication: K-12 Teacher Ratings—Profile 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages).....	140
21. Frequent Use of Computers for Specific Tasks by K-12 Teachers: Profiles 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages).....	143
22. Innovations in Profile 1997 as Precursors To Preferred Practices in Journey to Excellence Initiative.....	155
23. Responses by K-12 Teachers: “Have You Received a Copy of the Journey to Excellence (J2E) Report?”.....	160
24. Awareness/Use of Preferred Practices as Reported by K-12 Teachers: Profile 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, & 2007 (in Percentages).....	162
25. Areas of overlap between “Teacher Concerns” and “Work-related Problems” from Profiles 1987 and 1989.....	183
26. Most Prominent K-12 Teacher Concerns (Including “Work-Related Problems”) Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2007.....	185
27. Students With Special Needs in the Classroom: Elementary and Academy Teacher Perspectives, Profile 2004 (in Percentages).....	192

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In terms of authorship only one name appears on the cover of this volume. However, it represents the combined interests of several individuals whose support has helped to make it possible. First I must acknowledge God's leading and providential wisdom at every stage. Many times when I felt inadequate to surmount the varied challenges inherent in fulfilling the demands of such a project, I would drop to my knees and plead His promise for wisdom as chronicled in James 1:5-6, and He never failed me. I am also thankful to my parents, Martha and Gerald Desir, who instilled love for God in me from childhood, and who helped me to acquire a Christian education in my early years in spite of their financial challenges.

I am blest to have had as my coaches in this venture some well-informed, supportive scholars on my dissertation committee in the persons of Dr. Larry Burton and Dr. Faith-Ann McGarrell, Co-Chairs; Dr. Lee Davidson, and Dr. Douglas Jones. Dr. Charlene Barnes, initially a valuable committee member as well, relocated at the early stages of the journey. I am thankful to all the members of my committee for their encouragement and support, their enthusiasm, their timely feedback on drafts and other related communication, and for their much needed advice and assistance. In addition, I applaud my Chair, Dr. Burton, for guiding me in organizing the ocean of data ensuing from the results of 20 years of comprehensive research studies into intelligible formats for analysis.

Next, I am grateful to some individuals from the North American Division and the Lake Union Conference Office who contributed to this project in other meaningful ways. I am indebted to Dr. Paul Brantley of the NAD, and Project Director for the first eight Profile Surveys, for graciously “shouting” his approval in an “all caps” electronic response when I requested permission to use some of his original graphics in my dissertation. My heartfelt thanks also go to Dr. Carol Campbell of the North American Division Office of Education, and to Mrs. Joanna Sudds of the Lake Union Conference Office for sacrificing time and effort in returning to the archives in order to assist me in obtaining some much-needed nuggets of information.

Further, I am obligated to several individuals/departments at Andrews University for contributing in various ways to this research endeavor. Since some of the statistical data for this study had been archived on large, floppy disks in outdated formats, it became necessary for me to access an older computer for retrieval purposes. Mr. Brandon Lowry, Desktop Network Administrator for Information Technology Services, provided such a computer so I could access the information which contributed to the database for this study. Besides, the James White Library administration provided “second-mile” service beyond their normal business hours, and also a cozy carrel for relatively distraction-free study. In addition, on several occasions I was able to use the library to obtain MelCat resources which were not available locally. I also met Mrs. Anna Piskozub at the School of Education from the onset of the most recent phase of my academic journey. Her caring and sunny demeanor diffused the nuisances of mandatory paperwork in academia. Further, I am grateful to Dr. Duane Covrig, also of the School of Education, for making available to me some informative and relevant hard copy sources,

and for his support as a valuable resource person. Another important individual whom graduate students will encounter sooner or later, Mrs. Bonnie Proctor, was always available to provide guidance on formatting issues as I worked on this project.

And to my wonderful siblings and their families—including my sisters: Madge Simmons, Learah Peterson, Doreen Ernest, Marie Monroe, Rheumalia Vaiti, Vivina Jn Louis, Rose Desir; and my brothers: Haiden Desir, Steven Desir, Gabriel Desir, and Benjamin Desir, I say thank you for praying for me; for encouraging me, for believing in me. I am also indebted to many friends and colleagues including Linda Krause, Esther Williams, Pretoria Gittens-St. Juste, Elvetha Telemaque, Josephine Katenga, and Alan Williams (now deceased) for their support, prayers, and encouragement.

My hope and desire is that this research will provide information that will eventually result in making a positive impact on educational policy and practice in the North American Division, and possibly beyond.

CHAPTER I

THE PROFILE SURVEYS: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The connection of social inquiry . . . with practice is intrinsic, not external. Any problem of scientific inquiry that does not grow out of actual (or practical) social conditions is factitious; it is arbitrarily set by the inquirer instead of being objectively produced and controlled.

—John Dewey

Officially organized in 1863, the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church is a world-wide Christian organization comprised of 13 world divisions including the North American Division (NAD). Based on the 2013 issue of the *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook*, the organization consists of over 17.5 million members and more than 73,000 churches worldwide. Along with other ministries, those churches operate 7,883 private schools subdivided into the following categories: 112 colleges and universities, 48 worker training institutes, 1,908 secondary schools, and 5,815 primary schools. According to the *149th Annual Statistical Report* (Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research, 2013), the NAD operates 852 of those educational institutions comprising 14 colleges and universities, 109 academies, and 729 primary schools. The K-12 schools in that Division claim 51,866 (40,044 Adventist) enrollees instructed by 4,841 teachers. Of those 14 institutions of higher education, 11 offer K-12 teacher-training programs (Burton, 2005). The Profile Surveys, the focus of this study, relate to the K-12 school

system and teacher-preparation programs of the Adventist church in the North American Division.

The Profile Surveys began with the following story as L. D. Burton, Principal Investigator, recounted: Prior to their genesis in 1987, the educational leaders in the NAD had a “fractured vision” of the K-12 educational system. There was no shared vision; each Union (regional Adventist organizational unit composed of several states or provinces) within the NAD did what seemed best at the time. There was unequal resourcing by Unions and Conferences (local Adventist organizational unit often composed of one or more states or provinces), as groups with larger church memberships who could better afford to create educational materials were advantaged over smaller, struggling ones. While some Unions were willing to share resources, there was no centralized means of communication and many stakeholders did not even know what resources existed. There was need for Division-wide collaboration; for development of curriculum guides; for teacher support materials; and for continued creation of some Adventist-specific textbooks.

In their on-going quest to resolve the fragmentation issue in the educational system, the North American Division Office of Education (NADOE) decided to find ways to communicate with stakeholders in order to obtain a feel of what was going on in classrooms and education departments nation-wide (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 8, 2011). Brantley (1987) commented on an early effort to respond to this need:

In 1981, the [North American Division Curriculum Committee] NADCC voted that NADOE “develop a periodic needs assessment questionnaire and conduct a survey which will reflect the needs of the field and give guidance for future planning in the development of textbook and/or supplementary materials.” (p. 21)

This directive led to the development of the Profile Studies which made their debut in the spring of 1987. The NADOE contracted the services of Dr. Paul Brantley from the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at Andrews University in Michigan to coordinate the biennial research enterprise.

Since cyber-communication was not yet widespread in 1987, Brantley and his research team used postal mail to contact a random sample of one out of every six K-12 teachers in the NAD school system in North America, Canada, and Bermuda for that first endeavor. The samples for the various studies also included conference superintendents and other administrative personnel involved in K-12 education. The research team mailed surveys involving questions on various aspects of the curricula used in K-12 classrooms and the resources provided to facilitate learning. This survey process was repeated biennially from 1987 to 2001, and triennially thereafter (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 8, 2011). From 1987 to 2007, the response rates from the surveys have been very encouraging (around 80% on average for mailed surveys). Table 1 provides a snapshot of the number of respondents in each category through the duration of the Profile Surveys.

Based on personal communication with Burton (2011), secondary school administrators at the Union and Division levels started the FACT-21 initiative (Focus on Adventist Curriculum and Trends for the 21st Century) in 1995 after the Profile Surveys had been launched and were beginning to make an impact in terms of Division-wide integration. In relation to this vision, “Preferred Practices” were developed to help determine the degree of progress the schools had made in implementing the FACT-21 initiative. As awareness of the initiative became more widespread, elementary school

administrators wanted their schools to be included as well. In response to this need, the vision was expanded as a K-12 initiative known as “Journey to Excellence” or J2E (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 8, 2011). This initiative is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.

Table 1

Comparative Sample Sizes, Return Rates, and Subgroups: Profile Surveys 1987-2007 (in Percentages)

Year	Sample Sizes & Return Rates	Number of Respondents	Elementary Teachers	Academy Teachers	Teacher Educators	System-level Administrators
1987	832 (86)	716	451 (63)	169 (24)	--	98 (14)
1989	1108 (71)	791	65 (59)	201 (25)	33 (4)	92 (12)
1991	1106 (80)	880	525 (60)	258 (29)	26 (3)	71 (8)
1993	977 (79)	772	451 (58)	203 (26)	--	118 (15)
1995	980 (80)	783	514 (66)	157 (20)	--	112 (14)
1997	891 (76)	675	381 (56)	129 (19)	57 (8)	108 (16)
1999	919 (77)	708	404 (57)	156 (22)	35 (5)	105 (15)
2001	917 (86)	789	469 (59)	157 (20)	64 (8)	99 (13)
2004	2718 (20)	540	294 (54)	174 (32)	26 (5)	46 (9)
2007	3798 (25)	945	553 (59)	262 (28)	54 (6)	75 (8)

Note. A dash in a cell indicates that data were unavailable. Sample sizes for 1995 and 1999 are approximates deduced from response rates and numbers of respondents. Numbers sampled for those years are not included in the available data. (1995: “80+%" return rate)

An additional effort to further resolve the communication problem related to available curriculum resources and to share some of the resources that were being developed online led to the creation of the CIRCLE website (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 8, 2011). As noted on the CIRCLE website (n.d.), “The mission of the *Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center Linking Educators* (CIRCLE) is to serve as a comprehensive source for locating the ever-expanding array of resources for

Seventh-day Adventist educators as they continue the teaching ministry of Jesus Christ” (Circle website: “About Circle”). At that location educators can obtain and share a variety of resources to enrich their classroom experiences.

When Dr. Paul Brantley left Andrews University, Dr. Larry Burton from the same department shouldered the responsibility of coordinating the research studies beginning in 2004. Until 2001, postal mail was used to send surveys to a random sample of one out of every six K-12 teachers in the NAD. E-mail invitations to complete an online survey replaced postal mail for the 2004 and 2007 research endeavors, with invitations being sent to all NAD Adventist educators with email addresses.

Statement of Problem

Over the years, educational leaders and curriculum developers in the NAD have used the biennial results from the Profile Surveys to help guide their decisions in terms of curricular innovations. While some comparisons have been made between individual studies, and ensuing results have been used to influence policy and curriculum development to some degree, overall trends in the 10 studies up to 2007 have not been identified. As the studies increased in number, an integrative effort was needed in order to help reveal the trends in the combined results and to make them available in more compact form for use by curriculum developers.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this inductive analysis is to navigate the 10 Profile Surveys from 1987 to 2007 and to identify trends and patterns in selected areas related to curriculum. As McMillan and Schumacher (2001) proposed, results from individual versus

integrative studies are analogous to observing a city by driving through the streets versus having an aerial view from a helicopter. The former provides greater details such as displays in storefronts whereas the latter shows the big picture—the broad outline of the city along with the location of various points of interest in relation to others. While some detail is inevitably lost in the integrative process, the results can provide a contoured geography of the issues in focus, showing the location of the hills—the aspects that work well—and the valleys—those areas still needing attention. The current study is intended to respond to the need for an integrated perspective of recurrent themes from these studies.

Identifying curriculum-related trends is likely to be intrinsically beneficial in terms of supporting innovative educational change at various levels. As stated earlier, the results of the Profile Surveys have been used individually to some degree in curriculum development, but a need exists to study the patterns in the data and to render the results available for use in more compact form to help influence educational policy and curriculum development.

Curricular innovations based on analysis of the Profile Surveys can benefit various entities: The NADCC can access the trends based on stakeholder ratings to help guide them as they implement curriculum change. Teachers in turn are likely to reap the rewards by receiving materials that meet their needs more precisely. Students, moreover, are always at the receiving end of curricular innovations, and any benefits are likely to be passed on to them. Finally, parents are prone to be happier in terms of receiving more satisfactory returns on their investments in their children.

The analysis in this study focuses on trends based primarily on K-12 stakeholder ratings in the following areas: (a) Curriculum Guides; (b) Textbooks; (c) Technology; and (d) Other System-wide Issues including vision-making and implementation (such as FACT-21, Journey to Excellence [J2E], and Teacher Concerns).

Research Questions

The following four research questions guided this study:

1. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what trends emerge in K-12 teacher responses with regard to curriculum guides?
2. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what trends emerge in K-12 teacher responses with regard to textbooks?
3. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what K-12 technology issues feature most prominently?
4. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what other system-wide issues feature most prominently in K-12 Adventist education?

Obtaining answers to the above questions in this inductive analysis will hopefully facilitate the work of policymakers and curriculum developers in the North American Division as they revise and implement educational policy.

Theoretical Framework

The relationships among the independent and dependent variables in this study have been analyzed through the lens of the Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers: 1987-2007, a model based on institutional theory (see Figure 1). The dependent variables consist of internal and external job-related factors—specifically

Figure 1. Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers: 1987-2007.

normative, regulative, and cognitive—whereas the independent variables comprise teacher ratings of survey items related to curriculum guides, textbooks, technology in education, the J2E initiative, and teacher concerns including spirituality in schools, mainstreaming, teacher burnout, and professional development.

In addition to depicting the external environmental factors impacting Adventist education, the model underscores the biblical values that have been the underlying reason for the existence of the Adventist school system. In keeping with Selznick's (1957) proposition that founding values continue to impact institutional development through the lifespan of institutions, those values have permeated the Adventist school system throughout its history. Meyer and Rowan's (2006) discourse of institutional theory supports the rationale for applying institutional theory to this study:

New institutionalism has captured the imagination of scholars working in academic fields that contribute to educational research and policy analysis, including sociology, political science, economics, and organizational theory. . . . [This] signals the possibility of a new unity in these often fragmented disciplines, and it promises to provide researchers with a more universal language to describe and conceptualize research problems that are common to many fields. (p. 1)

Consistent with this proposition, Burch (2007) submits that educational research aligns with institutional theory in various ways even if the goals of the two may differ significantly. Beyond external environmental factors, Selznick (1957) offers a definition for “institutionalism” as “[infusing] with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand” (p. 17). In this context, Adventist education is highly institutionalized, with values and mandates from the Bible and the inspired writings of Ellen White having guided its philosophy from its inception to the present.

In the Schema (Deut 6:4-9), God instructed His people concerning His words: “You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in

your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down, and when you rise up” (v. 7, NKJV). In keeping with this directive, Ellen White, a prolific Christian writer with the status of “prophet” in Seventh-day Adventism, wrote in one of her earlier works on Adventist education:

No work ever undertaken by man requires greater care and skill than the proper training and education of youth and children. There are no influences so potent as those which surround us in our early years. Says the wise man, “Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it.” The nature of man is threefold, and the training enjoined by Solomon comprehends the right development of the physical, intellectual, and moral powers. To perform this work aright, parents and teachers must themselves understand “the way the child should go.” *This embraces more than a knowledge of books or the learning of the schools* [emphasis mine]. It comprehends the practice of temperance, brotherly kindness, and godliness; the discharge of our duties to ourselves, our neighbors, and to God. (White, 1923, p. 57)

As Covrig (1999) acknowledges, “if a person could have institutional status, then Ellen White would qualify for that status, at least in her relationship to the SDA community in general” (p. 106).

In scrutinizing the literature for models analyzing curriculum development in relation to institutional theory, Burch’s (2007) context while studying curriculum reform in the Glendale [public] School District aligns most closely with the milieu for the Profile Surveys. This school district had a K-12 student enrollment of about 100,000 attending 202 schools at the time the study was conducted between 2000 and 2003 (p. 86). Since Glendale shares several commonalities with other school systems both public and private, Burch’s approach to studying curricular reform efforts in that school district can certainly apply to other school systems. Her related graphic, a three-frame model, is an adaptation of Scott’s 1994 “Layered Model” of institutions (Scott, Meyer, & Associates, 1994, p. 57). However, since both models reflect neoinstitutional tenets, neither includes

foundational values, which permeate Adventist education so profoundly. The Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers (Figure 1), which has been used in analyzing the independent and dependent variables in this study, reflects the top-down macro-components of Scott's 1994 model. In addition, the model for this study highlights the impact of external regulatory and subtle mimicry influences on educational practice. Finally it accentuates the magnanimous impact of founding Christian values on Adventist education.

From its inception to the present, many theorists have contributed to the body of knowledge comprising institutional theory. Philip Selznick, one of its earliest and most influential proponents, enriched the field with his publications from the 1940s into the 21st century. In keeping with the goals of earlier institutional paradigms, he used the case study approach to conduct in-depth research of individual organizations such as the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA—Selznick, 1966) as opposed to later studies of “populations of organizations” (Covrig, 1999, p. 34) by other researchers which inevitably resulted in loss of precision. Selznick's studies led him to conclude that in addition to interactions with the external organizational field resulting in cooptation, internal historical factors including foundational values interplay to steer the course of institutions (Selznick 1948, 1957, 1966). Selznick's stance contrasts with the tenets of contingency theorists such as Aldrich (1979), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), and Thompson (1967), who underscore the role of external organizations in institutional development while marginalizing the impact of historical factors. Another early proponent of institutional theory, Stinchcombe (1965), proposed that isomorphism—or similarity among institutions in the same organizational field—ensues not from rational

activity, but from the use of common resources in the environment to achieve similar ends. Further, in their article on myth and ceremony in institutional development, Meyer and Rowan (1977) accentuated the impact of institutions submitting to societal rules to obtain and retain “legitimacy, resources, stability, and enhanced survival prospects” even when such action results in “[decreased] internal coordination and control” (p. 1). More recent voices concur with Meyer and Rowan by arguing that the rules and roles in institutions result, not from the need to promote efficiency by meeting genuine needs, but from external regulatory pressures coercing the institutions to meet certain conditions in order to earn legitimacy in the environment (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995a; Singh, Tucker, & Meinhard, 1991).

Institutional theory has its roots in sociology (Selznick, 1948, 1966) and social psychology (Berger & Luckmann, 1967), and comprises the “cognitive, normative, and regulative structures and activities that provide stability and meaning to social behavior” (Scott, 1995a, p. 33). Earlier institutional studies focused mainly on the normative and regulative structures to which institutions respond, while more recent studies focus primarily on “the mimetic or cognitive” aspects (Covrig, 1999, p. 13), thereby eliminating the history and values factors (Selznick, 1996). However, as Selznick attests, early and later institutional paradigms share the same history and are interdependent. In other words, institutional theory in general embraces all three “pillars,” as Scott (1995a) terms them (p. 35), and it is best not to separate them into “old” and “new” institutionalism (Selznick, 1996).

How could both internal and external institutional factors, specifically normative, regulative, and cognitive (independent variables), impact the quality of Adventist teacher

ratings of survey items (dependent variables), particularly those related to curriculum guides, textbooks, technology in schools, and other system-wide issues? What kinds of objective and perceived issues do those K-12 teachers experience that could connect substantively with institutional factors? Various studies correlate work environment with teacher perceptions, attitudes, and performance (Ghitulescu, 2013; McLaughlin, 1992; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Rafferty & Griffin, 2009; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). While the Profile Surveys sought to measure both objective and subjective curriculum-related realities as perceived by teachers, Bowen and Schuster (1986) submit that some aspects of reality are not easily measured:

It is the faculty's [or teacher's] *perceptions* of their circumstances, however inconsonant these perceptions may be with the "facts," which drive their responses to their environment, which determine how they behave and how they transmit the organization's culture to their colleagues, to their students, and others. (p. 138)

From Bowen and Schuster's (1986) proposition, it can be deduced that instructor responses to survey items could be easily influenced by their perceptions of their institutional environments both internal and external, whether or not those perceptions reflect reality. It follows, therefore, that teachers who are happy with their work environments for whatever reasons are likely to rate related survey items more positively than those who are dissatisfied. Examples of satisfaction in the context of the Profile Surveys are linked to current, well-organized, user-friendly curriculum guides and textbooks which reflect the values peculiar to Adventist education from its inception, state-of-the-art technology, and relevant professional development (PD). Conversely, examples of dissatisfaction are reflected in perceptions of stagnation and isolation, lack of administrative support, and PD experiences that focus more on preparing teachers to

complete paperwork to retain legitimacy rather than to meet the needs of students in the classroom.

Conditions in the work environment that result in satisfaction or lack of it impact teachers not only during the hours spent at work, but in practically all aspects of their lives (Vlăduț & Kállay, 2010). Like other professionals, teachers are acutely interested in work environments that engender fulfillment in multiple aspects of their lives (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Zanna & Rempel, 1988). In underscoring the need for a paradigm shift in studying organizational development, Scott (1995b) advocates the need for scholars to study how and why organizations operate the way they do, including the external factors that contribute to outcomes. In so doing he projects the rhetorical question: “How can we continue to scrutinize the figure and ignore the ground when shifts in the ground dislodge and reshape the figures we are attempting to study, explain, and understand?” (p. xii). It therefore follows that as shown in the Institutional Influences Model of Adventist Teachers used in this study, the independent variables (job-related factors) do impact the dependent variables (teacher ratings of survey items).

Delimiters

In examining the parameters imposed on this research, the delimiting factor was essentially the scope of the study. The issues covered in each study surpass a research project of this scope as each of the 10 Profile Surveys is, in effect, several studies within a study. Each individual study targets multiple curriculum-related issues, multiple grade levels (K-12), and stratified stakeholder participation (administrators, teacher educators, principals and other school personnel, and K-12 teachers). While 10 studies may

superficially not be deemed monumental, reality defies the possibility of analyzing all of the issues addressed within the limited scope of this research. It was therefore necessary to set parameters in terms of areas to target. This problem was inadvertently resolved by the NADCC in a cyber-conference.

Sometime after completing my research proposal, the assistant director of education at the NADOE was informed of the subject of my research and immediately became interested. With my permission he discussed the proposal with the NADCC. He subsequently scheduled an hour-long cyber conference involving the NADCC members, my dissertation chair, and me. He could see possibilities of using the findings of this research in future curriculum development endeavors. At that conference I was able to identify areas of special interest to the committee, based on the conversation. In consultation with my dissertation chair, those areas became the focus of this analysis. Essentially, due to the limited scope of this research, the analysis explores relatively few areas covered by the Profile Surveys.

Conceptual Definitions

Average(s): Aggregate(s), arithmetic mean, cumulative mean, mean (terms used interchangeably in this study).

Contingencies: Forces in the environment leading to institutional change. According to Covrig (2005), those include “new opportunities, new technology, catastrophe, change, political forces, etc.” (p. 117).

Cooptation: “The process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence” (Selznick, 1948, p. 34).

Cumulative mean or average: The sum of all the frequencies for a given variable for a specified number of years, divided by the total of the *Ns* for those years.

Environment: Institutional environments are classified by function rather than by geographical location. This helps to explain why K-12 schools respond to the same environment (organizational field) even when they are hundreds or thousands of miles apart.

External regulatory influences: Administrative and legislative organizations imposing mandates on institutions from the top.

Iron Cage metaphor: In his 1905 work, *The Protestant Work Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (later translated from German), Max Weber (1930) argued that bureaucratic government with its excessive rules and routine and red tape has locked humanity into an irreversible iron cage. Borrowing Weber's "iron cage" metaphor, DiMaggio and Powell argued in 1983 that bureaucracy is continuing to grow and organizations are becoming increasingly homogenous, but not necessarily more efficient.

Massed and distributed practice: Massed practice is a learning strategy utilizing successive practice sessions with no breaks in between. Conversely, distributed practice implies shorter practice sessions separated by breaks. According to Carpenter, Cepeda, Rohrer, Kang, and Pashler (2012), "Studying information across two or more sessions that are separated (i.e., spaced apart or distributed) in time often produces better learning than spending the same amount of time studying the material in a single session" (p.370).

Methodological inventiveness: "Combining conventional with creative new data collection and analysis methods" (Buchanan & Bryman, 2009, p. 6).

North American Division Curriculum Committee (NADCC): A Committee within the NAD Office of Education comprised of approximately 25 members responsible for coordinating curriculum development in the NAD school system.

North American Division Office of Education (NADOE): The office responsible for overseeing and coordinating all aspects of education in the NAD.

Organizational field: "Sets of organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life; key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983, pp. 148-149).

Sensemaking: The process of seeking to understand the fluid change forces in an institution's environment in order to enhance effective strategic planning (Weick, 1995).

Subtle Mimicry: In their quest to meet the demands of various administrative and regulatory organizations, institutions tend to mimic similar institutions in their environment, especially those considered exemplary (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

System-level administrators: Educational administrators at the Division, Union, and local Conference levels. Those include members of the NADOE, NADCC, and local Conference education superintendents.

Organization of the Dissertation

This study consists of seven chapters, the first of which describes the context for the research endeavor with its theoretical underpinnings. The literature review for the study has been integrated in context into the four findings chapters. This means that a separate chapter to review the literature has not been included. This method enhances the

possibility of having readers readily see connections between findings from survey data and views in the literature.

In the second chapter, the data-collection process along with the quantitative approach employed as the methodology to analyze the four research questions has been described. In addition, a rationale for choosing this method has been provided and the components of the model used to analyze relationships among the dependent and independent variables in the study have been described. While all variables related to the four research questions were initially tabulated, the ones retained for presentation and analysis in this study were primarily those represented in more than one of the 10 Profile Surveys between 1987 and 2007. With a few exceptions where results were of such magnitude as to impact survey results in general, repetition of single occurrences has been unnecessary as they have been covered in the individual studies.

The “Findings” section has been divided into four chapters numbered 3 through 6. Each of the chapters reflects trends in data derived from K-12 teacher ratings of curriculum-related issues in the K-12 Adventist school system in the NAD between 1987 and 2007. Analysis in Chapter 3 is based on issues related to curriculum guides including availability, delivery, preferred formats, use, and quality. Similarly, Chapter 4 analyzes textbook ratings with respect to availability, use, and quality. Chapter 5 provides an overview of the availability and use of various technologies in the NAD Adventist schools between 1987 and 2007, including the self-disclosed proficiency levels of K-12 teachers in their use of technology during that period. Chapter 6, the last of the four findings chapters, explores K-12 teacher perceptions of other system-wide issues impacting both teachers and students in the school system. Chapters 3 through 6 are

essentially a presentation of findings based on the tabulated and sifted data along with some non-tabulated, qualitative teacher feedback. Finally, Chapter 7 provides a synopsis of the study with a summary and discussion of major findings, along with the lessons learned and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Approaches to evaluation will become more eclectic and adaptive to contextual circumstances. Single-method evaluations will be viewed by professional evaluators, if not by the public and some elected officials, as simplistic and inadequate for evaluation of complex programs or those serving diverse populations.

—Jody L. Fitzpatrick, James R. Sanders, and Blaine R. Worthen

Institutional explanations provide the best way to understand the dynamics of “internal environments” and their role in organizational developments.

—Duane M. Covrig

Introduction

After exploring various possibilities for methodology in the context of this study, I opted for a quantitative approach using descriptive statistics, along with integration of selected qualitative comments. In addition, I used an inductive approach to analyze the four research questions through the lens of the Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers: 1987-2007 as depicted in Figure 1 (see Chapter 1). Moreover, in order to determine trends in the data based on the survey results, I also had to work out a feasible strategy to tabulate and graph relevant data in preparation for analysis. This chapter provides a description and rationale for the research methodology selection along with the data tabulation process.

Research Design: Description and Rationale

The database for this study was created using multiple secondary sources. Those consisted of written reports, articles, and SPSS files containing results based on the 10 Profile Studies from 1987 to 2007. These were supplemented with archived data from CDs, other hard copy sources, and personal communication with L. D. Burton, principal investigator for two Profile Studies, 2004 and 2007. Primary data were originally collected using mailed surveys for the first eight biennial Profile Studies (1987 to 2001), and electronic surveys for the other two (2004 & 2007). The former research team mailed surveys to a random sampling of one out of every six teachers in the NAD, which includes Canada and Bermuda. Conversely, the two most current surveys were completed electronically, with the sample consisting of all K-12 educators and administrators in the NAD with email addresses.

Survey results consisted of both quantitative and qualitative responses. However, the limited scope of this study rendered necessary the decision to explore quantitative data predominantly while integrating only selected, illustrative excerpts from qualitative comments in situations where such was necessary to clarify or strengthen findings based on quantitative data. In addition, descriptive statistics were used as opposed to inferential statistics due to lack of similarity in survey items and resultant data throughout the 20-year duration of the Profile Surveys. McMillan and Schumacher (2001) perceive descriptive statistics as “the most fundamental way to summarize data” and submit that their use “is indispensable in interpreting the results of quantitative research” (p. 207). Fitcher (1976) defines descriptive statistics as “a variety of methods used to summarize, describe and (to some extent) to interpret numerical data” (p. 1). The approach used in

this research endeavor to determine patterns in the data is consistent with Fletcher's definition. In many instances the data were visually represented by using bar and dot graphs. The graphs in turn reflected measures of central tendency including means and modes, and measures of variability, primarily ranges. In other instances the results from the various surveys were presented alongside each other through the years for purposes of comparison. Johnson and Christensen (2012) affirm the usefulness of "graphical representations" in describing data. They also submit that "measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) provide the numerical value that is considered most typical of the values of a quantitative variable" (p. 476).

The use of descriptive as opposed to inferential statistics presupposes that results are not generalizable to external populations, but apply only to the population targeted in the Profile Surveys. In discussing the value of descriptive statistics in research, Ackroyd (2009) submits:

The characteristics of populations can say a good deal about the likely extent of trends and processes. Responses to questionnaires relating to populations are useful if their limitations are understood, and if their primary use is descriptive. It is also permissible to use samples to estimate population characteristics; such techniques offer economical and reliable ways of estimating population values and parameters. (p. 543)

While the database used for this study focuses on curriculum-related issues, those were not addressed in a vacuum but in interaction with the population of key stakeholders, primarily K-12 teachers in the NAD. To some degree, therefore, Ackroyd's proposition about "populations" can apply to the K-12 teachers in the Profile Surveys as they interact with curriculum-related issues focused on curriculum guides, textbooks, technology in education, and other system-wide issues.

Further, exploration of the data to determine trends and patterns related to the four research questions necessitated an inductive approach. Johnson and Christensen (2012) define inductive analysis as "immersion in the details and specifics of the data to discover important patterns, themes, and interrelationships" (p. 378). Finally, the Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers—1987-2007, the lens through which the four research questions were analyzed, integrates the principles of both the earlier paradigms and the neoinstitutional perspectives of institutional theory. Using this lens, the stricter hegemony of traditional research methods gives way to more flexible alternatives (Buchanan & Bryman, 2009; Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2001; Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). As Buchanan and Bryman (2009) propose:

The field of organizational research displays three trends: widening boundaries, multiparadigmatic profile, and methodological inventiveness. . . . Research competence thus involves addressing coherently the organizational, historical, political, ethical, evidential, and personal factors relevant to an investigation. (p. 1)

The Model Described

As stated in Chapter 1, the Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers—1987-2007 has been used to show relationships among the dependent and independent variables in this study. The model reflects some aspects of W. Scott's 1994 "Layered Model" (p. 57), particularly the macro systems representing top-down imposition. In addition, it reflects the role of external regulatory and subtle mimicry influences on Adventist teacher practice. Lastly, it highlights the profound and continuing effects of Bible-based, founding values, along with community perspectives, on educational practice.

Essentially, the model consists of four major institutional elements impacting K-12 Adventist educational practice: (a) Macro Social and Cultural Patterns, (b) Organizational Fields, (c) Professional Culture in Education, and (d) Local Ideological Values (school, home, church, community). The dotted lines in the model denote permeability among institutions and their external environment. Scott and Meyer (1994) allude to the idea that contributions of some institutional researchers in the 1960s, especially Katz and Kahn (1966) and Thompson (1967), resulted in a paradigm shift. As a result of their research, organizations formerly perceived as closed entities were from then on considered as interdependent, “open systems” in relation to their environments (p. 138). Covrig’s (2005) Sensemaking Model relating neoinstitutionalism and early institutionalism further highlights the relationship between institutions and their organizational field. Local actors have to wrestle with contingencies, their local ideals, and governmental and professional pressures. Sensemaking in institutional theory refers to the process of seeking to understand the fluid change forces in an institution’s environment in order to enhance effective strategic planning (Weick, 1995).

Macro Social and Cultural Patterns impacting educational institutions can be described as the federal and state organizations that impose various regulatory demands on those institutions. Examples of such regulations include national and core standards, and accreditation-related mandates, representing “top down” imposition. In commenting on the actions that those governing bodies require of institutions, North (1986) wrote:

[Institutions] entail enforcement either of the self-enforcing variety, through codes of behavior, or by a third party policing and monitoring. Because ultimately a third party must always involve the state as the source of coercion, a theory of institutions also inevitably involves an analysis of the political structure of a society and the degree to which that political structure provides a framework of effective enforcement. (p. 231)

In the case of Adventist educational institutions, the founding values constituting the basis for the unique philosophy of education can be seen as “self-enforcing.” Conversely, it is unlikely that external regulations such as core standards would ever have found a place in Adventist education without imposition from those external federal and local agencies.

In view of top-down imposition, Adventist educators must of necessity adapt their curricula in order to acquire and retain legitimacy, and not necessarily because those mandates truly represent best practices. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), institutions generally access common resources in the environment in their quest to meet the demands of various administrative and regulatory organizations. In addition, when challenged by uncertainty, they tend to mimic other similar institutions in the organizational field, especially those that are considered exemplary. However, the values they uphold do play a role in the way they respond to external imposition. Adventist schools, for example, use their biblical founding values to set parameters through which they respond to administrative and regulatory bodies. In proportion to their degree of commitment to their philosophy, they are likely to challenge any regulations that threaten their founding values as they respond to external imposition—a bottom-up approach which might reflect modification of the imposed regulations.

In addition to federal and state agencies, various other entities in the organizational field also impact educational institutions. The term “organizational field” refers not to geographical location, but to function. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) define the term as “sets of organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life; key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and

other organizations that produce similar services or products" (pp. 148-149). K-12 educational institutions whether public or private, for instance, tend to use the same resources in the institutional environments in which they operate, to attain similar ends. Examples of such services include Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), social services, state regulations, and public opinion. As educational institutions interact with the same regulatory bodies and use the same resources in the organizational environment to respond to similar issues, they tend to become alike—a process known as isomorphism.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) propose that isomorphism consists of three varieties: normative, coercive, and mimetic. According to the authors, normative isomorphism involves similarity derived from common perspectives of professionalism and practice. Coercive isomorphism, on the other hand, refers to forced compliance based on external regulations. Finally, mimetic isomorphism entails imitating other organizations usually in the face of uncertainty, especially when those are perceived as legitimate. Isomorphism explains incidences of striking similarity among institutions in the same organizational fields even when they may be hundreds or even thousands of miles apart.

Perceptions of professionalism in the school system help administrators to decide on the kinds of teachers that are hired. In the Adventist K-12 school system, for instance, prospective teachers are perceived as eligible for employment if their qualifications align with the tenets of education theory. This entails not only earning college degrees in relevant fields, but also requires knowledge of the various theories that are linked with success and reform in education, and how they can be best applied in practice. Further,

they must keep up with certification requirements by continuing professional development. Moreover, beyond these professional requirements, the Adventist school system seeks to hire Christian teachers who will uphold its unique philosophy, not simply because employees are required to do so, but because the Bible-based philosophy reflects the value system of the teachers themselves.

The last sector of the model reflects the role of community values in the Adventist educational system in relation to practice. As stated in Chapter 1, Selznick (1957) attests that historical values continue to impact the development of institutions throughout their lifespan. The Adventist school system came into being primarily because the agenda of public schools did not align with Adventism's values-driven philosophy. It was therefore considered inadequate to "[prepare students] for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come" (White, 1903, p. 13). A perusal of both qualitative and quantitative stakeholder responses through the lifespan of the Profile Surveys substantiates that philosophical values based on the Bible, and further detailed and highlighted in the writings of Ellen White, greatly impacted participant responses. Through the lifespan of the Profile Surveys (1987-2007), K-12 teacher respondents, the key stakeholders, have repeatedly communicated their adherence to Christian values and their desire to see curriculum resources reflect those values. The majority of Adventist teachers strongly advocate faith and learning integration. They strongly advocate that their curriculum materials acknowledge Jesus as the world's Redeemer. They strongly advocate a literal 6-day creation week as described in the book of Genesis in the Bible. Finally, they strongly advocate that their curriculum materials reflect the detailed principles that God communicated on the subject of education through the writings of

Ellen G. White. The various parts of the Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers communicate that curriculum development in Adventist education is profoundly influenced by founding values as well as external factors, both regulatory and subtle.

The Data Tabulation Process

While 10 surveys might suggest a limited amount of data to analyze, such is not the case with the Profile Surveys. As stated in Chapter 1, each of the 10 research endeavors is highly stratified and comprehensive, in effect, several studies within a study. Not only does each survey include all grades ranging from K-12; it also includes system-level administrators, teacher educators, school principals, and K-12 teachers throughout the NAD. In addition, each covers a plethora of curriculum-related issues. By contrast, other curriculum-related studies in the literature generally target single grades and single subjects in the curriculum, often at a single school. Based on this premise, preparing the data for analysis was no straightforward task.

Unlike most researchers analyzing secondary data, I was privileged to have access to the original SPSS files along with reports and published journal articles from each survey. (Examples of related publications include Brantley, 1998/99; Burton, Gittens-St. Juste, McGarrell, & Nwosu, 2005; Burton, Katenga, Kijai, Xing, & Ho, 2011; and Burton & Telemaque, 2010/2011.) After reading through those resources and making personal copies, the next step was to create several master tables including all variables related to the four research questions covering all years represented. All variables occurring in a minimum of two of the surveys were then retabulated and retained for analysis. Since the focus was on identifying trends in the surveys, and various reports and journal articles had been published based on the individual studies, the approach for this study was

primarily integrative. On a limited basis, however, data occurring in single surveys were included in the current research when their impact was of such magnitude as to have a bearing on the study as a whole.

After completing the tables with variables from a minimum of two surveys, the data were further organized for integration. In some instances in which a 6-point Likert scale had been used in data collection, for example, the scale was recoded to three levels for analysis purposes. The two lowest levels became Level 1, the two middle ones—Level 2, and the two top ones, Level 3. Moreover, since this is an integrative study, the data for each table were aggregated for all years represented. In addition to representing the data in tabular form, much of it was presented graphically to reflect measures of central tendency, primarily means and modes, and also ranges—a measure of variability. The resultant data have been analyzed inductively for trends and patterns, using descriptive statistics.

CHAPTER III

CURRICULUM GUIDES AND RELATED INNOVATIONS

American education is a vast junkyard of curricular innovations that in their own heydays were promoted as panaceas for much that ails the schools and society. . . . It's not that good ideas and usable methods were lacking there. It's that they live in a culture where people expect too much, in too short a time, for too little an investment in resources.

—Edward. G. Rozychi

NAD teachers express some confusion about the role of curriculum guides, standardized tests, and recommended textbooks. They do not always understand how the three components relate to one another.

—Paul. S. Brantley and Alfredo Ruiz

Introduction

As part of their response to the fragmentation issue addressed in Chapter 1, the NADOE has been creating curriculum guides for all K-12 schools under their jurisdiction. Curriculum Guides are blueprints for instruction reflecting the philosophy, overarching goals, and general objectives for various courses of study. Additionally, since curriculum development is recursive, the NADOE has been spending considerable means and labor in their efforts to respond to teacher feedback in keeping the resources current and making them available to all K-12 teachers within the Division.

Ironically on one hand, system-level administrators have been making decided efforts to ensure that teachers receive curriculum guides reflecting the philosophies of their respective school systems; on the other hand, federal and state administrative bodies have been demanding that students take standardized tests which are generally not aligned with the state—and now national “common core” curricula (Au, 2009; English, 1987; Febey & Louis, 2008; Pagliaro, 2013; Ravitch, 1995) and which do not cater to the needs of diversified student populations (Au, 2009). In Profile 2004, teachers were asked to indicate if standardized test content “aligned with curriculum content” (Burton, 2005, p. 69). Only 29.5% of K-12 teachers responded in the affirmative. In terms of competence, however, schools and teachers are judged, if only informally, by student outcomes on those tests (Eisner, 2003; Tom, 1997). According to Goodlad (1979), public perception holds that schools and teachers do their jobs defectively. Craig and Ross (2008) argue that this situation “gave rise to accountability demands on schools and teachers as well as the high stakes testing movement” (p. 284). Instructors therefore are faced with the no-win options of teaching to the test while neglecting the curriculum at least to some degree, or teaching to reflect curricular trends at the expense of being labeled as incompetent when their students perform at substandard levels on the tests (Mehrens & Kaminski, 1989; Popham, 1999; Volante, 2004).

How have classroom teachers been responding to the continuing efforts by administrators to make curriculum guides available to them? To what degree do they use the guides? Do the ends justify the means? Chapter 3 presents findings on the first research question which targets trends related to curriculum guides as reported by K-12 teachers. In addition to quantitative data, some qualitative comments have been included.

Teacher perspectives regarding curriculum guides vary as the following examples illustrate:

The curriculum guides are necessary and helpful for reference and direction both for schools and for the curriculum committee on the Union level. . . . We are very fortunate to have the curriculum help we have available. Many other private schools flounder in this area and have to try to pick and choose for themselves. I think it is a good thing to have the curriculum guides include K-12 for all subject areas.
(Burton, 2007, p. 126)

The following teacher comment captures yet another perspective: “They [curriculum guides] are basically useless in their current format” (p. 122). Yet another respondent affirms that “the guides are done very carefully” (p. 123). In general, however, the majority of teacher respondents provided suggestions for improvement of curriculum guides. Due to the limited scope of this study, only a few of those suggestions could be included in this chapter. On account of differences in patterns of use, the elementary and secondary teacher ratings are discussed separately in some instances.

Reactions to Imposition in the Public School Arena

Proponents of institutional theory affirm that change can be enacted from the top down as well as from the bottom up (de Haan & Rotmans, 2011; Easterly, 2008; Fromhold-Eisebith & Eisebith, 2005; Scott, 2008). Since schools are at the receiving end of curricular innovations, they are in a position to respond in a variety of ways to the propositions handed down to them. According to Burch (2007), they can accept those top-down demands verbatim, they can sometimes even ignore them, or they can reframe the propositions to align with local needs.

As the following two examples illustrate, curriculum-related teacher decisions are often colored by the demands of the larger environment, or organizational fields with

which they interact. In a case study of Dutch literary education conducted in the Netherlands from 1968-2000, results indicated that students' favorite authors dominated textbooks rather than authors recommended by "literary experts." Similarly, teachers opted for literature texts showcasing their students' favorite authors (Verboord & van Rees, 2009, p. 74).

Febey and Louis (2008) share another example illustrating how the resistance of one school to imposition on the part of the state resulted in bottom-up change. As with other schools in Iowa, the state required that Angiers High School submit to a prescribed framework intended to engender improvement in student outcomes. Such improvement would be measured solely by results from the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITEDS). However, since Angiers students performed better than their peers from other schools in the state, the administration and teachers thought it unfair that they should have to submit to the same accountability requirements for schools with substandard performance. Besides, they saw no virtue in the state using the ITEDS as the sole measure for judging effectiveness, especially when it hardly aligned with their curriculum. Based on this logic they decided to use the test results as their rationale to resist compliance with strategies that could interfere with curriculum decisions deemed best for their students. Not surprisingly, the state supported their decision (p. 64). The foregoing examples suggest that from the perspective of organizational fields, educational researchers would do well to focus more on the intervening factors which impact curriculum-related decisions at the local school level.

Curriculum-Related Concerns: Curriculum Delivery and Availability

In order to ensure that the time, means, and effort spent in creating curriculum materials are worthwhile, those materials need to be put to good use by the stakeholders. Creating curriculum guides is one concern; another is getting them into the hands of teachers in a timely manner so that they are available for use. Yet another issue is providing relevant PD for teachers so that they can use the materials effectively. Assessing the delivery system that places those materials in the hands of teachers, the key stakeholders, is therefore important. In this subsection, the effectiveness of this delivery system (including orienting and coaching teachers) is presented through the eyes of the stakeholders. While this study focuses primarily on responses from K-12 teachers, the perspectives of system-level administrators need to be included here, since especially at the local conference level, they are principally responsible for curriculum delivery including orienting, coaching, and supervising teachers.

Availability of Curriculum Guides to K-12 Teachers

The data from survey results show that, in general, K-12 teachers in the NAD have the curriculum guides especially for the subjects they teach so that availability is no longer an issue. In Profile 2004, for example, “fewer than 10% of teachers indicated that they did not have a copy of any particular curriculum guide while some others, especially newer teachers, were not sure as to whether or not they had the resources” (Burton, 2005, pp. 18, 19). While many subject areas are not represented in Table 2, the statistics, based on the 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2007 Profile Surveys, indicate that a majority of K-8 teachers reported having curriculum guides in some key subject areas. These included

Science and Health, Social Studies, Mathematics, Language Arts, and Physical Education.

For the senior academy subgroup, related information available in more than one survey is rather limited, possibly because academy teachers generally teach fewer subjects than their elementary teacher counterparts and are likely to need curriculum guides only for the subjects they teach. In Table 2, only Mathematics and Physical Education (PE) have been represented for the senior academy grade levels. In Profile 1997, 15.2% of academy teachers who responded to the related item reported having the Math curriculum guide as compared with 66.7% in 2004 and 48.5% in 2007. For PE, corresponding ratings were 78.2% and 42.5% in 2004 and 2007 respectively.

When asked in Profile 2001 to state whether or not they had the NAD curriculum guides, 92.1% of elementary teachers responded in the affirmative, compared with 88.1% of senior academy teachers. In addition, less than 1% of each of the two subgroups indicated uncertainty as to whether or not they had the resources. Such could be attributable to newer teachers who may not have had the opportunity at the onset of their journey to access all the curriculum guides: “Since I am somewhat new to the Adventist system, I have not extensively used the curriculum guides” (Burton, 2007, p. 124). In addition, Kindergarten teachers have their own curriculum (*A Child’s World*) and possibly accounted at least in part for the 7.5% of elementary teachers who reported not having Adventist curriculum guides in Profile 2001.

Another issue relating to possibly compromising the integrity of some of the data in the most recent survey (completed using Survey Monkey) is highlighted in the following comment:

Table 2

Availability Ratings of NAD Curriculum Guides by Elementary and Secondary Teachers: Profiles 1997, 2001, 2004, and 2007
(in Percentages)

Elementary/Junior Academy Ratings					
Curriculum Guides	Year	Do Not Have	Not Sure	Have	<i>N</i>
K-12 Science/Health Curriculum Guide	2001	98 (22.2)	--	344 (77.8)	442
Health Curriculum Guide (K-8)	2007	29 (13.1)	77 (34.8)	115 (52.0)	221
Social Studies Curriculum Guide 9-12	2004	7 (9.2)	13 (17.1)	56 (73.7)	76
Social Studies Curriculum Guide K-8	2007	12 (5.1)	36 (15.3)	187 (79.6)	235
Math Curriculum Guide	2004	21 (7.9)	41 (15.3)	205 (76.8)	267
K-12 Math Curriculum Guide	2007	12 (5.6)	40 (12.7)	262 (83.4)	314
Language Arts Curriculum Guide (K-8)	2001	292 (62.3)	--	177 (37.7)	469
Language Arts Curriculum Guide (K-8)	2004	18 (6.9)	33 (12.7)	208 (80.3)	259
Multigrade Language Arts Manual	2007	93 (44.9)	47 (22.7)	67 (32.4)	207
K-8 Reading Curriculum Guide	2007	21 (8.9)	39 (16.5)	177 (74.7)	237

Table 2—*Continued.*

Elementary/Junior Academy Ratings					
Curriculum Guides	Year	Do Not Have	Not Sure	Have	<i>N</i>
K-12 PE Curriculum Guide	2004	21 (8.7)	44 (9.4)	177 (73.1)	242
	2007	20 (6.5)	59 (19.1)	229 (74.4)	308
SDA Curriculum Guides (in general)	2001	34 (7.5)	2 (0.4)	420 (92.1)	456
Senior Academy Ratings					
K-12 Math Curriculum Guide	1997	72 (84.7)	--	13 (15.2)	85
Math Curriculum Guide	2004	12 (11.8)	22 (21.5)	8 (66.7)	102
	2007	30 (22.1)	40 (29.4)	66 (48.5)	136
PE Curriculum Guide	2004	4 (7.3)	8 (14.5)	43 (78.2)	55
	2007	35 (26.1)	42 (31.3)	57 (42.5)	134
SDA Curriculum Guides (in general)	2001	17 (11.3)	1 (0.6)	133 (88.1)	151

Note. Dash indicates that data were not available.

My answers for #29, #31, #33, #37, and #39 are bogus. I have never seen curriculum guides for these subject areas nor told they were available. However, the survey would not let me continue unless I put an answer. So I just did a middle-of-the-road type answer since I have no information. I will have to check at school over the summer and see if we have these guides available. (Burton, 2007, p. 118)

For clarification, L. D. Burton, Project Director for Profile 2007, explained that the survey was designed to render the skipping of sections possible. Moreover, that aspect worked perfectly at the piloting stages. For some unknown reason, however, participants found it impossible to skip sections when granted access to the survey (L. D. Burton, personal communication, March 12, 2013). This issue will need to be monitored even more closely in future online surveys.

Alongside the “Availability” item in Profile 2007, respondents were asked whether or not they taught the subjects related to the various curriculum guides. The results were revealing as, in every instance, those who reported having the curriculum guides out-numbered those who reported teaching the particular subjects. Essentially, therefore, the availability problem has been resolved.

Delivery of Curriculum Guides to K-12 Teachers

Curriculum development and delivery are cyclical processes as classroom instruction needs to relate to emergent societal needs and trends. Once curriculum materials are created in the NAD, they are passed on to the system-level administrators at the local conference level, and from them to classroom teachers. Conference-level administrators are responsible not only for delivering the materials to the various schools, but for orienting the thousands of K-12 teachers regarding their use. Moreover, they are earmarked to provide PD for those teachers in effectively using the resources, including those reflecting innovative trends.

Several scholars advance the thesis that effective coaching of teachers can enhance student learning outcomes (Currier et al., 2012; Elder & Padover, 2011; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Stover, Kissel, Haag, & Shoniker, 2011). As Brantley (1991) affirms, “Research indicates that on-going coaching is by far the most effective way to institute and maintain curriculum change at the classroom level” (p. 9). Results from Profile 1987, 1991, and 1997 tell related stories of willing administrators and teachers faced with progress-defying challenges. In Profile 1991, 71 system-level administrators rated themselves in terms of “the amount of time [they spent] observing and assisting classroom teachers” (Brantley, 1991, p. 9). They selected their responses from the following options: “Adequate,” “Somewhat Adequate,” “Somewhat Inadequate,” and “Inadequate.” Based on their responses, only 10% perceived themselves as spending adequate time “observing and assisting teachers” (p. 9). The two largest subgroups opted for “Somewhat Adequate” (39%) and “Somewhat Inadequate” (38%), while 13% selected “Inadequate.” These data suggest that time constraints are an important factor in administrators providing effective PD.

In a similar vein, three subgroups of system-level administrators comprising conference personnel, members of the NADCC, and teacher educators were asked in Profile 1997 to rate their proficiency levels in terms of helping teachers implement the following 10 selected innovations (see Table 3 and Figure 2): (a) Portfolios; (b) Flexible Scheduling; (c) Teacher Networks; (d) Multiple Intelligences & Learning Styles; (e) EMG/CD Multimedia; (f) Integrated Curriculum; (g) Inclusion for Disabilities; (h) Innovative Instruction; (i) School/work Programs; and (j) Curriculum in Witnessing and Service (Brantley, 1997, p. 8). It is worthy of note that the majority of these innovations

are precursors to the Preferred Practices in the Journey to Excellence (J2E) initiative. The data show that those administrators asserted their willingness to assist teachers with the innovations.

Table 3

Leaders' Preparedness to Help Teachers With Innovations—Profile 1997 (in Percentages)

Question: HOW PREPARED ARE YOU to help teachers implement the following [curriculum-related] innovations?

	“Proficient in Helping Teachers”			“Desire More Information On”		
	Conference N = 81	NADCC N = 27	Teacher Educators N = 57	Conference	NADCC	Teacher Educators
Portfolios	13	26	38	35	19	9
Flexible Scheduling	13	11	25	41	19	25
Teacher Networks	17	30	29	30	19	23
Multiple Intelligences & Learning Styles	15	11	29	23	19	11
EMG/CD Multimedia	6	7	9	49	22	39
Integrated Curriculum	23	22	45	23	30	11
Inclusion for Disabilities	14	15	22	35	44	24
Innovative Instruction	13	11	20	38	52	14
School/work Programs	5	11	8	42	52	38
Curriculum in Witness- ing and Service	27	19	11	23	15	35

Note. Data are from *Profile '97: A Preliminary Report of Curriculum and Instruction in Seventh-day Adventist Schools* (p. 9), by P. S. Brantley, 1997, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Adapted with permission.

Figure 2. Leaders' preparedness to help teachers with innovations—percentage averages of Profile 1997 ratings (based on Table 3).

On the contrary, as shown in Table 3, the ratings from those who considered themselves “Proficient in Helping Teachers” substantially trailed comparative data from those who “Desire[d] More Information On” the innovations. Figure 2 provides a condensed version of the data presented in Table 3, based on the arithmetic mean for each column.

In the Southern Union of Seventh-day Adventists, teachers coach each other (Forbes, 2011); however, such is not the trend in the NAD. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Conference-level administrators are the key administrative subgroup responsible for providing PD for teachers. Unfortunately, a look at Figure 2 substantiates that among the three subgroups of system-level administrators, those at the Conference level rated themselves as being least prepared to provide the needed PD experiences. This too, is a cause for concern. The bleak picture just presented in relation to PD is by no means

unique to the K-12 Adventist school system in the NAD. Joyce and Showers (2002)

present a related consensus in the literature as seen through the research-based findings of several scholars:

Most districts are not organized to accompany staff development with systemwide initiatives in curriculum, instruction, or technology to ensure a healthy implementation (Crandall et al., 1982; Fullan & Park, 1981; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Hall, 1986; Joyce, Calhoun, & Hopkins, 1999; Huberman & Miles, 1984). For example, even though district committees can produce great curriculum guides and order and deliver textbooks and other materials to classrooms, implementation—including the use of new textbooks, in many cases—often doesn’t occur because the staff development component has not been extensive enough. (p. 66)

More recent voices acknowledge the validity of this perspective. While studying instructional reform in the Glendale School District, for example, Burch (2007) noted:

“By their own and the schools’ report, district office staff members with direct responsibility for providing instructional support possessed limited understanding of instruction and strategies for supporting school-level efforts” (p. 90). In a similar vein, Firestone and Martinez (2007) acknowledge that while school districts are generally proficient in implementing “clear, unambiguous policy” at the school level, they are challenged by tasks that “require the re-education of teachers” (p. 3).

In addition to system-level administrators, K-12 teachers were asked to rate their proficiency levels in using the 10 innovations discussed earlier. As with the system-level administrators, teachers were asked to select their responses from two options: “Using with Proficiency,” and “Would Like to Try.” Table 4 presents dismally low figures ranging from 2% to 19% of elementary teachers and 2% to 18% of academy teachers opting for “Using with Proficiency.” On a more positive note, greater numbers of respondents ranging from 20% to 46% of elementary teachers, and 22% to 52% of academy teachers, indicated their desire to try using the selected innovations.

Table 4

Teachers' Perceptions of Innovative Educational Practices—Profile 1997 (in Percentages)

Question: HOW DO YOU FEEL about the following innovations?

	“Using With Proficiency”		“Would Like to Try”	
	Elementary Teachers N = 381	Academy Teachers N = 129	Elementary Teachers	Academy Teachers
Portfolios	4	5	29	4
Flexible Scheduling	11	17	29	30
Teacher Networks	5	2	46	52
Multiple Intelligences & Learning Styles	12	18	27	25
EMG/CD Multimedia	6	9	33	37
Integrated Curriculum	19	8	20	31
Inclusion for Disabilities	10	6	21	22
Innovative Instruction	7	10	29	22
School/work Programs	2	6	44	41
Curriculum in Witness- ing and Service	12	13	36	38

Note. Data are from “Curriculum and Instruction in North American Schools: Results from the Profile ’97 Survey,” by P. S. Brantley, 1998/1999, *Journal of Adventist Education*, 61(2), p. 30. Adapted with permission.

Figure 3. Teachers’ perceptions of innovative educational practices—percentage averages of profile 1997 ratings (based on Table 4).

Figure 3 presents arithmetic means of the four columns of data in Table 3 for elementary and secondary teachers. With proficiency levels averaging 8.8% to 9.4% for elementary and academy teachers respectively, versus desire to try ranging from 31.4% to 32.2% for the same subgroups, willingness far supersedes ability. In Profile 2007 one teacher wrote: “I don’t feel I am as familiar with how to use the curriculum guides as I should. I wish we could have a class or inservice on utilizing the curriculum guides” (Burton, 2007, p. 122).

Problems in implementing curriculum-related innovations are not unique to the Adventist school system but plague the public school system as well. Fullan (2008) reported that even before he and Pomfret “published the first review of research on curriculum implementation” in 1977, several researchers such as “John Goodlad, Neal Gross, and Seymour Sarason” (p. 113) had already documented the problem in individual

research endeavors. Those scholars affirmed that the proposed curricular innovations of the 1960s never made their way into the nation's classrooms. Goodlad, Klein, and Associates (1970), for example, in their classic, *Behind the Classroom Door*, affirmed that some schools claiming to adopt certain innovations showed no evidence of their use, while others claiming not to use them inadvertently showed evidence of some usage. In some later studies, researchers such as Ball and Cohen (1999), and Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, and Lipton (1999), noted the issue of superficiality as teachers sought to implement innovations. They follow the crowd simply because it is popular at the time, but the decision is not based on inquiry.

More current research supports the notion that the trend has not changed; however the focus has shifted. Fullan (2008) affirms that the primary focus of curriculum implementation was on innovations “roughly [from] 1995 to 1997 (and still going)” (p. 113). From “1997 to the present,” he wrote in 2008, curriculum implementation has been perceived as part of system-wide reform (p. 113) involving a variety of elements including some institutional variables. As Burch (2007) asserts, teachers can decide to be loyal to the administrative bodies handing down the innovations and seek to implement them as presented. Otherwise they can “reframe,” or “reinterpret,” those innovations to align with their own agendas. Alternatively, they can ignore them all together.

In the Adventist school system, an integrated perspective of ratings from administrators and teachers communicates shortfalls in terms of coaching, which is intricately connected with implementation of innovations. No wonder when over 400 K-12 teachers were asked in the Profile 1987 survey to rate six selected resources, “Supervisor Visits” trailed them all (see Table 5). Teachers favored Teacher's Editions

most, followed by Standardized Tests, Teachers' In-service and Conventions, School Library, Curriculum Guides, and Supervisor Visits in descending order.

Table 5

Perceived Helpfulness of Various Resources by K-12 Teachers Arranged in Descending Order: Profile 1987

Resource	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Teacher's Editions	7.5	1.52	419
Standardized Tests	6.2	2.33	403
Teachers' In-service & Conventions	5.7	2.22	412
School Library	5.4	2.28	419
Curriculum Guides	5.0	2.24	416
Supervisor Visits	4.2	1.87	414

Note. The data in this table are from *Profile 1987: Curriculum and Instruction in Seventh-day Adventist Schools—A Profile of Teacher Concerns: An Executive Summary—Draft* (p. 20), by P. S. Brantley, 1987, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Reprinted with permission. The original title was "Teachers' Estimate of Usefulness of Resources."

By comparison, in Profile 2004, K-12 teachers were asked to rate their perceived helpfulness of various PD resources including "Classroom Visits." Of the 343 K-12 teachers who responded to this item, 192 (60.0%) reported that they were either "Very Helpful" or "Quite Helpful"; 121 (35.2%) perceived them as being "Of Little Help"; and 30 (8.7%) considered them "Not Helpful." Further complicating the preceding challenges is the numeric ratio of system-level administrators to teachers: They simply are not sufficient to effectively coach the thousands of K-12 teachers. Data on the corresponding item related to perceived helpfulness of Teacher Conventions were available from

elementary teachers only. Of the 268 elementary teachers who responded, 170 (63.4%) rated those conventions as “Very Helpful” or “Quite Helpful” while 88 (32.8%) rated them as being “of Little Help”; finally, 10 (3.7%) rated them as “Not Helpful.”

While the foregoing information communicates the willingness of many teachers to try the curricula-related innovations, the statistics also indicate that many of the administrators assigned to coach teachers need to be trained themselves in applying the concepts so that they in turn can train teachers. On another note, should all administrators become proficient, time constraints and too large a leader/teacher ratio could still impede progress. The foregoing data suggest a standing problem in coaching teachers. In a subsequent section it will be seen more vividly that professional development relating to the use of curriculum resources directly impacts the degree to which teachers use the resources and how they rate those resources. Even when copies of curricula are available to K-12 teachers, their use is generally not optimized partly due to lack of proper coaching. Could this situation possibly signal the need for a system-wide paradigm shift in terms of coaching?

In addressing the issue of what works and what doesn't in professional development with regard to implementation, Joyce and Showers (2002), seasoned researchers in the field of professional development in education, propose that peer coaching significantly outshines all the other options tested. Based on research and their informed judgment, they provide estimates of three outcomes of training, the strategies used to achieve those outcomes, and the quantitative results in terms of the percentage of participants expected to benefit from each category (Table 6).

As shown in Table 6 Joyce and Showers (2002) suggest that in terms of outcomes, only 10% of teachers who are trained in a theory related to a concept are able to obtain a thorough knowledge of the concept, compared with 5% who will acquire strong skills in that area. In addition, theoretical training alone is likely to result in 0% implementation. Comparatively, 30% of teachers can master concept acquisition through demonstrations, and 20% are likely to acquire copious skills. While demonstrations are more potent than theory only, they still yield 0% implementation in the classroom. Joyce and Showers (2002) argue that theory and demonstration can be integrated since “they have reciprocal effects” (p. 74).

Table 6

Training Components and Attainment of Outcomes in Terms of Percentage of Participants

Components	Outcomes		
	Knowledge (thorough)	Skill (strong)	Transfer (executive implementation)
Study of Theory	10	5	0
Demonstrations	30	20	0
Practice	60	60	5
Peer Coaching	95	95	95

Note. The data in this table are from *Student Achievement Through Staff Development* (p. 78), by B. Joyce and B. Showers, 2002, Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Reprinted with permission.

Through practice, the third component, 60% of teachers are able to acquire both thorough knowledge and strong skills related to the concept, but only 5% of those

teachers actually transfer the concept to classroom practice. Joyce and Showers (2002) propose that implementation requires practice in varying degrees depending on the complexity of the skill to be taught. In addition, they recommend that, in order to enhance implementation, teachers should simulate the classroom environment as closely as possible as they practice. In terms of the amount of practice needed, they recommend “20 or 25 trials in the classroom over a period of about 8-10 weeks” “for models of medium complexity” (p.74), and less practice for simpler skills. Finally, as a result of peer coaching—the last component—95% of teachers acquire thorough knowledge and strong skills related to the concept, and the entire 95% also implement them in their teaching. It is worthy of note that while evaluation has its rightful place, implementation can occur in copious degrees without the element of teacher evaluation.

Joyce and Showers (2002) provide the following definition of peer coaching:

The collaborative work of teachers to solve the problems or questions that arise during implementation. It begins during training and continues in the work-place. Peer coaching provides support for the community of teachers attempting to master new skills and to plan and develop lessons. This planning time is essential to changes in curriculum and instruction. (p. 74)

They argue that when implementation is the desired outcome from professional development, “theory, demonstration, practice, and peer coaching” (p. 77) are all needed. They further argue that while substituting peer coaches with trainers can yield the same results in terms of implementation, this “is not practical in most settings” (p. 77). Other scholars researching professional development in education also concur on the premise that peer coaching can impact implementation significantly (Currier et al., 2012; Elder & Padover, 2011; Stover et al., 2011). No wonder distributed leadership involving various models of peer coaching has been gaining momentum in some school districts in North

America including the Southern Union (Forbes, 2011) as well as in other countries (van Nieuwerburgh, 2012).

Based on propositions by Joyce and Showers (2002), it can be deduced that much of the time, means, and efforts expended on professional development has been wasted, at least in terms of classroom implementation, primarily due to lack of peer coaching with all of its elements. Institutional theorists concur on the notion that many practices remain unchanged simply because they have become established habits and not necessarily because they work. However, some educational administrators recently have been seeing the value of coaching and have been increasingly including training for this innovation in professional development. In commenting on this trend, van Nieuwerburgh (2012) affirms:

The past decade has witnessed a notable increase in coaching-related activities in educational contexts. Head teachers, principals, and university administrators have started to introduce coaching alongside more traditional continuing professional development activities. Coaching in education can take many forms and has an impact on a broad range of potential beneficiaries. This includes staff (such as teachers, school leaders, and university lecturers), students and other stake-holders (such as parents, governors, and members of the community). Training in coaching skills now forms part of the professional development for school leaders in the UK and has been recognized as the new leadership skill for educators in the USA. (p. 4)

Coaching in education (not to be confused with mentoring) can take a variety of formats including traditional coaching with an administrator joining the teacher in the classroom (Rock, Zigmund, Gregg, & Gable, 2011), virtual coaching in which the teacher wears an earpiece and receives supportive feedback remotely (through Skype, for example) while teaching (Rock et al., 2011), and peer coaching in which a group of teachers can interact with each other to teach/learn a concept taking turns as “teacher” and “students” respectively (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Whatever coaching models are adopted, they should be teacher-centered and supportive (J. Knight, 2011). In addition, they should include all the salient elements in order to make a positive difference in teacher implementation of innovations in the classroom (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Use of Curriculum Guides by Elementary Teachers

Items related to use of curriculum guides by elementary teachers featured in seven of the 10 Profile Surveys up to 2007, and in several subject areas. In Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1997, 1999, 2001, and 2004, elementary teachers were asked to select from two options: “I Did Not Use This Resource,” and “I Used This Resource.” Their ratings of the following curriculum guides, namely, Mathematics, Language Arts, Music, Christian Service (later titled *Curriculum in Witnessing & Service*), Exceptional Child, Art, and *A Childs World* (K Curriculum), are presented in Table 7 and Figure 4.

Earlier in this chapter it was concluded that availability of curriculum guides to K-12 teachers is no longer a major issue. However, based on the data in Table 7 and related data from the seven Profile Surveys as displayed in Figure 4, elementary teachers who reported using the resources ranged from 11.4% for *Exceptional Child* to 63.5% for *Language Arts*. As for the kindergarten curriculum, only kindergarten teachers would be expected to use it, and for obvious reasons. The 20.5% “use” rating and corresponding 79.5% “non-use” rating, therefore, seem reasonable. Conversely, elementary teachers who reported not using the selected curriculum guides ranged from 36.5% for *Language Arts* to 88.6% for the *Exceptional Child*.

Table 7

Elementary Teacher Ratings of Use of Curriculum Guides—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Guides	Year	I Did Not Use This Resource	I Used This Resource	N
Math Curriculum Guide	1997	232 (68.0)	108 (31.7)	340
	2004	81 (32.5)	168 (67.5)	249
Language Arts Curriculum Guide (K-12)	1991	150 (41.4)	212 (58.6)	362
	2004	67 (28.8)	166 (71.2)	233
K-12 Music Curriculum Guide	1997	276 (80.7)	65 (19.0)	341
Elementary Music Curriculum	1997	243 (71.0)	99 (28.9)	342
	1999	277 (73.1)	102 (26.9)	379
	2001	252 (58.7)	177 (41.3)	429
Christian Service Curriculum Guide (K-12)	1987	279 (65.0)	150 (35.0)	429
(same content as <i>Curriculum in Witnessing</i>	1989	400 (86.0)	65 (14.0)	465
& <i>Service</i>)	1991	224 (62.7)	133 (37.3)	357
Curriculum in Witnessing & Service	1997	192 (58.2)	138 (41.8)	330
Exceptional Child Guidelines (K-12)	1987	360 (84.0)	69 (16.0)	429
	1989	442 (95.1)	23 (4.9)	465
	1991	281 (85.7)	47 (14.3)	328
Art Works Small Schools	1991	195 (71.2)	79 (28.8)	274
Art Curriculum Guide K-12	2001	210 (47.9)	228 (52.1)	438
Kindergarten Curriculum	1997	289 (84.4)	51 (15.0)	340
	2001	308 (74.9)	103 (25.1)	411
<i>“Did you use curriculum guides when you made overall plans for the school year?”</i>	1997	177 (46.5)	204 (53.5)	381
<i>Usage of curriculum guides [in general]</i>	1997	140 (42.3)	191 (57.7)	331

Note. 1991 use based on percentage of teachers who reported awareness of the resources (some or very much awareness/some or very much use). Also, in response to the question, “*Did you use curriculum guides when you made overall plans for the school year,*” the 177 (46.5%) elementary teachers who responded either opted for “No” or left the space blank.

Figure 4. The cumulative mean showing use of curriculum guides for each subject area by elementary teachers—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (based on Table 7). Highest Ratings for respective years by subject: Math: 67.5 (2004); Language Arts: 71.2 (2004); Music: 41.3 (2001); Christian Service 41.8 (1997); Exceptional Child: 16.0 (1987); Art: 52.1 (2001); K Curriculum: 25.1 (2001). With one exception (*Exceptional Child Curriculum Guide*) ratings showing the highest degrees of use are all for the most recent years, suggesting improvement in the use of curriculum guides by elementary teachers.

Some qualitative teacher responses in Profile 2007 suggested that time is a factor in use or lack of use of curriculum guides. One teacher for instance submitted the following:

Most of the teachers in the Adventist system teach full time. Most of us are over-worked and do not have the time to search websites, books, look at curriculum guides, etc., in order to have a decent classroom. There are so many new things added to the curriculum that we just do not have the time needed to justify doing anything out of the ordinary. I think most teachers would love to be able to develop exciting lesson plans for our students, but this is just not practical since most of us do not have planning periods, or free time to grade papers, or even to review necessary test results. I'm thankful that the Lord takes care of many of our failures. Another curriculum guide will not improve many of us who give everything we have plus. Another curriculum guide is just another frustration for us. We would love to be able to follow the curriculum guidelines if we had the time and energy to read them completely. Do I really have the time to fill out this survey? No not really. I'm having to set aside something else to help you out. (Burton, 2007, p. 122)

This is only one of many comments showing that lack of time interferes with optimal usage of curriculum guides.

Whereas the ratings from elementary teachers who use the selected curriculum guides are relatively low as displayed in Table 7 and Figure 4, it should be noted that only two of the resources in those visuals, namely those for Math and Language Arts, relate to what would be considered “core” subjects. Teachers are likely to use curriculum guides for core subjects more than they would some of the others such as those for Music, with 29.7% aggregated “Use” ratings, and Art, with a corresponding 43.1% (actually less than four percentage points from Math—with the second highest aggregate ratings). Similarly, the *Christian Service Curriculum Guide* and the *Exceptional Child Curriculum Guide* scored aggregated “Use” ratings of 30.7% and 11.4% respectively. On a related note it will be shown in Chapter 6 that Adventist teachers experience concerns with integrating faith and learning, and also in coping with students of varied ability levels in their classrooms. With this in focus, more extensive use of the two

related resources could possibly have helped to alleviate those concerns. Understandably, the curriculum guides for Math and Language Arts received the two highest aggregated “Use” ratings of 49.6% and 64.9% respectively. In addition, the two lead among the selected curriculum guides with the highest respective single “Use” ratings of 67.5% and 71.2% in the selected subject areas for all of the years represented.

Overall, as shown in Figure 4, even the highest statistics related to use of curriculum guides by elementary teachers for individual years leave room for improvement. In addition to the leading scores already discussed for Math and Language Arts, highest “Use” scores from least to greatest are as follows: *Exceptional Child*: 16%; *A Child’s World*: 25.1%; *Music*: 41.3%; *Christian Service*: 41.8%; and *Art*: 52.1%. Also, as shown in Table 7, 53.5% of elementary teachers reported using curriculum guides in planning for the school year, and 57.7% reported using “curriculum guides in general.” In spite of the relatively low “Use” statistics, the data in Table 7 communicate improved use of the resources through the years as in all but one instance (*Exceptional Child*), the highest “Use” rating for each curriculum guide is for the most current year included in the table. In addition, I hypothesize that inclusion of curriculum guides from additional “core” subject areas in Table 7 would have resulted in improved statistics related to use of the resources.

Use of Curriculum Guides by Academy Teachers

Items related to the use of curriculum guides by academy teachers were also included in seven of the 10 Profile Surveys: 1989, 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, and 2004. Comparison of Table 8 and Figure 5 with Table 7 and Figure 4 (academy and elementary) shows that the former include curriculum guides for many more “core”

Table 8

Academy Teacher Ratings of Use of Curriculum Guides—Profiles 1989, 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Guides	Year	I Did Not Use This Resource	I Used This Resource	N
Science Curriculum Guide	1991	100 (66.2)	51 (33.8)	151
9-12 Science Curriculum Guide	1995	119 (83.8)	23 (16.2)	142
New Science 9-12 Curriculum Guide	1999	107 (77.0)	32 (23.0)	139
Science Curriculum Guide	2001	123 (78.3)	34 (21.7)	157
Health Curriculum Guide	1991	105 (73.4)	38 (26.6)	143
	1997	78 (91.8)	7 (8.2)	85
Science/Health Curriculum Guide K-12	2001	86 (62.3)	52 (37.7)	138
Language Arts Curriculum Guide	1991	101 (63.9)	57 (36.1)	158
	1997	70 (83.3)	14 (16.7)	84
	2004	19 (38.0)	31 (62.0)	50
English /Lang Arts 9-12 Curriculum Guide	1999	116 (84.7)	21 (15.3)	137
English /Lang Arts 9-12 Curriculum Guide	2001	93 (66.4)	47 (33.6)	140
English Curriculum Guide	2001	129 (82.2)	28 (17.8)	157
Social Studies Curriculum Guide	1991	109 (72.2)	42 (27.8)	151
Social Studies Curriculum Guide 9-12	1995	116 (84.7)	21 (15.3)	137
	1997	80 (95.2)	4 (4.8)	84
	1999	119 (87.5)	17 (12.5)	136
	2004	25 (49.0)	26 (50.9)	51
Math Curriculum Guide	1991	99 (65.6)	52 (34.4)	151
K-12 Math Curriculum Guide	1997	72 (84.7)	13 (15.3)	85
Math Curriculum Guide	2001	120 (76.4)	37 (23.6)	157
K-12 Math Curriculum Guide	2004	31 (44.9)	38 (55.1)	69
Computer Education Curriculum Guide	1991	110 (78.6)	30 (21.4)	140
Computer Education Curriculum Guide	2001	137 (87.3)	20 (12.7)	157
9-12 Computer Curriculum Guide	1995	123 (90.0)	14 (10.0)	137
Computer K-12 Curriculum Guide	1997	76 (89.4)	9 (10.6)	85
Business Education Curriculum Guide	1997	80 (94.1)	5 (5.9)	87
Business Curriculum Guide	2001	149 (94.9)	8 (5.1)	157
Business & Computer Curriculum Guide	2001	97 (71.3)	39 (28.7)	136

Table 8—*Continued.*

Curriculum Guides	Year	I Did Not Use This Resource	I Used This Resource	<i>N</i>
Physical Education Curriculum Guide	1991	113 (81.3)	26 (18.7)	139
K-12 PE Curriculum Guide	1995	118 (92.2)	10 (7.8)	128
Physical Education Curriculum Guide	1997	81 (95.3)	3 (3.5)	84
	2001	143 (91.1)	14 (8.9)	157
	2004	19 (54.3)	16 (45.7)	35
Music Curriculum Guide	1991	128 (88.9)	16 (11.1)	144
K-12 Music Curriculum Guide	1997	80 (94.1)	5 (5.9)	85
	2001	116 (84.7)	21 (15.3)	137
Modern Language Curriculum Guide	1991	120 (83.3)	24 (16.7)	144
Modern Language Curriculum Guide	2001	144 (91.7)	13 (8.3)	157
	2004	19 (46.3)	22 (53.7)	41
9-12 Second Language Curriculum Guide	1997	82 (96.5)	3 (3.5)	85
	1999	122 (89.7)	14 (10.3)	136
Christian Service Curriculum Guide (K-12)	1989	145 (72.1)	56 (27.9)	201
Curriculum in Witnessing & Service	1997	45 (55.6)	36 (44.4)	81
<i>“Did you use curriculum guides at the time you planned your course outlines?”</i>	1997	52 (40.3)	77 (59.7)	129
Usage of Curriculum Guides	1997	21 (28.4)	53 (71.6)	74
<i>[Did you use] SDA Curriculum Guides in general?</i>	1991	96 (39.5)	147 (60.5)	243
	2001	17 (11.3)	133 (88.1)	151

Note. In response to the question, “Did you use curriculum guides at the time you planned your course outlines,” the 52 (40.3%) academy teachers who responded either opted for “No” or left the space blank. Note as well that *Curriculum in Witnessing and Service* is the same in content as *Christian Service Curriculum Guide*.

Figure 5. The cumulative mean for each subject area showing use of curriculum guides by senior academy teachers—Profiles 1987, 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, & 2004 (based on Table 8).

subjects than do the latter: Math, Language Arts, Health, Science, Social Studies, and Business, in addition to other guides not related to “core” subjects. Ratings based on academy teacher responses have been displayed in Table 8 and Figure 5, and are presented in this section.

A casual glance at Table 8 and Figure 5 is likely to communicate a waste of time and resources in creating curriculum guides for academy teachers, since use substantially trails non-use of those resources. However, such is not necessarily the case as academy teachers specialize far more than do their elementary counterparts and are expected to use the curriculum guides only for the subjects they teach. Based on this premise, aggregated “use” statistics ranging from 11.5% for Music curriculum guides, to 32.6% for the *Christian Service Curriculum Guide* as presented in Figure 5 possibly could be considered normal for academy teachers, notwithstanding the likelihood that similar data

would have been dismal for elementary teachers. On another note, some academy teachers acknowledge their failure to use curriculum guides as the following example illustrates: “I admit that I don't look at curriculum guides. For me, the past two editions for English 9-12 have been too vague. I teach from the 9-10 Bible books, so I figure they were written around the curriculum” (Burton, 2007, p. 125).

In addition to the ratings for the Music and *Christian Service Curriculum* guides already discussed, the cumulative mean for each of other resources is presented in ascending order in Figure 5: Physical Education: 12.7%; Modern Language: 13.5%; Business Education: 13.7; Computer Education: 14.1%; Social Studies: 19.7%; Science: 23.8%; Health: 26.5%; Language Arts: 27.3%; and Math: 30.3%. Despite the fact that only 32.6% of academy teachers reported using *Christian Service Curriculum Guide*, it is encouraging to see this resource leading in terms of use. Its scope in terms of potentially impacting student activity in all subject areas in the curriculum, if used effectively, perhaps surpasses that of any of the other curriculum guides included in Table 8 and Figure 5.

Use of Curriculum Guides in Public Schools

Extensive use of curriculum guides by both private and public school teachers has long been an issue. Some scholars, for instance, support the notion that many teachers use textbooks to replace curriculum guides (Apple, 2008; English, 1987). Perhaps they find it more practical to simply follow the chapters in the textbooks rather than use the curriculum guides to determine what sections of the textbooks should be taught. English wrote in 1987:

It may be heresy to say it but curriculum guides are obsolete. After reading, rating, and ranking hundreds of such guides in seven states since 1979 as part of curriculum audits, I find that most of them are neither used, usable, nor reliable indicators of what teachers really do in their classrooms when the doors are shut.

I've conducted several random and anonymous surveys in which teachers have told me that they use two things to make day-to-day content decisions about curriculum: their own ideas and the textbook. (p. 50)

English (1987) went on to suggest several reasons why aligning curriculum guides with the standardized tests would be a more workable option. However, this approach would be unlikely to work, at least not in its totality, for a parochial school system with its own unique philosophy of education. More current research in the public school arena shows that the picture has not changed (Apple, 2008). Results from the Profile Surveys also indicate that Adventist teachers favor teachers' editions far more than they do curriculum guides (see Table 5, Profile 1987). Such information suggests that textbook publishers sometimes inadvertently assume the role of curriculum developer in spite of their beliefs, agendas, and values.

Professional Development Impacts Ratings

While some Profile respondents might not have used specific curriculum guides for various reasons, additional data also suggest that professional development or lack of it reflects on use and perceived helpfulness of curriculum guides by teachers. Whatever causative factors undergird this lack in the use of curriculum resources created at great cost and effort need to be studied and addressed.

In some of the Profile 1995 survey items the researchers sought to correlate the impact of professional development with teacher ratings and use of selected curriculum resources. While the related items were included only in the 1995 survey and targeted only academy teachers, the results are telling in terms of the need for adequate coaching.

In addition, while the sample involved is relatively small, the results are generalizable to the population in focus due to random sampling.

In Profile 1995, senior academy teachers were asked to rate five curriculum guides, simultaneously indicating whether or not they were well “inserviced”—the term used at the time, later replaced with “professional development.” No definition of effective PD has been included in the Profile Surveys. In light of this, teacher ratings as to whether or not they were well inserviced are highly subjective. The ratings were to reflect degrees of use and helpfulness of the resources for the following subject areas: Physical Education, Social Studies, Computers, Science, and Substance Abuse. The results in Table 9 indicate that among teachers who considered themselves adequately inserviced, 62% ($N = 13$) reported using the curriculum guides as opposed to 38% ($N = 8$) who reported little or no use. Conversely, among teachers who perceived themselves as inadequately inserviced, 17% ($N = 9$) reported using the guides as opposed to 83% ($N = 44$) who reported little or no use. For greater visual impact, a dot graph of the same data has been presented in Figure 6. The data show that teachers who perceived themselves as being adequately inserviced used the curriculum guides far more extensively than those who considered themselves inadequately inserviced.

A similar pattern emerged when the senior academy teachers rated the same curriculum guides on degrees of helpfulness (see Table 10 and Figure 7). Of the 21 respondents who perceived themselves as adequately inserviced, 19 (90%) rated the resources as “Helpful” compared with two (10%) in the same category who reported that they were “Little /No Help.” Conversely, of the 45 respondents who perceived themselves as inadequately inserviced, 21 (47%) rated the curriculum guides as “Helpful”

Table 9

Use of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately or Inadequately Inserved: Profile 1995 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Guides	Adequately Inserved		Inadequately Inserved	
	Users of the Guide	Little/No Use of the Guide	Users of the Guide	Little/No Use of the Guide
Physical Education	4	2	3	1
Social Studies	4	3	1	15
Computer	2	1	1	10
Science	3	1	4	15
Substance Abuse	0	1	0	3
TOTAL	13 (62)	8 (38)	9 (17)	44 (83)

Note. Data in this table are from *Profile '95: Present Realities . . . Future Perspectives* (p. 18), by P. S. Brantley, 1996, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Reprinted with permission.

Figure 6. Use of curriculum guides by senior academy teachers who perceived themselves as adequately or inadequately inserved—Profile 1995 (based on Table 9).

Table 10

Helpfulness of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately or Inadequately Inserved: Profile 1995 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Guides	Adequately Inserved		Inadequately Inserved	
	Guides Were Helpful	Guides Were Little/No Help	Guides Were Helpful	Guides Were Little/No Help
Physical Education	6	0	2	1
Social Studies	6	1	5	8
Computer	3	0	3	5
Science	4	0	9	9
Substance Abuse	0	1	2	1
TOTAL	19 (90)	2 (10)	21 (47)	24 (53)

Note. Data in this table are from *Profile '95: Present Realities . . . Future Perspectives* (p. 18), by P. S. Brantley, 1996, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Reprinted with permission.

Figure 7. Perceived helpfulness of curriculum guides by senior academy teachers who perceived themselves as adequately or inadequately inserved—Profile 1995 (based on Table 10).

as opposed to 24 (53%) who reported that they were “Little /No Help” (Brantley, 1996). Figure 7 communicates the same information for stronger visual impact.

The foregoing results indicate that teachers who perceived themselves as being “well inserviced” in using the curriculum guides rated them more favorably and used them more extensively than those who reported that they were not properly oriented in their use. This reinforces the need to have effective strategies in place for orienting teachers in the use of new curriculum resources. In a related publication, Burton, Gittens-St. Juste, and Davidson (2007) also confirm a positive correlation between teachers’ use of Adventist curriculum guides and their ratings of those materials.

While the following example is not necessarily a “definition” for adequate “inservicing,” it provides a perspective of the same from a team of experts. Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, and Shapley (2007), who analyzed over 1,300 research endeavors focusing on professional development, labeled the nine studies in which teachers engaged in related PD activities for an average of 49 hours, “substantial professional development” (p. iii), and concluded that the results from such activity boosted student outcomes by about 21 percentile points. The same authors further propose that the following elements characterize “high quality” PD: “Although calls for high quality professional development are perennial, there remains a shortage of such programs—characterized by coherence, active learning, sufficient duration, collective participation, a focus on content knowledge, and a reform rather than traditional approach” (p. 1). In addition, as was discussed earlier in this chapter, Joyce and Showers (2002) emphasized the need for sufficient time for extensive practice during peer coaching in order to promote implementation.

Further, a study conducted by Masuda, Ebersole, and Barrett (2012) highlighted some of the elements of effective PD from the perspectives of teachers at various stages of their careers. The study involved 16 teachers, some relatively new, others in the middle of their careers, and still others at later stages. While they all indicated interest in PD, those interests varied depending on their career stages. Inexperienced teachers were interested in everything as long as topics were relevant to their current classroom contexts and easy to apply in day-to-day teaching. They also valued peer networking as a PD activity. Mid-career teachers tended to favor time with their colleagues and also content-specific activities that they could easily apply in regular pedagogy. Finally, late career teachers valued most, connection with their colleagues and idea-laden electronic resources. In addition, late career teachers favored voluntary inservice activities from which they could choose those most relevant to their needs, “as opposed to attending mandatory PD sessions that were sometimes irrelevant and being ‘shoved down their throats’” (p. 5).

The following excerpt further highlights some teacher concerns with regard to professional development:

These teachers' views toward contemporary PD were nuanced with concerns about accountability issues and standards-based reform; for example, the type and topic of PD were often imposed upon teachers. For teachers at schools under restructuring mandates or reform models, school-level PD dealt with data analysis and data-driven decision making, specific research-based instruction from external providers, and the use of technology. Although teachers complied with attending and participating in their school's PD, they often found these sessions overwhelming and perceived the information as being disconnected from their everyday teaching. They implied that too much was already being asked of them, there was "not enough time" to do everything, and yet they were being asked to do more. (Masuda et al., 2012, p. 7)

It is worthy of note at this juncture to realize the interplay of organizational fields involved in those areas of concern. While private schools may be governed by their own

unique philosophies to some degree, they are subject to the same “nuances” since they too are accountable to various external organizations and their students often write the same standardized tests, are subject to the same core standards, and use many of the same services as those from the public sector. Educational researchers, even those studying private schools, need to take a closer look at the many external variables possibly impacting classroom practice.

Quality of Curriculum Guides

This section includes four subsets of data tabulated separately due to differing quality-related objectives in the survey items, and also due to differences in patterns of use between elementary and academy teachers. Table 11 and Figure 8 showcase elementary teachers’ quality ratings of curriculum guides in four of the Profile Surveys: 1991, 1997, 1999, and 2001. Similarly, Table 12 and Figure 9, based on data from Profiles 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2001, reflect quality ratings by academy teachers. In both instances, teachers were asked to select their responses from the following options: “Excellent,” “Minor Problems,” and “Major Problems.”

The third subset of data as shown in Table 13 and Figure 10 represents quality-related statistics from Profiles 2004 and 2007 only and displays K-12 teacher responses to the question: “*To what extent do NAD curriculum materials reflect Spiritual, Cognitive, Physical, and Social goals for students?*” Teachers were asked to select their responses from the following options: “Easy to Use”; “Essential for SDA Education”; “Helps Me Do a Better Job”; “Represents Best Practices”; and “Supports SDA Philosophy of Education.” In Figure 10, the graphed data reflect arithmetic means based on three of the data columns in Table 13: “Easy to Use,” “Represents Best Practices,” and

“Supports the SDA Philosophy of Education,” since those were included in more than one survey.

Finally, the last two graphics in the “Quality” section with respect to curriculum guides, Table 14 and its derivative Figure 11, display data based on K-12 teacher responses to the question: *“To what extent do NAD curriculum materials reflect Spiritual, Cognitive, Physical, and Social goals for students?”* In responding to this question teachers were given the following options: “Not Helpful at All,” “Somewhat Helpful,” and “Quite Helpful.”

The data from Table 11 and Figure 8 indicate that overall satisfaction with the selected curriculum guides presented, and also with Adventist curriculum guides in general, borders more on the positive than on the negative among elementary teachers. Those who rated the selected curriculum guides as having “Major Problems” ranged from 3.7% for Language Arts curriculum guides, to 16.5% for Music curriculum guides, thereby communicating that between 83.5% and 96.3% of teachers considered the resources as “Excellent,” or having “Minor Problems.” Conversely, those who rated them as “Excellent” ranged from 29.0% for Art curriculum guides to 58.1% for the Language Arts curriculum guides.

The curriculum guide ratings by academy teachers also conveyed similar overall information: “Major Problems” were in the minority when compared with “Excellent” and “Minor Problems” ratings (see Table 12 and Figure 9). The academy teachers who rated the selected curriculum guides as having “Major Problems” ranged from 2.0% for Science to 22.0% for Business and Computer curriculum. Comparatively, academy teachers who perceived Adventist curriculum guides as “Excellent” or having “Minor

Table 11

Elementary Teacher Ratings of the Quality of Curriculum Guides—Profiles 1991, 1997, 1999, & 2001 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Resources	Year	Excellent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>
Language Arts Curriculum Guide	1991	122 (62.9)	70 (36.1)	2 (1.0)	194
Small Schools English	1997	36 (46.2)	32 (41.0)	8 (10.3)	78
K-12 Music Curriculum Guide	1997	26 (41.3)	25 (39.7)	11 (17.5)	63
SDA elementary Music Program	1997	34 (39.5)	37 (43.0)	14 (16.3)	86
SDA elementary Music Program	2001	35 (20.6)	108 (63.5)	27 (15.9)	170
Elementary Music Curriculum Guide for SDA Schools	1999	39 (39.0)	44 (44.0)	17 (17.0)	100
Art Works Small Schools	1991	68 (67.3)	28 (27.7)	5 (5.0)	101
Art K-12 Curriculum Guide	2001	25 (11.4)	164 (74.5)	31 (14.1)	220
<i>A Child's World</i> (K Curriculum)	1997	34 (64.2)	15 (28.3)	2 (3.8)	53
<i>A child's World</i> (K Curriculum)	2001	43 (44.8)	45 (46.9)	10 (10.4)	98
<i>Curriculum Guides (in general)</i>	1999	97 (45.1)	107 (49.8)	17 (7.9)	215
<i>SDA Curriculum Guides (in general)</i>	2001	92 (22.8)	301 (74.5)	11 (2.7)	404

Figure 8. Cumulative mean of elementary teachers' quality ratings of curriculum guides for each subject represented—Profiles 1991, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (based on Table 11).

Table 12

Academy Teacher Ratings of the Quality of Curriculum Guides—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Resources	Year	Excellent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>
Science Curriculum Guide 9-12	1997	6 (55.0)	4 (36.0)	1 (9.0)	11
Science Curriculum Guide 9-12	1999	8 (27.6)	20 (69.0)	1 (3.4)	29
Health Curriculum Guide 9-12	1997	4 (44.0)	5 (56.0)	0	9
K-12 Science/Health Curriculum Guide	2001	19 (36.5)	33 (63.5)	0	52
Social Studies Curriculum Guide 9-12	1995	11 (55.0)	0	9 (45.0)	20
Social Studies Curriculum Guide K-12	1997	4 (44.0)	5 (56.0)	0	9
	1999	9 (50.0)	8 (44.4)	1 (5.6)	18
Computer Curriculum Guide 9-12	1995	6 (54.5)	0	5 (45.5)	11
Business Education 9-12 Curriculum Guide	1997	5 (55.6)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	9
Business & Computer Curriculum Guide	2001	12 (30.8)	22 (56.4)	5 (12.8)	39
English 9-12 Curriculum Guide	1997	12 (70.6)	4 (23.5)	1 (5.9)	17
English/Lang Arts 9-12 Curriculum Guide	1999	9 (42.9)	9 (42.9)	3 (14.3)	21
English/Language Arts 9-12 Curriculum Guide	2001	14 (29.8)	28 (59.6)	5 (10.6)	47

Table 12—*Continued.*

Curriculum Resources	Year	Excellent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>
Second Language Curriculum Guide 9-12	1997	2 (28.6)	4 (57.1)	1 (14.3)	7
Second Language Curriculum Guide 9-12	1999	8 (66.7)	4 (33.3)	0	12
K-12 Music Curriculum Guide	1997	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	6
K-12 Music Curriculum Guide	2001	4 (19.0)	17 (81.0)	0	21
Music Curriculum Guide 9-12	1997	3 (33.3)	5 (56.0)	1 (11.0)	9
Adventist Curriculum Guides (in general)	2001	29 (23.2)	88 (70.4)	8 (6.4)	125
Perception of Adventist Education/Curriculum	2004	43 (36.8)	65 (55.6)	9 (7.7)	117

Note. In Profile 1997, 72% of teachers who taught the respective subjects reported using the related curriculum guides. For that year the *Ns* represent the number of users of the Guides.

Figure 9. Cumulative mean of academy teachers' quality ratings of selected curriculum guides—Profiles 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (based on Table 12). The last two sections, namely, "SDA Curriculum Guides in General" and "Perceptions of SDA Education/Curriculum" have not been aggregated. For the former, data are available for 2001 only, whereas for the latter, data are available for 2004 only. They have been included here for comparison.

Table 13

NAD Curriculum Guides: K-12 Teacher Ratings of Quality in Selected Subjects—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages)

Curriculum Resources	Year	Easy to Use	Essential for SDA Education	Helps Me Do a Better Job	Represents Best Practices	Supports SDA Philosophy of Education	<i>N</i>
K-12 Math Curriculum Guide	2004	93 (32.4)	--	--	71 (25.2)	133 (47.5)	282
	2007	168 (46.7)	134 (37.2)	113 (31.4)	118 (32.8)	196 (54.5)	360
K-12 PE Curriculum Guide	2004	80 (35.6)	--	--	61 (27.1)	104 (46.2)	225
	2007	102 (44.7)	75 (32.9)	70 (30.7)	76 (33.3)	121 (43.0)	228
Language Arts Curriculum Guide K-8 Reading Curriculum Guide	2004	107 (35.4)	--	--	79 (20.8)	143 (57.2)	268
	2007	166 (46.9)	156 (44.1)	151 (42.7)	150 (42.4)	208 (58.8)	354
K-8 Social Studies Curriculum Guide	2004	16 (51.6)	--	--	15 (48.4)	--	31
	2007	158 (53.2)	132 (44.4)	131(44.1)	137 (46.1)	184 (62.0)	297

Note. Dash indicates that data were not available.

Figure 10. Averages of K-12 teacher ratings of quality of selected curriculum guides—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (based on Table 13). “SDA Philosophy” statistic for *Social Studies Curriculum Guide* not averaged: available for 2007 only.

Table 14

Curriculum Goals: K-12 Teacher Ratings of the Extent to Which NAD Curriculum Materials Reflect Spiritual, Cognitive, Physical, and Social Goals for Students—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages)

Goals	Year	Not Helpful at All	Somewhat Helpful	Quite Helpful	N
Spiritual Goals	2004	13 (2.9)	107 (23.8)	329 (73.3)	449
	2007	17 (3.0)	192 (33.4)	365 (63.5)	574
Cognitive Goals	2004	13 (2.9)	65 (14.6)	368 (82.6)	446
	2007	16 (2.8)	218 (38.1)	338 (59.1)	572
Physical Goals	2004	35 (8.0)	161 (36.7)	243 (55.4)	439
	2007	26 (4.6)	291 (51.6)	247 (43.8)	564
Social Goals	2004	29 (6.5)	202 (45.4)	214 (48.1)	445
	2007	24 (4.3)	293 (52.1)	245 (43.6)	562

Note. From *Profile 2007: Final Report* (pp. 68, 69), by L. D. Burton (Ed.), 2009, December. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews International Center for Educational Research. Adapted with permission.

Figure 11. Averages of K-12 teacher ratings of the extent to which NAD curriculum materials reflect spiritual, cognitive, physical, and social goals for students—Profiles 2004 & 2007 (based on Table 14).

Problems” ranged from 78.0% to 98.0%. “Excellent” ratings for academy teachers ranged from 23.2% for Adventist curriculum guides in general, to 52.6% for the Second Language Curriculum Guide. Moreover, more than 70% of academy teachers perceived Adventist curriculum guides in general as having “Minor Problems.” On a more positive note, 6.4% of academy teachers rated Adventist curriculum guides in general as having “Major Problems.” Finally, 36.8% of those teachers rated “Adventist education / curriculum” as “Excellent”; 55.6% opted for “Minor Problems” while 7.7% opted for “Major Problems.”

In order to highlight a relatively minor, but important issue that warrants attention in future surveys, ratings for the Social Studies Curriculum Guide for 1995, 1997, and 1999 as presented in Table 12 have been singled out here for scrutiny. The resource was rated for quality in the surveys for those years and enjoyed relatively high “Excellent” ratings. Of the 20 academy teachers who rated the item in Profile 1995, 11 (55.0%) opted for “Excellent,” while the other nine (45.0%) selected “Major Problems.” Comparatively, in Profile 1997, four (44.0%) of the nine teachers rated it as “Excellent,” five (56.0%) as having “Minor Problems,” and none (0%) as having “Major Problems.” Further, in Profile 1999, nine (50.0%) of the 18 respondents rated the resource as “Excellent,” eight (44.4%) as having “Minor Problems,” and one (5.6%) as having “Major Problems.”

In comparing the 1995 statistics to those of 1997 and 1999, how might the seeming discrepancy in ratings from “Major Problems” to “Minor Problems” be explained? It must be reiterated here that for purposes of this study, items with identical or similar responses were combined in order to establish patterns in the data. In Profile 1995, for instance, teachers were given only two options for this item: “[The resource

was] Quite Helpful”; OR “Little/No Help.” For this study, “Quite Helpful” was combined with “Excellent,” and “Little/No Help” with “Major Problems.” With no middle option such as “*Mostly Helpful*,” teachers were left to choose from the two extremes of the continuum. Had a “middle” option been provided in Profile 1995, it is possible, based on the ratings from Profiles 1997 and 1999, that the majority of teachers who opted for “Little/No Help” would have selected a more positive alternative. While “two options only” has been the exception, and not the rule in the Profile Surveys, it might be profitable in the future to ensure that all items afford respondents choices representing more than just the extreme points on any continuum.

Next, Table 13 and Figure 10 provide glimpses of data related to both the elementary and the academy grades. As previously stated, the related data span the last two Profile Surveys: 2004 and 2007, and include quality ratings for four subject areas. Teachers were asked to rate curriculum guides using the following options: “Easy to Use”; “Essential for SDA Education”; “Helps Me Do a Better Job”; “Represents Best Practices”; “Supports SDA Philosophy of Education.”

A perusal of the average ratings of the curriculum guides for each of the four subject areas shows that for all three options, teachers rated the Social Studies Curriculum Guide more favorably than any of the others. With “Easy to Use” average ratings of 53.0% for the two surveys, the Social Studies Curriculum Guide outshone the 43.9% Language Arts mean, the next highest, by 9.1 percentage points. “Easy to Use” ratings of 40.7% for the K-12 Math Curriculum Guide and corresponding 40.2% ratings for the K-12 PE Curriculum Guide closely mimicked the Language Arts ratings. Similarly, 46.3% of teachers perceived the Social Studies Curriculum Guide as

“Represent[ing] Best Practices,” compared with 36.8% for Language Arts, the next highest, showing a lead of 9.5 percentage points. With average ratings of 29.4% and 30.2% respectively, the Math and PE curriculum guides trailed the Language Arts ratings by about 7 percentage points.

Ratings for the Social Studies Curriculum Guide again surpassed the 56.4% for Language Arts, the next highest, with 62% of teachers perceiving the resource as “Support[ing] the SDA Philosophy of Education.” The Math Curriculum Guide rating of 51.2% was followed closely by the PE Curriculum Guide ratings, with 49.7% of teachers reporting that it “Supports the SDA Philosophy of Education.” While the Social Studies Curriculum Guide leads in the subject ratings, teachers support most strongly the notion that among the available options, the selected curriculum guides most strongly “Support the SDA Philosophy of Education.” It takes no more than a casual glance at Figure 10 to conclude that this is true for all four curriculum guides. Similarly, “Represents Best Practices” earned third place for all the curriculum guides, and “Easy to Use” placed second among the three options.

Since philosophy is foundational to all that is done in any institution, it is encouraging to see this area leading in the ratings. In addition, it might be interesting to study the factors undergirding the relatively high ratings for the Social Studies Curriculum Guide so that, as far as practical, the positive aspects can be replicated in future curriculum guide revisions for other subjects as well. Further, overall ratings generate unanswered questions: What factors might have impacted the responses of the many teachers who did not rate the curriculum guides favorably? This issue will be further addressed in the “Advantages and Disadvantages” subsection.

Finally, Figure 11 derived from Table 14 showcases visual comparisons of teacher ratings of the four goals as reflected in the NAD curriculum materials. Whereas Table 14 displays exact percentages, Figure 11 shows related arithmetic means based on Profile 2004 and 2007 data. Perusal of Table 14 shows that for all four goals, Profile 2004 “Quite Helpful” ratings outshone those of Profile 2007 in terms of teacher satisfaction with NAD curriculum materials. In Profile 2004, 73.3% of the 449 K-12 teacher respondents perceived the materials as meeting the Spiritual Goals set for students quite well. By contrast, in Profile 2007, 63.5% of the 574 teachers who responded to the related item rated the materials as “Quite Helpful,” a 9.8% decline. The ratings for “Cognitive Goals” suffered an even greater decline. In Profile 2004, 82.6% of the 446 teachers who rated the materials opted for “Quite Helpful” in terms of reflecting “Cognitive Goals” for students. This was the highest of all the ratings for the two surveys. However, in Profile 2007, only 59.1% of the 572 teacher respondents rated the materials as “Quite Helpful,” a decline of 23.5 percentage points. Ratings for Physical Goals also fell by 11.6% and for Social Goals by 4.5%.

In general, survey results from K-12 teachers through the years indicate that curriculum development can positively impact teacher ratings of curriculum resources (Brantley, 1987, 1990, 1991; 1996; Brantley & Burton, 1993). One possible explanation for the lower ratings in Profile 2007 simply could be that some of the materials were older by then, and teachers had more time to discover flaws in them than they had by 2004. Also, it is noteworthy that several new curriculum guides in various subject areas were adopted between 2004 and 2007 (see Appendix C), so that ratings for the two related Profile Surveys were not necessarily all based on the same resources. Another

possibility simply could be the need for regularly updating curriculum resources to reflect innovative trends. Whatever the reasons, the statistics are revealing, and the issues resulting in teacher dissatisfaction need to be promptly studied and addressed.

The data in Figure 11 also show that a majority of teachers perceive the NAD curriculum materials as quite effectively meeting especially the cognitive and spiritual goals set for students. An average of 69.4% of teachers opted for “Quite Helpful” for Cognitive Goals versus a corresponding 67.8% for Spiritual Goals. Physical and Social Goals trailed the two others by several percentage points, with an average of 48.9% of teachers rating the materials as “Quite Helpful” in terms of meeting Physical Goals, and 45.6% in terms of meeting Social Goals. Survey results indicate that from the eyes of teachers, the key stakeholders, NAD curriculum materials at large need improvement in order to enhance the likelihood that students will obtain a holistic education. However, curricula for the physical and social arenas are the areas of greatest need.

Some additional examples of teacher perspectives on improving curriculum guides based on Profile 2007 qualitative comments include the following: create curriculum guides suitable for multigrade; provide suggestions for integrating faith with learning, including strategies for integrating faith in the provincial curricula used in Canada; “make them standards-based and specific” (p. 124); make them available online. Finally, a kindergarten teacher wrote the following:

The kindergarten program, *A Childs World*, is getting old. I think it needs some changes in the December unit "Christmas in other Lands." I think it needs to be more Christ centered. The last unit about animals needs to have another emphasis, not circus. Also some of the resources suggested are out of date. (Burton, 2007, p. 123)

Innovations Seldom Adopted in Classroom Practice

With reference to updating curriculum guides to reflect innovative trends, research findings indicate that teachers seldom adopt such innovations in actual classroom practice and those who do tend to do so only superficially (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Fullan, 2008; Oakes et al., 1999). In order to be effective, innovations are best carried out as part of systemic reform, and change should be carefully planned and gradual (Spillane, 2004). In other words, administrators should not demand too much from schools in too little time (Fullan, 2008). Research further supports that with Comprehensive School Reform (CSR), which is carried out at the local school level and not throughout the other layers of the system, only a relative few of those endeavors yielded positive results in terms of student achievement. The following examples illustrate:

Herman, et al. (1999) reviewed over 130 studies of achievement effects of 24 schoolwide reforms and found only three models with evidence of raising student achievement levels: Direct Instruction, High Schools that Work, and Success for All. The meta-analysis of Borman et al. (2003) includes 232 studies of 29 models. They found only three models that had statistically significant evidence of positive impact on student achievement: Direct Instruction, the Comer School Development Program, and Success for All. Even for models where school performance improved, they work only in some situations and they do not have a track record of sustainability when successfully implemented. (Fullan, 2008, p. 118)

As shown in the foregoing discussion, improvements in student outcomes are not sustained over time even when innovations are implemented as expected. This helps to explain why state and national governments have to keep making major efforts at reform every several years (Fullan, 2008).

In addition to other factors, inadequate PD is partly responsible for lack of implementation of innovations. Human beings including teachers are creatures of habit,

and without effective PD demonstrating clear expectations and given sufficient time and practice, teachers are not likely to make major changes at the core of their pedagogy (Fullan, 2008; Fullan, Hill, & Crevola, 2006; Joyce & Showers, 2002). Moreover, Stigler and Heibert (1999) affirm that isolated innovations outside of systemic reform can sometimes result in further fragmentation of pedagogy if adopted, and due to lack of clarity in terms of process, can result in practices less desirable than what obtained prior to implementation. A teacher, for example, might attempt cooperative learning in a manner that permits some students to be spectators while others are producers.

Curriculum Guides: Preferred Formats

Survey results through the years have shown that one of the reasons teachers underuse curriculum guides is for want of user-friendly formats. Through various means including the Profile Survey results, the NADOE has been listening to teachers and making efforts to respond to their needs, but curriculum development is a recursive effort with no end in sight. Determining the best formats for curriculum guides in part can be deduced from teachers' perceptions of how they are, or should be used. Based on Profile Survey results, increasing numbers of teachers have been using curriculum guides mainly as reference tools for long-term planning (Brantley 1991, 1996; Brantley & Burton, 1993). However, significant numbers have not been using them at all (Brantley, 1997; Brantley & Burton, 1993).

While relatively few teachers are very satisfied with the curriculum guides and have no suggestions for change (Brantley, 1997; Brantley & Burton, 1993; Burton, 2009), the majority of those who use the resources have been contributing suggestions such as the following for changing their format:

Somehow make them easier to use for the multi-grade setting. Maybe put them online in a searchable format so that [teachers] could search [for] all the objectives about a given skill, topic, or concept. This would make creating integrated units easier. (Burton, 2007, p. 119)

Yet another teacher makes the following suggestion:

I think they could be made into a format that would be easier to understand, and maybe even have blank room on each page for teachers to be able to make notes to themselves on how and when they will personally incorporate each section into their curriculum—in essence make them more of a workbook or textbook look. (Burton, 2007, p. 124)

The following information, based on several of the Profile Surveys, shows some desired, format-related characteristics from the perspectives of K-12 teachers: Curriculum guides should be (a) concise, accessible, and easy to read; (b) arranged in checklist format; (c) available on CD or DVD, (d) accessible online, and (e) formatted as easy-to-use pamphlets (Profiles 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2004, 2007).

Many consider curriculum guides too cumbersome and want them condensed to cover key points in easy-to-read formats. With this in view, some have suggested abridging them into “pamphlets” or “checklists.” Others, in keeping with the opportunities that modern technology offers, have suggested placing the information on CDs or DVD, and making them available online: “[Have] the curriculum guides in a format that teachers can have at their fingertips to use more frequently such as a CD” (Burton, 2007, p. 124).

As far back as 1987 in referring to public school curriculum guides English (1987) wrote: “Curriculum Development must be scaled down. The process must become shorter and more compact. The product must become smaller and more usable” (p. 51). Fortunately, “in recent years, revised editions have been made shorter and more teacher-

friendly” in response to teacher appeals (Brantley & Hwangbo, 2000, p. 8). However, curriculum revision is cyclical, and the work of curriculum developers never ends.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Curriculum Guides

What are some advantages and disadvantages of curriculum guides? In Profile 1999, 156 academy teachers were asked whether or not they thought the NAD should make curriculum guides available to teachers. Ninety percent of them responded in the affirmative, while 10% opted for “No.” Interestingly, although 40% of academy teachers reported not using curriculum guides in the 1997 survey, 90% of them in the 1999 survey thought it necessary for the Adventist educational system to make curriculum guides available to teachers.

Various factors might have influenced teacher responses in terms of the need for making curriculum guides available. Many advantages and disadvantages of curriculum guides as reported by teachers in several of the Profile Surveys are listed below.

Stakeholders who thought teachers should have curriculum guides probably considered the many advantages. Based on Profile Survey ratings, curriculum guides are reliable reference tools for planning instruction. Since the resources outline the requirements for each grade, teachers can know their parameters and plan instruction accordingly. The reference tools include not only the topics to be taught, but also the scope of coverage, standards for meeting objectives, and the sequencing of concepts.

From the perspectives of K-12 teachers, the advantages of curriculum guides include the following:

1. They serve as reliable reference tools for teachers.

2. They help keep teachers abreast with requirements for the classes they teach.
3. They serve as guides on content, scope, sequence, and methods for planning and instruction.
4. They help prevent overlap.
5. They include standards for objectives.
6. They provide some degree of uniformity to student learning experiences throughout the school system.
7. They offer direction to new teachers and help keep the experienced current (Profiles 1991, 1997, 1999, 2004, & 2007).

Conversely, from the perspectives of K-12 teachers, disadvantages of curriculum guides include the following:

1. They are “too lengthy, overwhelming, and outdated.”
2. They are not sufficiently flexible to encourage teacher creativity.
3. They do not sufficiently integrate various subjects and concepts.
4. Teachers are not sufficiently involved in curriculum guide revisions.
5. They should be available in formats that leads to less preparation time.
6. They are not used by many teachers.
7. They are not too practical for Canadian teachers, as those teachers are mandated to use the Provincial curricula.
8. They are not too practical for small schools as teachers must simultaneously plan for multiple grade levels (Profiles 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2004, & 2007).

While each class generally includes students with varied learning abilities who are likely to acquire skills at different rates, using curriculum guides to plan instruction can

help forestall overlap to some degree. In addition, they enhance uniformity in system-wide student learning experiences. Furthermore, new teachers are likely to experience increased confidence with curriculum guides to lend direction for planning than to venture on that path unaided. Conversely, teachers who have been in the system for longer can use the resources to keep abreast with innovations in education.

Several contrasting factors possibly influenced the responses of the 10% of academy teachers who thought teachers should not have curriculum guides. Perhaps they taught from the textbooks and neglected the curriculum guides. Perhaps they lacked adequate orientation in the use of the materials, resulting in less positive ratings; or possibly they were included with the many teachers who thought the guides were not user-friendly. In Table 13 based on Profiles 2004 and 2007, for instance, a majority of teachers in most instances thought that the curriculum guides were not easy to use. The Social Studies Curriculum Guide was the only exception, with more than 50% of respondents indicating ease of use in each of those two surveys. Finally, respondents who thought teachers should not have curriculum guides might have been influenced by some of the disadvantages listed above.

In suggesting that curriculum guides (in the public school arena) should be “abolished,” English (1987) offered five reasons:

1. Most guides are not user-friendly.
2. Most guides are not quality documents.
3. Most guides are based on a partially true premise [that teachers are more likely to use curriculum guides they create—but those very teachers use textbooks as “surrogates”].
4. Most guides are too costly and take too much time to create.
5. Most guides are based on the myth of local control [when local teachers are required to write curricula]. (pp. 50-51)

Individuals who are acquainted with curriculum development in the K-12 Adventist school system in the NAD will forthwith realize that some of English's reasons do not relate.

In most of the 10 Profile Surveys until 2007, K-12 teachers have reported multiple disadvantages of curriculum guides: "In the upper grades, I feel that some of the essentials of learning are too prescriptive and need to be generalized more. The focus needs to be on how to learn not what" (Burton, 2007, p. 120). Another teacher reported that curriculum guides are too rigid:

They [curriculum guides] are too prescriptive and often do not come close to representing "best practices." They also often assume that a check list or a set of expectations can overcome lack of teacher-preparation or specific knowledge. This is nuts. The social and intellectual qualities of the person who manages the environment really matter. They matter much more than curriculum guidelines. I manage relationships and environment first; curriculum second. No guide can make up for what is not in my head. They can help in extremes, but too often become a "punch list" that fits no one and nothing. (Burton, 2007, p. 121)

Conversely, yet another would prefer more specific approaches to curriculum guide content:

Under each curriculum guide there are numerous skills that are expected of the student. It would be terrific if the curriculum guide would target the top ten specific goals for the curriculum that are seen as most important and then place the rest of the goals in order of importance. (Burton, 2007, p. 121)

A much-repeated comment spanning many of the Profile Surveys is that the guides are too long, cumbersome, and outdated, demanding much preparation time on the part of the busy teachers who use them. Further, integration of subjects and concepts across the curriculum is another drawback. Some groups, moreover, do not find the curriculum guides practical as evidenced in the following teacher comment: "Curriculum guides are all USA based. It is time to recognize the needs for Canadian content and stop

creating documents ‘one fits all.’” “Canadian curriculum requirements are very different from one province to another” (Burton, 2007, p. 123). In addition, multi-grade teachers, who simultaneously need to plan instruction for more than one grade level, often find the curriculum guides impractical. Finally, some teachers report not having sufficient involvement in curriculum revisions (Brantley, 1997; Brantley & Burton, 1994).

Following is one of several such comments:

Usually those who make curriculum decisions have been out of the classroom for years. They issue the directive but they are not on the cutting edge. They can come up with “pie-in-the-sky” ideas yet they do not have to deal with the day-to-day problems of implementation!!! (Brantley & Burton, 1994, p. 1)

Some suggested that curriculum committees should include both curriculum experts and current classroom teachers, while in fact the committees are composed of classroom teachers and led by administrators. Brantley (1990) affirmed that based on Profile 1989 results, “nearly half of secondary teachers had served on curriculum development or textbook committees” (p. 5).

As stated earlier in this chapter, the NADOE is sensitive to the needs of classroom teachers, and in many instances, the needs have been, and continue to be, addressed. Feedback from previous Profile Surveys has been used on an on-going basis to impact curricular revisions in attempts to resolve the problems. Some specific actions have included providing shorter, more user-friendly curriculum guides in many subject areas; creating the “Integrated Units” to enhance teaching across the curriculum; designing some materials especially with multigrade teachers in mind; and conducting the Profile Surveys in an effort to learn and respond to teacher concerns. Again, as stated earlier, curriculum development is cyclical, and the challenges are on-going with no end in sight.

With such variety in teacher perspectives, curriculum developers are challenged to find a balanced approach that can work for everyone.

Relationship to Institutional Factors: Curriculum Guides

“In the highest sense the work of education and the work of redemption are one” (White, 1903, p. 30). In the Adventist school system, education is certainly imbued with values beyond the technical aspects, which means that it is highly institutionalized (Selznick, 1957). Curricula in Adventist schools are generally developed in response to perceived needs, whether cognitive, spiritual, social, or physical. It follows therefore that teacher responses to survey items related to curriculum guides will reflect some degree of satisfaction with the way certain needs are being addressed, while communicating the desire for curriculum developers to respond more effectively to unmet or inadequately addressed needs. In the K-12 Adventist school system in the NAD, formal, written curriculum guides are intended to delineate what should be taught in schools in order to impact students holistically. However, the complete school curriculum is not all visible as it consists of the formal as well as the hidden curriculum.

The Adventist school system has a unique, Bible-based philosophy which is to serve as the basis for curriculum development. With this in focus, the school curriculum should help to prepare students to find their God-appointed places as they serve in this life in preparation to serve in larger spheres in the world to come (White, 1903). As has been stated in Chapters 1 and 2, early institutional theorists underscore the prevalence of founding values throughout the existence of institutions (Selznick, 1957; Stinchcombe, 1965), and the Adventist school system in the NAD is a prime example of this phenomenon. In responding to survey items, therefore, committed teachers are expected

to applaud adherence to founding values in relation to curriculum guides. Conversely, they are expected to desire curricular revisions in efforts to correct any incongruities that might exist between the philosophy of education and the curriculum guides.

Official learning activities along with the hidden curriculum together reflect the complete curriculum. The former are written in curriculum guides while the latter is consistently communicated by various individuals and experiences. The hidden curriculum consists of lessons and values inadvertently learned by simply interacting with the school environment, which includes the contributions of all actors including students, teachers, and other workers. Lessons learned from the hidden curriculum can sometimes support the goals of the written curriculum. To illustrate, students who are immersed in a school culture where Christian principles pervade all activities are likely to learn that Christianity can impact the whole person. A teacher from such a school culture is likely to rate items relating to faith and learning integration positively. Conversely, the hidden curriculum can also conflict with the goals of the written curriculum. A teacher whose school or classroom is perturbed by racial tension, for example, is likely to request curricular revisions with greater emphasis on diversity in order to address the issue. In essence, the hidden curriculum, consisting of the informal values which the school ethos communicates, plays a role in teacher perception of curriculum needs.

In addition to the foregoing examples, K-12 teacher ratings of curriculum-related survey items are potentially impacted by multiple environmental factors, a few more examples of which follow: creation/evolution perspectives, family social issues, and college entrance requirements. With the creation/evolution issue, teacher concerns relate to sufficient emphasis on creationism in curriculum resources in adherence to

foundational values, and also to dispel any evolution-related myths that students may encounter in the external environment or in textbooks produced by secular publishers. In addition, teachers desire curriculum resources that can help them to serve children impacted by family social issues including poverty, illiteracy, and single-parenting, with their related repercussions. Finally, academy teachers, especially those who teach juniors and seniors, are likely to adapt their instruction with the view of helping their students to do well in college placement exams such as the SAT and ACT, while seeking to honor their unique philosophy. High scores on those exams are interpreted if only informally as the result of effective pedagogy. In keeping with the goals to excel on exams, their ratings of curriculum resources are expected to reflect varying degrees of satisfaction including demands for related revisions.

In addition to the foundational values of institutions influencing their internal environments, Selznick (1957) also emphasized that those values impact the way they respond to potentially conflicting external demands. This can sometimes entail compromising within limits. In other words, institutions sometimes have to straddle the line of determining how to remain true to their philosophy while meeting the demands of regulatory systems in order to acquire and retain legitimacy. In providing guidance to teachers who encounter students of varied ability levels in their classrooms, for example, White (1913) directs Adventist schools to ensure that academically challenged students acquire the basics such as grammatical skills, spelling, and writing even at the expense of neglecting other subjects for some time (see pp. 218-219). On the same note she proposes that teachers should have their students “climb the lower rounds of the ladder before reaching for the higher rounds” (p. 219). Teachers who would like to follow this

directive face conflict of interests as they are required to prepare all their students for standardized testing. Those teachers need to teach to the tests in their efforts to help students perform competitively, or risk damaging their own reputation and that of their schools by being perceived as incompetent. While fortunately, a majority of K-12 teachers in the NAD reported that they either welcome learners with special needs in their classrooms or are neutral about it, I hypothesize that in the absence of standardized testing, more K-12 teachers would embrace mainstreaming and try to help struggling students to advance at their own pace.

Adventist teacher responses to the Profile Survey items through the years reflect their commitment to remaining true to the historical beliefs and values which undergird the Adventist philosophy of education, partly by having the curriculum guides reflect that philosophy. On another note, they also of necessity must pay allegiance to some external organizations if they are to retain legitimacy.

Summary of Major Findings Related to Curriculum Guides

1. Availability of curriculum guides is no longer an issue for the vast majority of teachers.
2. Administrators and teachers are willing to try curricular innovations but report that they lack the proficiency levels needed.
3. Having system-level administrators coach teachers in adopting curricular innovations is ineffective partly due to time constraints and their lack of related training.
4. Professional development impacts teacher ratings of curriculum guides in terms of quality and levels of use.

5. The numbers of teachers using curriculum guides have increased to a majority; however, significant numbers still do not use the resources.

6. Teachers reported the following concerns with the formats of curriculum guides: they are too bulky, not user-friendly, and irrelevant in some teaching situations. Multigrade teachers, for instance, need concise resources that do not require much planning time.

7. Teachers prefer curriculum guides in the following formats: pamphlets, checklists, CD/DVD, hard copies, and electronic.

8. K-12 teachers reported the following as examples of *advantages* of curriculum guides: (a) serve as guides on content, scope, sequence, and methods for planning and instruction; (b) include standards for objectives; (c) provide some degree of uniformity for student learning experiences throughout the school system; and (d) offer direction to new teachers and help keep experienced ones current.

9. K-12 teachers reported the following as examples of *disadvantages* of curriculum guides: (a) too lengthy, overwhelming, and outdated; require too much preparation time; (b) impede creativity; (c) do not sufficiently integrate various subjects and concepts; (d) not used by many teachers; (e) not too practical for some groups, for example, Canadian and multigrade teachers.

10. The majority of K-12 teachers perceive NAD curriculum guides as effectively meeting especially the cognitive and spiritual goals set for students. Goals related to the physical and social arenas represent areas of greatest need.

11. In rating selected curriculum guides, the largest subgroup of K-12 teachers reported that they reflected the Adventist philosophy of education; the second largest

subgroup said they were easy to use; the smallest subgroup reported that they represented Best Practices.

CHAPTER IV

TEXTBOOKS

It is a reasonable assumption that textbooks are a foundational resource from which teachers convey and students learn information, skills, and behaviors. It is equally reasonable to expect this resource to have maximum biblical fidelity in line with preparing Christians to be, individually and collectively, all that it means to be God's people (e.g., salt and light to the world [Matt 5: 13-16]; in harmonious relationship with each other [John 17:21]).

—William F. Cox, Jr.

Both teachers and pupils have thought that in order to obtain an education, it was necessary to study the productions of writers who teach infidelity, because their work contains some bright gems of thought. But who was the originator of these gems of thought? It was God, and God alone; for He is the source of all light.

—Ellen G. White

Introduction

The second research question focused on trends related to textbooks as reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007. Textbooks, including teacher editions, are instructional tools used daily in the classroom by both students and teachers. In Christian private schools such as those within the Adventist K-12 school system in North America, parents, teachers, and other stakeholders share concerns about exposing students to content that reflects their unique philosophy of education. In this context, choosing the right textbooks is of paramount importance. Related data derived from elementary and secondary teacher ratings of NAD textbooks are presented later in this chapter.

In the K-12 Adventist school system in the NAD, educators have undoubtedly realized that not all textbooks are classroom-worthy in terms of reflecting the Adventist philosophy of education (Brantley, 1997b; Brantley & Burton, 1994; Burton, 2007). Their awareness of this situation has in part underscored continuing efforts on the part of the NADOE to create textbooks reflecting the unique Adventist philosophy in selected subject areas, and to make those textbooks available to all K-12 schools within the Division. Such efforts are to be commended. On another note, results reflected in research endeavors such as Dudley and Kangas (1990), P. Scott (2012), and Smithwick (2005) indicate that many students who attend Christian schools do not necessarily become Christians and the majority are not confident about their salvation. White (1913) counsels that Adventist schools have a responsibility in that direction:

Special care should be given to the education of the youth. The children are to be trained to become missionaries. *They must be helped to understand distinctly what they must do to be saved* [emphasis mine]. Few have the instruction in religious lines that is essential. (p. 168)

In harmony with this directive one teacher wrote:

The most important thing is for the colleges, Unions and Conferences to focus on teaching teacher[s] how to lead a young person to Jesus Christ. If you want to see a huge difference academically, spiritually, socially and physically, this needs to be number one. (Burton, 2007, p. 101)

Several scholars including Cox, Hameloth, and Talbot (2007), G. Knight (2010), and Schultz (1998) also perceive a need for further strategizing in order to improve spirituality in Christian schools. They propose that existing approaches need to be questioned and improved in order to engender positive change in terms of providing holistic, truly Christian education for the youth. Since textbooks are pivotal to any educational system, they are a logical focal point when considering positive change. In

the Profile 1997 qualitative comments one teacher wrote: “Textbooks become the curriculum; curriculum guides are hard to use on a regular basis and cumbersome” (p. 11).

While Adventist educators generally appreciate the efforts of the NAD in providing Christ-centered curricula and textbooks for some subjects, they also communicate the need for improvement. One teacher wrote: “I am very pleased with how tuned NAD is to its schools. It’s up to us as educators to make it happen: technology, portfolios, and multiple intelligences. NAD goals and framework are solid” (Brantley, 1997b, p. 7). The following comments, however, convey a different perspective: “Seventh-day Adventist education should have their own History curriculum. It seems Christianity is being taken out of more texts” (Brantley, 1997b, p. 6). Another wrote: “I would like to see our Social Studies texts written from a Christian perspective” (p. 7). Still another wrote: “I would like to see more practical application exercises in textbooks, especially Bible ideas for community service/outreach that could be done by school groups” (p. 7).

In highlighting the important roles that textbooks play in schools, Apple (2008) presents an aggregated perspective from the literature as follows:

Textbooks are crucial for a number of reasons. First, they are constitutive parts of the curriculum in most schools. Indeed, some have estimated that 80% of teachers use textbooks in their classrooms as a primary curricular device. Using survey data, some commentators indicate that nearly 50% of student time in public schools is related to textbook use. Other data suggest that in many classrooms 80-90% of classroom and homework assignments “are textbook driven or textbook centered.” (p. 26)

Any activity that feeds minds so extensively is certain to have significant impact, whether positive or negative; the direction would depend on the nature of the content.

Textbook Use Ratings

Making textbooks available to teachers is important; but this effort is worthwhile only when teachers put those textbooks to good use. The data in Table 15 and its derivative Figure 12 reflect teacher ratings from Profiles 1987, 1993, 1997, 1999, 2001, and 2004. In this section, variations in patterns of textbook use have again necessitated separate analyses for the elementary and academy grades. In separate sections, Table 15 and Figure 12 exhibit “Use” ratings for both subgroups.

Informed sources related to public school systems in North America indicate that teachers use textbooks far more extensively than they do curriculum guides (English, 1987; Finn & Ravitch, 2005). In an effort to determine the degree of use of some selected textbooks in K-12 schools in the NAD, teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they used those resources. They were given two options from which to select their responses: “I Did Not Use This Resource,” and “I Used This Resource.” For greater conciseness and visual impact, the cumulative mean for each subject area has been graphically presented in Figure 12 as well, to depict trends in textbook use for the years represented. For the elementary grades these include use of textbooks for Science and Health, Math, Reading, and Bible. Conversely, for the senior academy grades, comparable data are available for Bible textbooks only.

Unlike many curriculum guides, which target multiple grade levels, textbooks are generally grade-specific and elementary teachers are expected to use the textbooks only for the grades they teach. Similarly, academy teachers are expected to use textbooks only for the subjects they teach. It is also possible that teachers replied with a nonuse answer if the textbooks were not for subjects they taught.

Table 15

Textbooks: Elementary and Secondary Teacher Ratings of Use—Profiles 1987, 1993, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (in Percentages)

Elementary/Junior Academy Textbook Ratings				
Textbooks	Year	I Did Not Use This Resource	I Used This Resource	N
SDA Science/Health Text, 5-8	1987	231 (52.3)	211 (47.7)	442
Rockets and Raisins (3-4)	1987	262 (59.3)	180 (40.7)	442
Science/Health Textbook	1993	128 (63.1)	75 (36.9)	203
SDA Science/Health 1-2	1997	236 (69.2)	105 (30.8)	341
SDA Science/Health 3-4	1997	215 (62.9)	127 (37.1)	342
SDA Science/Health 5-6	1997	202 (58.9)	141 (41.1)	343
SDA Science/Health 7-8	1997	228 (66.7)	114 (33.3)	342
Discover God's World (5-6)	1999	184 (46.7)	210 (53.3)	394
Math Textbook Series	1997	133 (39.9)	200 (60.1)	333
Math Books (Misc)	1999	44 (11.1)	353 (88.9)	397
Reading: Life Series	1987	107 (24.2)	335 (75.8)	442
Gateway to Reading (K-10)	1997	271 (79.2)	71 (20.8)	342
Life Series Grades 1-2	1997	227 (66.2)	116 (33.8)	343
Life Series Grades 3-6	1997	174 (50.9)	168 (49.1)	342
Life Series Grades 7-8	1997	221 (64.4)	122 (35.6)	343
Life Reading Series	1999	80 (20.6)	309 (79.4)	389
Bible Textbooks	1993	148 (54.8)	122 (45.2)	270
Belonging to His Family (1-4)	1999	186 (47.1)	209 (52.9)	395
Elementary Bible Books	2004	109 (55.9)	86 (44.1)	195
Senior Academy Textbook Ratings				
New Crossroads Series	1999	100 (69.4)	44 (30.6)	144
Crossroads Grades 9-12	2001	98 (72.1)	38 (27.9)	136
Bible	2001	129 (82.2)	18 (17.8)	147
Secondary Bible Textbooks	2004	9 (26.5)	25 (73.5)	34

Figure 12. Cumulative mean of elementary and academy teachers’ use ratings of textbooks for each subject represented—Profiles 1987, 1993, 1997, 1999, 2001, & 2004 (based on Table 14). The first four sections represent elementary ratings. Only the last section relates to senior academy.

These trends account for what could superficially look like low “Use” ratings for the textbooks in Table 15 and Figure 12, but which, essentially, may be up to standard. Aggregated data in Figure 12 show that 40.8% of elementary teachers reported using the Science/Health textbooks, compared with 75.8% for Math textbooks, 50.9% for Reading textbooks, and 48.5% for Bible textbooks. Comparatively, 27.1% of senior academy teachers reported using the Bible textbooks for Grades 9-12.

In the senior academy Bible textbook ratings displayed in Table 15, the “Use” statistic of 73.5% from Profile 2004 differs substantively from those of other years. In Profile 1999, for example, 30.6% of academy teachers reported using the secondary Bible textbooks, compared with 27.9% in 2001. The lower statistics seem more “normal” than the higher one, since academy teachers specialize, so that only a relative few would be

“Bible” teachers. A closer look at the data also shows that the numbers of respondents for 1999 and 2001 were much greater than for 2004 ($N = 144$ and 136 respectively, compared with $N = 34$ for 2004). This difference in the numbers of respondents would suggest that in Profile 2004, most of the 34 respondents are likely to have been “Bible” teachers as opposed to the larger numbers who responded to the related item in previous surveys. Twenty-five of the 34 respondents reported using the resources in Profile 2004; hence the larger percentage for that year.

Textbook Quality: Overview

In seven of the 10 Profile Surveys up to 2007, K-12 teachers were asked to rate the quality of textbooks used in various subject areas. With a few exceptions, ratings refer to textbooks used in specific subject areas rather than to individual textbooks. In responding to the quality-related items on the surveys, teachers were asked to select from the following options: “Excellent,” “Minor Problems,” and “Major Problems.” In some of the surveys, teachers also rated specific textbooks based on the following characteristics provided as options in the surveys and reflected in qualitative comments: “readability, inadequate activities, difficulty in managing, appropriateness of content, student interest, testing and record keeping, Christ-centeredness, durability, and affordability” (Brantley, 1987, 1991; Brantley & Burton, 1993). In this section elementary textbook ratings are first presented, followed by academy textbook ratings.

Brantley and Burton (1993) acknowledge that “in our academies, with the possible exception of Bible, class textbook selection is often left to the discretion of the individual school or teachers” (p. 19). Accordingly, as opposed to their elementary

counterparts, academy teachers select many of the textbooks for the subjects they teach so that a variety of textbooks are typically used for each subject. In Profile 1987, for example, 53 Vocational Arts teachers reported using 49 different textbooks. Comparatively, 43 Mathematics teachers reported using 32 different textbooks (Brantley, 1988a, p. 32).

In describing the textbooks used in the public school system, Apple (2008) proposed that “texts are simultaneously economic, political, and cultural (p. 26). He posits that at the state level, textbooks are regulated, and often special committees determine the content as well as what gets published and adopted in schools. Brantley and Burton (1993) remarked that based on Profile Survey results, “teachers critiqued commercial books as ‘not Christ-centered’” (p. 20). According to Cox et al. (2007), textbooks used in Christian schools should not simply be neutral, let alone include information which conflicts with Christian values, but should reflect faith and learning integration. Ideally, faith should permeate every aspect of the school ethos (G. Knight, 1980), and that includes textbooks.

In their qualitative comments K-12 teachers also communicated their desire for greater faith integration in Adventist textbooks as the following examples illustrate:

Adoption of materials that are Christian based [is needed]. There are some materials available from Christian sources incorporating Christian standards that are missing in the secular press materials we use. We teachers teach the spiritual concepts, but the ideas are lacking in our books. What the students read in their books makes a difference. (Burton, 2007, p.105)

On a similar note another teacher wrote: “A new Bible program for Grades 7-8 that is Christ centered and spiritually rich needs to be developed” (Burton, 2007, p.103).

Textbook Quality: Elementary

Table 16 presents a summary of elementary teachers' perspectives on the quality of textbooks used in a variety of subjects as reported in seven of the Profile Surveys spanning the years from 1987 to 2001. In Figure 13 the data from Table 16 are further condensed using the cumulative mean for each subject. Figure 14 displays yet another perspective: "Excellent" ratings for each subject presented in Table 16 from Profile 1987 to 2001 have been graphically presented to give a snapshot of the trends in teacher satisfaction.

As noted earlier in this section teachers were asked to select from the following options to rate the textbooks used for each subject: "Excellent," "Minor Problems," and "Major Problems." Figure 13 shows the cumulative mean for each subject through the respective surveys included in Table 16. Textbooks in three subject areas each enjoyed "Excellent" ratings of over 50%, with 59% of elementary teachers rating Handwriting textbooks as Excellent, followed by Reading with 56%, and the Kindergarten Curriculum, *A Child's World*, with 51%. Conversely, teachers rated Art and Music textbooks relatively low on the continuum—16% and 21% respectively. Next, Science/Health, Math, Social Studies, and English, tied with 39% each. The two other subjects, namely, Spelling and Bible, were rated at 44% and 46% respectively. With ratings of 40% and 41% respectively, textbook ratings for Music and Art led in "Major Problems." Conversely, some subject textbooks were rated in the single digits in terms of "Major Problems": Handwriting (4%), Reading, Spelling, and Kindergarten curriculum tying at 7%, and Math (9%). English, Bible, Social Studies, and Science/Health textbooks were rated around the middle with scores of 13%, 14%, 18%, and 22% respectively.

Table 16

Quality Ratings of Textbooks by Subject Areas as Reported by Elementary Teachers—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (in Percentages)

	Subjects	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems
		1987				1989				1991			
104	Bible	194	74 (38)	79 (41)	41 (21)	389	109 (28)	195 (50)	86 (22)	350	164 (47)	158 (45)	28 (8)
	Reading	185	37 (74)	44 (24)	4 (2)	376	244 (65)	124 (33)	8 (2)	404	206 (51)	174 (43)	24 (6)
	Science/Health	194	83 (43)	68 (35)	43 (22)	360	140 (39)	144 (40)	79 (22)	356	100 (28)	157 (44)	99 (28)
	Mathematics	171	30 (76)	39 (23)	2 (1)	372	153 (41)	216 (58)	0 (0)	347	198 (57)	135 (39)	14 (4)
	Social Studies	164	44 (27)	71 (43)	49 (30)	317	108 (34)	133 (42)	73 (23)	308	157 (51)	132 (43)	18 (6)
	English	116	50 (43)	54 (47)	12 (10)	325	156 (48)	150 (46)	23 (7)	306	110 (36)	162 (53)	34 (11)
	Handwriting	172	108 (63)	57 (33)	7 (4)	315	173 (55)	126 (40)	16 (5)	305	186 (61)	107 (35)	12 (4)
	Spelling	164	61 (37)	79 (48)	24 (15)	319	150 (47)	147 (46)	26 (8)	367	172 (47)	176 (48)	18 (5)
	Music	161	23 (14)	55 (34)	84 (52)	171	12 (7)	55 (32)	104 (61)	98	20 (20)	48 (49)	30 (31)
	Art	231	16 (7)	109 (47)	106 (46)	299	29 (9)	120 (40)	152 (51)	161	56 (35)	84 (52)	21 (13)

Table 16—*Continued.*

Subjects	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems
1993					1997				1999			
Bible	297	111 (37)	160 (54)	26 (9)	--	--	--	--	204	72 (35)	111 (54)	21 (10)
Reading	261	106 (41)	135 (52)	20 (8)	414	195 (47)	185 (45)	29 (7)	290	105 (36)	132 (46)	53 (18)
Science/Health	266	55 (21)	117 (44)	94 (35)	493	253 (51)	161 (33)	71 (14)	204	92 (45)	88 (43)	24 (12)
Math (Misc.)	--	--	--	--	195	72 (37)	75 (39)	46 (24)	309	86 (28)	163 (53)	60 (19)
English	250	60 (24)	134 (54)	56 (22)					--	--	--	--
Small School Engl.	56	23 (40)	23 (40)	10 (18)	76	36 (47)	32 (42)	8 (11)	--	--	--	--
K Curriculum	35	18 (51)	15 (43)	1 (3)	53	34 (64)	15 (28)	2 (4)	--	--	--	--
Spelling	258	101 (39)	140 (54)	7 (7)								
Music	--	--	--	--	86	34 (40)	37 (43)	14 (16)	102	40 (39)	45 (44)	17 (17)
Art	141	32 (23)	84 (60)	25 (18)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2001												
K Curriculum	108	47(44)	51 (47)	10 (9)								

Note. A dash in a cell indicates that data were unavailable. Data for years 1987 to 1991, only, are adapted from *Profile '91: A Curriculum Impact Study of Seventh-day Adventist Schools in North America* (p. 25), by P. S. Brantley, 1991, Berrien Springs, MI: Author.

Figure 13. Cumulative mean of elementary teachers' textbooks quality ratings for each subject represented—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1997, 1999, & 2001 (based on Table 16).

Figure 14. Excellent ratings of textbooks by elementary teachers in each subject represented—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1997, 1999, & 2001 (based on Table 16). Note how ratings for Reading, Math, and English decline between 1987 and 1999.

Figure 14, which displays only the “Excellent” ratings from Table 16, communicates the degree of stability for each subject in terms of teacher satisfaction through the years. While varying degrees of fluctuation are obvious in the ratings for most subject textbooks, Social Studies leads in terms of most improved ratings. Only 27% of teachers rated Social Studies textbooks as “Excellent” in Profile 1987. However, ratings increased to 34% in 1989 and 51% in 1991. The improved ratings in 1991 could have been due to the adoption of the new Social Studies textbook series in the 1989-1990 school-year (see Appendix D). Comparatively, the “Excellent” ratings for *Small Schools English* improved from 40% in Profile 1993 to 47% in Profile 1997, the only two ratings available. Other textbooks enjoying improved “Excellent” ratings in spite of some fluctuations include Science/Health, Spelling, Music, and Art. Still others have suffered diminished ratings, but are relatively stable. Those include Bible, Handwriting, and the Kindergarten Curriculum.

While “Excellent” ratings for some textbooks have improved, others have definitely declined. Such include textbooks for Reading, Math, and English, which are core subjects in the school curriculum. In Profile 1987, Reading and Math textbooks started out with the highest “Excellent” ratings of 74% and 76% respectively. However, except for one fluctuation in either case, the ratings decreased consistently through the years so that the 1999 ratings for Reading and Math, the last available in both instances, were 36% and 28% respectively. English was included in four of the surveys, and like Reading and Math, the ratings decreased steadily except for one fluctuation. “Excellent” ratings for English textbooks started with 43% in Profile 1987, increased to 48% in Profile 1989, and dropped to 36% and 24% respectively in the next two Profile Surveys.

Based on the qualitative comments from the Profile Surveys, teachers have been expressing a variety of concerns regarding possibilities for textbook improvement. Regarding Science textbooks one teacher wrote: “The Science [textbooks] need to be updated to reflect today's standards. The same books have been used since the 80s and need to be revised” (Burton, 2007, p. 112). Another wrote: “[Teachers need] SDA textbooks that are kept up-to-date: Science, Bible, Reading, [and] a good Health book for elementary levels” (Burton, 2007, p. 112). The next comment consists of both commendation and suggestions for improvement:

I have been impressed by the reading series. It includes writing and grammar. The new Bible series for 1-4 is good. It would be nice to work on science and social studies for these grades. We need to have updated and effective programs for both kindergarten and preschool. (Burton, 2007, p. 101)

The following rather detailed comment seems to have come from an elementary school principal, since the respondent referred to his or her “lower grade teacher”:

1. You did not give teachers the opportunity to express their opinions of this new reading program that has been forced on us by the NAD, the local Union, and our Conference. Please understand that my school is a rather small school, but I think what I am about to express would apply to all schools.
2. The program is extremely expensive. . . . At first, we were told this program would cost about \$100.00 per student. This is way more than we spend on any other class. However, this one class is costing over \$300.00 per student! My budget for books is \$10,000 for this next year. I will be spending approximately \$8,500.00 for just this one class. What am I supposed to use to buy all the other books we need for next year?
3. The quality of the material is not that good. Some of the books are really cheap paperback books. They look like the kind of books that you could buy at the Dollar Store. . . .
4. Are the students going to learn to read better with this program? I say "NO." My lower grade teacher [has] to use a lot of material from the old series to compensate for the lack of material in this new program. . . .

5. The books were not even ready at the beginning of last year. Why would NAD force something on us before it was ready? My teacher would receive student texts before she would receive the Teacher's Edition. The books would come out of sequence on a regular basis.
6. Did someone in NAD get a big kick back on forcing us to use this material? It just [does] not make any other sense as to why we would be using such an expensive unit. (Burton, 2007, p. 134)

To help alleviate the “cost” problem especially for smaller schools, another teacher suggested “forming a co-op where textbooks can be purchased at reduced rates” (Burton, 2007, p. 6). On the issue of cost, the problem is not only with Adventist-specific textbooks but with textbooks in general. Besides, according to Burton (2013), Division-wide purchasing agreements with textbook publishers were developed in the 1990s and continue to the present time (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 27, 2013).

In a study conducted by Cox et al. (2007), targeting the quality of textbooks used in several Christian schools in Virginia, results showed that 60% of the 121 textbooks came from Christian publishers (mainly two), while 40% came from various other publishers. The three researchers, all “Christian education experts” (p. 185), were primarily concerned with rating the integration of biblical content in books written from a Christian worldview, and for this they used a rating rubric with six elements, along with a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0-3 with the following indicators: “0 = general absence of Christian and/or presence of contrary content; 1 = minimal and inadequate for discipleship equipping; 2 = adequate for discipleship equipping; 3 = optimum for high quality discipleship equipping” (p. 192).

The six elements were as follows:

1. Christian Worldview
2. Christian character traits [as opposed to simply good living]
3. Biblical concepts

4. Faith and learning integration [not simply the presence of Bible verses in textbooks]
5. Curriculum alignment
6. Conclusion. (p. 190)

The researchers rated a sampling of 15 of 121 textbooks representing 86% from Christian publishers and 14% from others. The texts also spanned the elementary, middle, and high school grades. Results ranged from 3.0 on their response scale ($n = 4$) to 0.0 ($n = 2$ —textbooks by non-Christian publishers. In the middle ranges, about half of the texts produced by Christian publishers received overall ratings of less than 2, with “curriculum alignment” receiving the highest ratings. For the 15 textbooks sampled the average score was 1.55, suggesting that even most textbooks by Christian publishers are inadequate for equipping students to be Christian disciples (p. 193).

Textbook Quality: Academy

Table 17 displays academy teacher ratings of textbooks used for selected subjects as reported in five of the 10 Profile Surveys: 1987, 1989, 1997, 1999, and 2001.

As noted earlier in this chapter, academy teachers often select the textbooks for the subjects they teach so that several different textbooks are used for each subject. For most of the six subject areas in focus, items related to quality of textbooks used featured in only two of the 10 surveys: Profiles 1987 and 1989. Figure 15 displays the cumulative mean for textbook ratings for each of the subject areas represented in Table 17. It is noteworthy that the “Excellent” option scored highest for textbooks in all subject areas, with a range of 58% for Math to 66% for Science. Such high “Excellent” ratings could be attributable to the fact that the majority of academy teachers obtain textbooks of their choice for the subjects they teach.

Table 17

*Ratings of Textbooks by Subject Areas as Reported by Senior Academy Teachers:
Profiles 1987, 1989, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (in Percentages)*

Subjects	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems	<i>N</i>	Excel- lent	Minor Problems	Major Problems
1987					1989			
Vocational Arts	53	34 (64)	13 (24)	6 (11)	50	28 (56)	17 (34)	5 (10)
Science	67	42 (63)	16 (24)	9 (13)	73	50 (68)	17 (23)	6 (8)
History	48	29 (60)	12 (25)	7 (14)	36	21 (58)	11 (31)	4 (11)
Language Arts	44	25 (57)	16 (36)	3 (7)	56	31 (55)	9 (16)	6 (29)
Mathematics	43	20 (46)	20 (46)	3 (7)	89	57 (64)	27 (30)	10 (11)
Bible	35	16 (46)	11 (31)	8 (23)	80	18 (23)	30 (37)	32 (40)
1997					1999			
English 9-12	11	8 (73)	1 (9)	1 (9)	--	--	--	--
Grade 9 Bible	34	22 (65)	8 (24)	2 (6)	--	--	--	--
Bible Series Grades 9-12	--	--	--	--	42	11 (26)	27 (64)	4 (10)
2001								
Bible Series Grades 9-12	96	42 (44)	43 (45)	5 (5)				

Note. A dash in a cell indicates that data were unavailable. Data for years 1987 and 1989, only, are adapted from *Profile '91: A Curriculum Impact Study of Seventh-day Adventist Schools in North America* (p. 25), by P. S. Brantley, 1991, Berrien Springs, MI: Author.

Figure 15. Cumulative mean of senior academy teachers' quality ratings of textbooks for each subject represented—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1997, 1999, & 2001 (based on Table 17).

With “Excellent” ratings for academy textbooks relatively high, “Major Problems” ratings are correspondingly low, ranging from 9% for Language Arts to 18% for Bible. The other subject textbook ratings in the “Major Problems” category were relatively close to each other: Math (10%), Science and Vocational Arts (tied at 11%), and History (13%).

Figure 16, the last in this chapter, provides another perspective of the same data: it depicts degrees of teacher satisfaction in terms of “Excellent” ratings only for the respective years represented. An examination of Figure 16 shows fairly stable trends with the greatest fluctuation in ratings of Bible textbooks, possibly because that subject was included in five of the Profile Surveys while most of the others were included in only two surveys. Overall “Excellent” ratings for Science, English/Language Arts, and Math

textbooks improved, while those for Vocational Arts and History declined. Bible ratings, on the other hand, displayed a roller-coaster pattern with “Excellent” ratings of 46% in Profile 1987, 23% in 1989, 65% in 1997 (for Grade 9 Bible), 26% in 1999 for the *Crossroads Series*, and back up to 44% in Profile 2001 for the 9-12 Secondary Bible Series. The “roller-coaster effect” might have been partly due to the different Secondary Bible textbooks that were rated from 1987 to 2001.

Figure 16. Excellent ratings of textbooks by senior academy teachers for each subject represented—Profiles 1987, 1989, 1997, 1999, & 2001 (based on Table 17).

Newer Textbooks: Higher Ratings

An interesting observation deduced from survey results was that teachers rated newly adopted or revised textbooks more favorably than they did the older counterparts (Brantley & Burton, 1993). This trend has been evident even in some of the earliest Profile Survey results. As Brantley (1990) proposed, “ratings of old and new reading and

science materials, when compared, confirm the fact that curriculum development and revision can make a real difference” (p. 27). In addition, Brantley (1996) affirmed that in comparing Profile 1991 teacher ratings of textbooks to those of Profile 1995, “as a whole, the latter results compare favorably. Especially gratifying is the high rating given the new science-health series—the highest rating ever recorded in nine years of profile surveys” (p. 17). For textbook adoption dates covering the span of the Profile Surveys, from 1987 to 2007, see Appendix D.

Relationship to Institutional Factors: Textbooks

As with curriculum guide ratings, Adventist teachers’ textbook ratings reflected both commendations and recommendations for revision. They rated textbooks with certain characteristics positively while requesting change in others with perceived limitations. In keeping with inspired directives, the values-driven feedback from Adventist teachers indicates that they generally favor books designed to build the faith of their students, and not to weaken their faith. White (1948a) enjoins: “Those who respect the words of infidel authors and lead students to look upon these books as essential in their education lessen their faith in God” (p. 166).

The subject of textbooks in Adventist educational institutions has received great emphasis in the inspired writings of Ellen White. In some instances she received visions in which certain kinds of textbooks were actually taken away from the hands of teachers by some heavenly being who proceeded to explain why such should never be used in Adventist schools (see White, 1913, pp. 401-403; and White, 1948c, p. 162). Essentially, she counsels educators to have the Bible as the all-pervading influence in the curriculum, as its values-laden principles are relevant in preparing students to serve in this life and to

form characters that will fit them to live with angels, with God's followers through the ages, and with God and Jesus themselves in the world to come. She directs teachers to weed out books that mix truth with error; books patronizing the works of "infidel authors" regardless of the popularity or longevity of the works of those authors; and books with content conflicting with biblical truths. She warns educators that once the human mind has been exposed to error, unlearning such error can be very challenging to the extent of having eternal consequences (White, 1903, 1913, 1923, 1968).

According to White (1948a), "the productions of infidel authors" (p. 164) can negatively impact learners at all academic levels, including teachers. In recounting a vision she had about textbooks used in schools, she quoted the words of a heavenly messenger who was present during that vision:

In the study of these objectionable books the minds of teachers as well as students become corrupted, and the enemy sows his tares. It cannot be otherwise. By drinking of an impure fountain, poison is introduced into the system. Inexperienced youth taken over this line of study receive impressions which lead their thoughts into channels that are fatal to piety. Youth who have been sent to our schools have learned from books which were thought to be safe because they were used and encouraged in the schools of the world. But from the worldly schools thus followed many students have gone forth infidels because of the study of these very books. (p. 164)

Students spend a considerable portion of school hours studying and completing assignments from textbooks, and since many of them may not be sufficiently mature to apply critical thinking skills to separate truth from error, it is especially important for teachers to place safe material in their hands. Again, in vision, White (1948a) heard a heavenly messenger addressing the "large company" present with the challenging question: "Do you find in these authors sentiments and principles that make it altogether safe to place them in the hands of students?" (p. 162). In commenting on textbook inadequacies particularly in the public school arena, Chester E. Finn (in Thomas B.

Fordham Institute, 2004) attests that many of them are “mediocre and dreadful,” and that “many K-12 teachers and schools depend so heavily on them for the core of their curriculum” (Foreword, par. 1).

While individual researchers may differ in their views on the textbook selection issue, it certainly needs careful attention especially in light of the fact that the Adventist school system produces only some of the textbooks used in its schools. Dr. David N. Menton (1993) of The Missouri Association for Creation denounces the seepage of “evolution as fact” in some of the nation’s textbooks:

The occurrence of evolution is widely believed to be a scientific "fact" and those who dare to doubt it are not endured gladly. The Encyclopedia Britannica confidently assures us that "we are not in the least doubt as to the fact of evolution." In his textbook *_Evolution_*, J. Savage says "we do not need a listing of the evidences to demonstrate the fact of evolution any more than we need to demonstrate the existence of mountain ranges." In another textbook titled *_Outlines of General Zoology_*, H. Newman arrogantly declared that evolution has no rival as an explanation for the origin of everything "except the outworn and completely refuted one of special creation, now retained only by the ignorant, the dogmatic, and the prejudicial." (Series 4, Par. 7)

With more recent voices like Cameron Smith (2011) joining the conversation with his book, *The Fact of Evolution*, coming to the forefront, evolution is no longer a “theory” as far as some textbook publishers are concerned, but a “fact.”

Adventist teachers have continued to voice their awareness of the amalgamation of defective science with textbook content especially in the qualitative comment sections of the Profile Surveys. In keeping with their historic organizational values, they generally desire textbooks that are Christ-centered; and in keeping with societal demands and expectations, they also want those textbooks to reflect current and innovative trends. While religious principles are timeless, societal trends change constantly. Individuals who produce textbooks for use in Adventist schools are therefore challenged to

continually upgrade them to reflect the needs of the external environment while integrating faith with content to reflect internal institutional values. Unfortunately, as the cost of producing and constantly updating textbooks is monumental, Adventist schools are likely to continue to use external publishers to supplement their own textbook publications in the foreseeable future.

The following two quotations illustrate the content of White's many discourses on the selection of textbooks:

There is need of separating from our educational institutions an erroneous, polluted literature, so that ideas will not be received as seeds of sin. Let none suppose that education means a study of books that will lead to the reception of ideas of authors that will sow seed and spring up to bear fruit that must be bound up in bundles with the world, separating them from the Source of all wisdom, all efficiency, and all power, leaving them the sport of Satan's arch-deceiving power. A pure education for youth in our schools, undiluted with heathen philosophy, is a positive necessity in literary lines. (White, 1923, p. 387)

I am given a word of caution to teachers in all of our established schools. The work of our schools must bear a different stamp from that borne by some of our most popular schools. The mere study of the ordinary textbook is not sufficient; and many of the books that are used are unnecessary for those schools that are established to prepare students for the school above. . . . The Lord expects our teachers to expel from our schools those books that teach sentiments that are not in accordance with His word, and to give place to those books that are of the highest value. (White, 1923, pp. 516-517)

As has been discussed earlier in this chapter, perusal of the qualitative comments by K-12 teachers in many of the Profile Surveys indicates that while they desire state-of-the-art resources, they especially value textbooks that reflect effective faith and learning integration in keeping with the directives from the Bible and the E. G. White writings.

Summary of Major Findings Related to Textbooks

1. Elementary teachers are more likely to use the textbooks produced by the NAD than academy teachers.

2. Many teachers are concerned about costs of NAD textbooks.
3. Ratings for Reading and Math elementary textbooks dropped substantially between Profile 1987 and Profile 1999. Ratings for English textbooks also dropped between Profile 1987 and Profile 1993.
4. Teachers rated some textbooks more favorably than others based on the following elements: “readability, inadequate activities, difficulty in managing, appropriateness of content, student interest, testing and record keeping, Christ-centeredness, durability, and affordability” (Brantley, 1987, Appendix). (The criteria used for rating textbooks in Profile 1987 were also used in Profiles 1991 and 1993, with some minor changes. See Brantley, 1991, p. 22; and Brantley & Burton, 1993, p. 18.)
5. Teachers rate newly adopted textbooks more highly than they do older ones possibly due to too much lapse of time between upgrades.
6. Teachers reported that Teacher’s Editions of textbooks were more useful than curriculum guides.
7. The majority of academy teachers select their own textbooks for the subjects they teach; many do not use the textbooks produced by the NAD.
8. Academy teachers reported the highest percentage of major problems with Bible textbooks in Profiles 1987 and 1989 (23% and 40% respectively).

CHAPTER V

TECHNOLOGY

Ambient Intelligence (AmI) carries out a futuristic vision of living environments which are sensitive and responsive to the presence of people and, by taking care of their desires, intelligently respond to their actions improving their comfort and well-being.

—G. Acampora and A. Vitiello

School leaders working in tandem with their School Board and other stakeholders, must seek to articulate a policy on acquisition, selection appraisal and use of technology media. This should be followed with systematic implementation of policy guidelines deemed acceptable to the school community.

—Ian Mighty

Introduction

This chapter addresses the third research question focusing on technology-related trends in K-12 Adventist education. In keeping with curricular developments in the early 1990s, Profile 1993 included the first technology-related questions with special emphasis on computers in schools. As with curriculum guides and textbooks, the North American Division Office of Education shared the concern of other stakeholders that the schools within the Division would have access to new technologies emerging at that time. Having access to the resources is one issue; another is being able to use them effectively to enhance teaching and learning.

Availability of Educational Technologies

Several scholars concur on the notion that a dearth of resources can negatively impact the degree of technology adoption in teaching (Becker, 2000; Inan & Lowther, 2010; Means, 2008). As Becker (2000) proposes, teachers who have sufficient computers in their classrooms in relation to the numbers of students are likely to integrate computer-related activities into their pedagogy and have students use the technology regularly. On the other hand, teachers who have to schedule time to use the school's computer lab are likely to have their students use the technology less frequently. As with many other innovations, time is also a factor in assimilating computer-related technologies into pedagogy. Table 18 along with related Figures 17-23 summarizes survey results related to availability of various kinds of technology in K-12 schools for the years spanning the last seven Profile Surveys, 1993 through 2007.

As an organizational strategy the educational technologies included in Table 18 have been classified into five categories analyzed in the order listed: (a) Computer Access; (b) Computer Networking; (c) Computer Accessories; (d) Multimedia Technologies; and (e) Computer Applications /Other Technologies. A look at the table indicates that most K-12 schools had few or none of the related technologies in the early 1990s. As the years advanced, however, Adventist schools in general had acquired various forms of technology by the time the last Profile Survey to date was conducted in 2007. Even a casual look at Table 18 shows the progression as schools have been adding to their assets over the years. Several related graphics have been generated from the six categories represented in the data to provide varied perspectives.

Table 18

Educational Technology Available in the School: K-12 Teacher Ratings: Profiles 1993-2007 (in Percentages)

Technology Resources	1993 (N = 539)	1995 (N = 671)	1997 (N = 510)	1999 (N = 560)	2001 (N = 658)	2004 (N = 468)	2007 (N = 859)
Computer Access							
1. Apple PC	137 (25.4)	171 (25.5)	116 (22.7)	128 (23.3)	117 (17.0)	--	--
2. IBM Compatible PC	207 (38.4)	497 (74.1)	355 (69.6)	492 (89.6)	565 (85.9)	--	--
3. Teacher Computer	--	--	--	--	--	417 (87.8)	696 (81.0)
4. Student Computers	--	--	--	--	--	424 (90.6)	763 (88.8)
5. Technical Support						137 (29.3)	193 (22.5)
Computer Networking							
1. Teacher Internet	--	--	--	--	--	400 (85.5)	692 (80.6)
2. Student internet	--	--	--	--	--	371 (79.3)	727 (84.6)
3. Internet		102 (15.2)	228 (44.7)	377 (68.7)	467 (71.0)	--	--
Computer Accessories							
1. Printer	--	--	383 (75.1)	517 (94.2)	596 (90.6)	420 (89.7)	656 (76.4)
2. Computer projector	--	--	1 (0.2)	--	--	243 (51.9)	455 (53.0)
3. Computer CD-ROM	--	--	342 (67.1)	352 (64.1)	--	--	--

Table 18—*Continued.*

Technology Resources	1993 (N = 539)	1995 (N = 671)	1997 (N = 510)	1999 (N = 560)	2001 (N = 658)	2004 (N = 468)	2007 (N = 859)
Multimedia Technologies							
1. Overhead projector						303 (64.7)	521 (60.7)
2. Video camera						71 (15.2)	114 (13.3)
3. VCR	384 (71.2)	--	351 (68.8)			366 (78.2)	707 (82.3)
4. Digital camera						131 (28.0)	275 (32.0)
5. Television						353 (75.4)	688 (80.1)
6. DVD player						169 (36.1)	656 (76.4)
7. CD player						331 (70.7)	670 (78.0)
8. Cassette player						307 (65.6)	528 (61.5)
Computer Applications/Other Technologies							
1. PowerPoint	--	--	--	109 (19.9)	390 (59.3)	--	627 (73.0)
2. Fax	--	330 (49.2)	307 (57.3)	462 (84.2)	--	58 (12.4)	71 (8.3)

Note. Dash indicates that data were unavailable.

Computer Access

Figure 17 shows availability of computers in K-12 schools by type from Profile Surveys 1993 through 2001. Throughout that period, IBM-compatible PCs dominated the schools while Apple was always in the minority. In addition, the numbers of teachers reporting the presence of PCs in their schools have been increasing through the years, whereas corresponding data have been declining for Apple computers. In Profile 1993, for instance, 38.4% of K-12 teachers reported having PCs in their schools compared with 25.4% for Apple computers. By the time the next Profile Survey was conducted in 1995, the 74.1% of teachers reporting on PCs had grown by 35.7 percentage points. Conversely, the 25.5% of teachers reporting on Apple computers at their schools during the same 2-year period had grown by 0.1 percentage points, the highest recorded up to 2001. With minimal fluctuation during the 8-year period, 85.9% of teachers reported having PCs in 2001 against 17.8% for Apple.

Figure 17. Computer access available in K-12 schools by types—Profiles 1993-2001 (based on Table 18).

As stated earlier, schools have been increasing their assets in educational technology over the years. However, availability of technical support is an issue demanding attention. According to Inan and Lowther (2010), availability of technical support is one of the significant variables impacting adoption of technology use in classroom instruction. As shown in Figure 18, K-12 teachers were asked in the last two Profile Surveys to indicate availability of student computers, teacher computers, and technical support in their schools. In Profile 2004, 87.8% of teachers reported that their schools had teacher computers compared with 81.0% in Profile 2007. Correspondingly, 90.6% of teachers reported having student computers in their schools in Profile 2004 against 88.8% who affirmed the same in Profile 2007. The difference of 1.8 percentage points lies well within an acceptable statistical margin of error so that it does not necessarily represent a decrease in the number of computers available.

Figure 18. Computer access and technical support available in K-12 schools—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (based on Table 18).

In responding to an item related to availability of computers for students in the classroom one teacher wrote: “Computers and other technological devices are not provided in my classroom . . . NOTHING” (Burton, 2007, p. 9). On a similar note another expressed the need for computers in the classroom:

[We have] no student computers in [the] classroom. Once or twice a month we reserve the library so students can use computers during class [time]; this is rare since [during] those periods study halls are filled. I really need 3-5 computers in the classroom!!! (Burton, 2007, p. 9)

Anyone who has used computers for some time is likely to have encountered technical difficulties demanding expert intervention. Schools also experience technical problems with their computers; and depending on the extent of use, lack of technical support can interfere with teaching and learning. In Profiles 2004 and 2007, however, the 29.3% and 22.5% of teachers who reported having access to technical support woefully trailed the numbers of schools with student and teacher computers. Fortunately, based on qualitative teacher comments (Profile 2007), many schools contract the services of tech-savvy parents or other personnel to provide technical support on call. Some respondents stated that such persons are not always available when needed. Others have teachers at their schools who are sufficiently equipped to provide such services. Economic reasons were cited for this shortage of hired help to deal with technical issues.

Finally, a casual look at the statistics in Figure 18 shows that for some reason, the 2004 “Access” statistics slightly outshine those of 2007 in every instance, even for technical support. Moreover, this is not the only instance where 2004 data slightly outshines those of 2007. It would have been informative if the original researchers could have discovered some reasons for this pattern.

Computer Networking

Figure 19 provides a glimpse of computer networking available in K-12 schools from 1995 to 2007. With each new survey, the numbers of teachers reporting Internet access in their schools increased considerably. In Profile 1995, only 15.2% of K-12 teachers reported having Internet access in their schools. The ratings increased to 44.7% by the time the next survey was conducted in 1997, and to 68.7% in Profile 1999, an increase of 53.5% over a 4-year period. By the time Profile 2001 was conducted, Internet access in schools seemed to have leveled off with the 71% ratings, showing less than a 3% increase over a 3-year period.

Figure 19. Computer networking available in K-12 schools—Profiles 1995 – 2007 (based on Table 18).

In the last two surveys teachers were asked to report separately on availability of Internet access for teachers and students. In Profile 2004, 85.5% of teachers reported

teacher Internet access in their schools against 80.6% in the Profile 2007 survey. Comparatively, 79.3% of teachers reported student Internet access in their schools in Profile 2004 against 84.6% in Profile 2007. On another note some teachers reported in the qualitative comments (Profile 2007) that Internet services at their schools are so unreliable that it is impractical to include any Internet-related activities in lesson planning. Limited access to technical support in many instances only compounded the problem. Overall, the data in successive surveys indicated that even while some schools have taken a “no-Internet” stance due to philosophical reasons (L. D. Burton, personal communication, February 10, 2012), the number of K-12 schools with Internet access has been increasing.

Computer Accessories

Figure 20 showcases three categories of computer accessories and teacher ratings of their availability in K-12 schools from 1997 to 2007. In Profile 1997, 75.1% of teachers reported having access to printers in their schools. Comparative statistics peaked in Profile 1999 with 94.2% of teachers reporting access to printers. Ratings from the three subsequent surveys showed a decline, with 90.6%, 89.7% and 76.4% of teachers reporting printer access at their schools in 2001, 2004, and 2007 respectively.

The next subset of computer accessories, computer projectors, was included in three of the surveys. In Profile 1997, only 0.2% of K-12 teachers reported having access to computer projectors in their schools. Seven years later, in Profile 2004, ratings had soared to 51.9%, possibly due to plummeting prices and increased availability. The 53.0% ratings in Profile 2007 represented an increase of only 1.1%. It might be interesting to study possible reasons for so little increase in 3 years.

Figure 20. Computer accessories available in K-12 schools—Profiles 1997-2007 (based on Table 18)

The third subset of computer accessories, CD-ROM, was included in Profiles 1997 and 1999 only. Ratings showed 67.1% and 64.1% of teachers reporting access to computer CD-ROM in the two respective surveys. While no recent data are available for this subset, the statistics may have shifted significantly with time.

Multimedia Technologies

Figures 21 and 22 display availability ratings of Multimedia Technologies in K-12 schools. Figure 21 shows the data spread for the survey years included, whereas Figure 22 displays the average ratings for the various media for the same years.

As displayed in Figure 21, items targeting availability of multimedia technologies, except for the VCR, were included only in Profiles 2004 and 2007. In addition, statistics for the availability of the DVD player were the only ones with a rather large difference between ratings for 2004 and 2007. Whether showing increases or decreases, data for availability of the other multimedia technologies remained relatively stable over the years.

Figure 21. Multimedia technologies available in K-12 schools—Profiles 1993, 1997, 2004, & 2007 (based on Table 18).

Figure 22, derived from averaged data using the statistics in Figure 21, shows that video cameras and digital cameras earned the lowest average ratings for availability among the featured multimedia technologies (13.9%, 30.6%, respectively). Technologies rated at over 60% for availability comprised overhead projectors (62.1%), DVD players (62.2%), and cassette players (62.9%). Correspondingly, CD players, VCRs, and Televisions earned the highest aggregated availability ratings of 75.4%, 76.1%, and 78.4% respectively.

Figure 22. Averages for multimedia technologies available in K-12 schools—Profiles 2004 and 2007. Exception: Average for VCR also includes 1993 and 1997 data (all data based on Table 18).

Computer Applications and Other Technologies

Figure 23 presents the availability of Computer Applications in K-12 schools. In Profile 1999 only 19.9% of K-12 teachers reported having PowerPoint access at their

schools. Since a few times that number reported having computer access that same year, the low ratings for PowerPoint probably reflected lack of familiarity with the program at that time even when it might have been included with the computer programs. By 2001 the statistic for PowerPoint availability had increased to 59.3% and by Profile 2007, to 73%.

Figure 23. Computer applications available in K-12 schools—Profiles 1999, 2001, & 2007 (based on Table 18).

Finally, as shown in Table 18, items related to fax machines were included in five surveys from 1995 to 2007. The data on fax machines is rather revealing. In Profile 1995 and 1997, 49.2% and 57.3% of teachers respectively reported having access to fax machines in their schools. Ratings peaked by the time Profile 1999 was conducted, with 84.2% of teachers reporting access to fax machines at their schools. In Profiles 2004 and 2007, ratings dropped drastically with only 12.4% and 8.3% of teachers respectively reporting access to fax machines at their schools—a range of 75.9% between the highest

and lowest ratings for the five surveys. When compared with the 80% email use for specific tasks by K-12 teachers in the 2004 and 2007 Profile Studies (see Table 21), it is conceivable that to some degree, email could be displacing faxing as a means of communication.

Confidence Levels in Using Technology in Education

In Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2001, K-12 teachers were asked to respond to the following question relating to their comfort levels with educational technology: *“Just where are YOU on the information superhighway?”* As displayed in Table 19 they were given seven options from which to choose their responses. Figure 24 provides a visual comparison of K-12 teacher options for each of the four surveys while Figure 25 presents the cumulative mean for the data in each category. Figure 24 communicates that the statistics in each category and for each year have been relatively stable.

While the data show some improvement in terms of the comfort levels of K-12 teachers with the new technologies, the majority remained “in low gear,” “with less than a third of K-12 teachers [using] the computer for a wide variety of *teaching* applications” (Brantley & Ruiz, 2001/2002, p. 20). Ratings show that in the 6 years spanning the four related Profile Surveys, the largest subgroups of K-12 teachers, ranging from 46% to 54%, lingered “in low gear.” Meanwhile, the second largest subgroup ranging from 11% to 22%, and statistically trailing the largest, continued “in high gear.” Between Profile 1997 and Profile 2001, the “high gear” subgroup grew from 13% to 22%, an increase of 9 percentage points. During that same time the “low gear” subgroup deflated from 52% to 46%, apparently losing some of its adherents to the “high gear” subgroup.

Table 19

K-12 Teacher Perceptions of Their Position on the Information Highway: Profiles 1995-2001 (in Percentages)

Question: "Just where are YOU on the information superhighway?"				
Location	1995 (N = 671)	1997 (N = 436)	1999 (N = 565)	2001 (N = 658)
Still in the garage; I can't seem to get oriented into using computers to any extent.	27 (4)	17 (4)	13 (2)	21(3)
Waiting for a ride; I'm interested but need someone to help me get moving.	108 (16)	46 (11)	41 (7)	40 (6)
Started up my engines; I'm really excited! I've already made plans to get started.	61 (9)	28 (6)	22 (4)	17 (3)
In the driveway; I've tentatively begun doing some things that look promising.	45 (7)	23 (5)	40 (7)	61 (9)
In low gear; I'm using computer systems for some basic teaching or non-teaching things.	346 (51)	227 (52)	303 (54)	305 (46)
In high gear; I use computer computer systems for a wide variety of applications in teaching.	76 (11)	57 (13)	120 (21)	147 (22)
Near my destination; I am a sophisticated user, developer, and consultant.	15 (2)	11 (3)	15 (3)	23 (4)

Note. Bold font included in original table. Those are descriptors for the "information highway" metaphor. From "Curriculum and Instruction in North American Schools: Results From the Profile '95 Survey of SDA Educators" (p. 18), by P. S. Brantley, 1996/1997, *Journal of Adventist Education*, 59(2), 14-20. Adapted with permission.

Figure 24. K-12 teacher perceptions of their position on the information superhighway—Profiles 1995-2001 (based on Table 19).

Figure 25. Cumulative mean for each category—K-12 teacher perceptions of their positions on the information superhighway—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2001 (based on Table 19).

Based on Figure 25, more than 25% of K-12 teachers rated themselves at the four lowest confidence levels of the information superhighway during the 6 years spanning Profiles 1995 to 2001: “still in the garage”; “waiting for a ride”; “started up my engines”; and “in the driveway.” The next statistic represented the majority, with 50.1% of teachers rating themselves “in low gear.” The two highest levels, “in high gear” (17.2%) and “near my destination” (2.7%), together added up to 19.9%.

How have Adventist teachers been using technology in their classrooms? Based on their qualitative comments in Profile 2007, some teachers have students use computers for word processing. Others have them use the Internet as a research tool for writing academic papers. Examples of other uses of technology as reported by teachers include slide presentations, video conferencing, movie-making, and photography. The following quotations reflect additional uses of various technologies in the classroom: “I use a lot of technology in science labs” (p. 31). “I use digitizing software and embroidery machine for personal touches to sewing projects” (p. 3). “We have a polycom we use for study groups and participation with One-2-One an integrated small group educational program with our conference” (p. 7). “I use the computer for collecting data in physics and math using an interface that connects to sensors” (p. 10).

Historically, in the public school arena, integrating computer technology into pedagogy also has not been very pervasive, and usage is generally not aligned with the curriculum (Cuban, Kirkpatrick, & Peck, 2001; Means, 2008). Results from a survey conducted by Becker (2000) also showed that elementary school teachers were more likely to have their students use computer technology than their secondary school counterparts, and for the latter, it varied by subject. In addition, results indicated that

teachers did not use computer technology in their pedagogy to support the core curriculum. Instead, they used it to teach skills in computer use, for basic skills acquisition, and for academic enrichment. In commenting on more current use of computers in classroom instruction, Means (2008) concluded that such trends have been rather consistent “over the past 20 years” (p. 128).

As noted earlier in this section, elementary teachers were more likely to have their students use computers in the classroom than their secondary teacher colleagues. Such a trend possibly could be attributable, at least in part, to greater ease in using block scheduling in elementary classrooms with one teacher for the entire school-day. Conversely, at the academy level, many teachers are limited to one class period, and effectively integrating technology into instruction can be time-consuming.

In a 2002 study, Adelman et al. (as cited in Means, 2008) determined that the most common excuse teachers give for neglecting to use computers in their teaching is time constraints. They argue that they can teach only what they know, and learning to use computers effectively and strategizing to integrate the technology into teaching is time-consuming. In addition, more time is required for setup and configuration. Moreover, with increased demands for standards-based testing, they submit that available software is generally not aligned with the curriculum. They further attest that concepts can be taught even faster without computers than with them (Means, 2008, p. 131).

On another note Becker (2000) deduced from his research that computer use correlated positively with specific variables such as the number of computers in the classroom, teachers’ technology literacy level, and their philosophical stance. He stated, for example, that more than 75% of teachers who had a minimum of five computers in

their classrooms, were comfortable with using the technology, and had a strong constructivist philosophical stance, were likely to have their students use computers regularly, especially for word-processing, but also for “at least one other type of software besides skill-based games” (p. 1). He also correlated computer use with block scheduling in light of the possibility of having long class periods. Finally, his research confirmed that as opposed to “a standards-based, accountability-oriented approach to teaching,” a constructivist approach generally results in students taking the initiative to make greater use of computers outside of the classroom. Again it is note-worthy that imposition of state-mandated accountability requirements can impact curriculum-related decisions such as failing to integrate computer use in classroom instruction.

The consensus in still more recent studies seems to be that the adoption of technology in classroom instruction is highly situational. In a research endeavor using 144 suburban secondary school teachers as subjects, results indicated that PD and availability of resources correlated positively with adoption of technology in teaching (Buckenmeyer, 2010). Another study using 1,382 mostly urban preservice teachers as subjects showed that several variables related to individual characteristics impacted confidence levels and technology adoption in teaching. The following variables were used in developing the “Path” model to guide the study: “Age, years of teaching, computer proficiency, computer availability, teachers’ beliefs, teachers’ readiness, overall support, technical support, and technology integration” (Inan & Lowther, 2010, p. 5). Results indicated that readiness had the greatest effect on adopting technology, followed by “overall support and computer proficiency respectively. Other significant variables

included teacher beliefs, computer availability, technical support, and years of teaching” (p. 10).

In summary, the data from the Profile Surveys show that at least until 2001, more than three-quarters of K-12 teachers in the NAD educational system were not proficient in using educational technology. Has the picture changed since then? Related data from Profiles 2004 and 2007 analyzed later in this chapter help to answer this question. While those two last Profile Surveys did not ask teachers to indicate their positions on the information superhighway, they communicate additional and more current information on teachers’ use of computers and other educational technologies.

Regular Use of Technology for Instruction/Administration

Table 20 displays K-12 teacher ratings of educational technologies used frequently “for instruction/administration or communication.” For purposes of this study, the category labeled “frequently” includes “regular” and “often.” This table, based on Profiles 2004 and 2007 only, includes two broad subsets of data: “Multimedia Technologies,” and “Other Technologies.” For enhanced visual comparison, arithmetic means using data from the last two Profile Surveys have been computed and graphically presented for all items (Figures 26 and 27). It was necessary to present “Multimedia Technologies” as a separate graph to accommodate the many items in that subgroup. Figure 26 displays comparative percentage ratings by K-12 teachers for frequent use of nine “Multimedia Technologies in Instruction/Administration, or Communication,” Profiles 2004 and 2007.

Table 20

*Regular Use of Technology for Instruction/Administration or Communication—K-12
Teacher Ratings: Profiles 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages)*

Technologies	2004 (N = 468)	2007 (N = 859)
Multimedia Technologies		
Overhead projector	133 (28.4)	246 (28.6)
Video camera	21 (4.5)	59 (6.9)
Digital camera	84 (17.9)	278 (32.4)
Television	143 (30.5)	298 (34.7)
VCR	165 (35.2)	314 (36.6)
DVD player	51 (10.9)	308 (35.9)
CD player	171 (36.5)	409 (47.6)
AV aids	245 (52.4)	393 (45.8)
Cassette player	130 (27.8)	246 (28.6)
Other Technologies		
Fax	104 (22.2)	226 (26.3)
Copier	417 (89.1)	728 (84.7)
<i>Computer Networking</i>		
Chat rooms	7 (1.5)	28 (3.3)
<i>Computer Accessories</i>		
E-Gradebook	300 (64.1)	500 (58.2)
<i>Computer Applications</i>		
PowerPoint	76 (16.3)	221 (25.7)

Figure 26. Percentage ratings showing frequent use of multimedia technologies for instruction / administration or communication by K-12 teacher—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (based on Table 20).

Figure 27. Percentage ratings showing frequent use of other educational technologies for instruction / administration or communication by K-12 teachers—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (based on Table 20).

As shown in Figure 26, the 2007 use ratings were higher than those of 2004 in all but one category (AV Aids): overhead projector (28.4% vs. 28.6%), video camera (4.5% vs. 6.9%), digital camera (17.9% vs. 32.4%), television (30.5% vs. 34.7%), VCR (35.2% vs. 36.6%), DVD player (10.9% vs. 35.9%), CD player (36.5% vs. 47.6%), AV aids (52.4% vs. 45.8%), and cassette player (27.8% vs. 28.6%). The widespread use of cell phones for video recordings in recent years possibly accounts for the relatively low statistics for video camera use in the surveys—the two most recent in the 10 Profile Surveys. Except for the “video camera” ratings, the statistics for 2007 are relatively stable for the various categories, ranging from 28.6% to 47.6%. This contrasts with the 2004 statistics, three of which fall below 20%.

In addition to fax machines and copiers, the next category termed “Other Technologies” presented in Table 20 includes computer networking, computer accessories, and computer applications. Comparative percentage ratings based on Profiles 2004 and 2007 data have been presented in one graph as shown in Figure 27. At a glance, Chat-rooms (1.5% vs. 3.3%) received the lowest ratings for both years followed by PowerPoint (16.3% vs. 25.7%), and Fax machines (22.2 vs. 26.3%). The use of copiers (89.1% vs. 84.7%) led in the ratings for both years followed by use of the E-Gradebook (64.1% vs. 58.2%).

Frequent Use of Computers for Specific Tasks

Table 21 shows five computer operations that K-12 teachers reported using frequently for specific tasks in Profiles 2004 and 2007: PowerPoint, the Internet, Email, Word Processing, and Tele/Web Conferencing. For ease of comparison and greater visual

impact, data for 2004 have been graphed alongside data for 2007 and have been arranged from lowest to highest as shown in Figure 28. For both years, email, the Internet, and word processing were used most frequently for specific tasks. The data for the three operations respectively are presented with statistics for 2004 preceding those for 2007: email (80.3% vs. 80.1%), the Internet (81.2% vs. 80.8%), and word processing (88.5% vs. 80.9%). The other two operations, tele/web conference (7.5% vs. 2.6%) and PowerPoint (47.9% vs. 20.5%), were used least frequently for specific tasks in 2004 and 2007. It might be worthwhile to determine the reasons for the decline in use of these two operations as reported in Profile 2007 versus Profile 2004.

Table 21

*Frequent Use of Computer for Specific Tasks—K-12 Teacher Ratings:
Profiles 2004 and 2007 (in Percentages)*

Technologies	2004 (N = 468)	2007 (N = 859)
PowerPoint	224 (47.9)	176 (20.5)
Internet	380 (81.2)	694 (80.8)
Email	376 (80.3)	688 (80.1)
Word processing	414 (88.5)	695 (80.9)
Tele/Web-Conference	35 (7.5)	22 (2.6)

Figure 28. Percentage ratings showing frequent use of computer for specific tasks by K-12 teachers—Profiles 2004 and 2007 (based on Table 21).

What might technology integration in K-12 schools look like in another decade?

Among other prospects visionaries are looking at the possibility of using ambient intelligence to individualize some aspects of learning (Chandrasekhar, Kaimal, Bhamare, & Khosla, 2011; Chin et al., 2010; Education Nation 2.0, 2011). In addition, with the rising cost of textbooks, digital text is likely to replace some more of the hard copies in the classroom. With new possibilities on the horizon, teacher educators and system-level administrators will need to adopt new approaches for empowering teachers in the effective use of new and existing technologies to enhance teaching and learning.

Relationship to Institutional Factors: Technology in Education

Technology in schools is highly institutionalized since its correct use is values-driven. While the God-given principles that govern Adventist education have remained constant, the external environment has greatly changed and educators have been challenged to embrace those changes within the parameters of their unique philosophy. The many varieties of technology used in today's schools were virtually nonexistent

when the first Adventist schools were organized from the late 19th to the early 20th century, let alone when the Bible was written. However, in principle, the Bible and E.G. White writings include guiding values for practically every aspect of human experience, and those have permeated Adventist education from its inception.

In addition to the “values” aspect, technology has been increasingly used to connect institutions in the same organizational field even when geographically isolated. In a PBS (Positive Behavior Support) survey conducted by Grunwald Associates LLC (2011), it was determined that teachers increasingly join “online professional communities to connect, collaborate, and share resources with other teachers” (p. 9). Examples of activities involving teacher connections with the external organizational field via technology include access to the following: various software applications such as Skype, digital libraries, videos, graphics, webinars, PD presentations, blogs, news media, and social media including educational discussion forums. Institutions in the same organizational field can be physically hundreds or even thousands of miles apart; but technology usage has helped to diminish the distances by rendering instant communication possible. In other words, technology has to some degree helped to diminish fragmentation based on physical isolation of related institutions.

When used wisely, various technologies can be effective tools in advancing God’s mission in multiple areas including personal, academic, and professional development, and local, national, and international service (Ohler, 2008; Sellers, 2007). With knowledge of effective search strategies applied in browsing various search engines or specialized websites, students and teachers can access a plethora of resources in practically any area in relatively quick time. In this information age the question

generally is not about the availability of resources, but about strategizing to access the most relevant materials for a given situation. As students access the world-wide web for various reasons, they need to be taught to think critically in terms of the kinds of information that can potentially build or ruin them as Christians (Mighty, 2007).

According to Coy (1986), teachers are responsible to God and to their students to promote the appropriate use of various forms of technology “to address the challenge of worldwide evangelism” (p. 25). While individuals can be creative in their quest to respond to such a challenge, examples of forums which can be used for evangelism include YouTube, social media, and email. Through these and other avenues, messages can be sent around the world in record time, and students should be taught to be responsible in the ways they use those God-given opportunities. In response to a technology-related challenge at his school, Mighty (2007), an Adventist school principal in Canada, suggested that educators might benefit from asking the following evaluative questions:

1. Does the technology I intend to use promote the values and ideals of Seventh-day Adventist Education as supported by Seventh-day Adventist parents?
2. Can I clearly articulate my school’s policy guidelines for the acquisition, selection, appraisal and use of the technology?
3. Does the technology I intend to use promote Biblical values?
4. Does the technology promote healthy moral relationships?
5. Is there a redeeming value in the use of the technology?
6. Is there an educational value and could I use an alternative medium to provide similar or greater value to the students?
7. Is the technology relevant to the curriculum being studied by my students?
8. Is the technology appropriate for the age and maturity level of my students?
9. Can I detect a clear distinction between good and evil?
10. Is there value placed on human life? (pp. 3-4)

Since God communicates with human beings through the senses, which in turn impact the thoughts and actions, much of the counsel related to how the senses of seeing

and hearing should be used can relate to technology usage in schools. Whether used in the classroom, in the workplace, or for entertainment or general information purposes, technological advancement relates to individuals in many facets of life (Bigne, Ruiz, & Sanz, 2005; Curtis, 2013; Loan, 2012; Simonds, 2013; Singer, 2014) and related choices should be determined by one's philosophy and values. The direction of one's choices can render technology either a blessing or a curse, and teachers are partly responsible to educate their charges to choose wisely.

In procuring personal items from the many technological devices available today, students should be taught to invest wisely. Since money is a limited resource with most individuals, and since God actually owns everything and holds the “managers” of His goods accountable, students need to learn to prioritize when purchasing anything including technological devices. Teachers need to educate them on how to prioritize in order to avoid “spend[ing] their money on what is not bread, and [their] labor on what does not satisfy” (Isa 55:2, NIV). In commenting on God's expectations in this regard, White (1940) enjoins:

There are only two places in the universe where we can place our treasures: in God's storehouse or in Satan's; and all that is not devoted to God's service is counted on Satan's side, and goes to strengthen his cause. The Lord designs that the means entrusted to us shall be used in building up His kingdom. His goods are entrusted to His stewards that they may be carefully traded upon, and bring back a revenue to Him in the saving of souls. These souls in their turn will become stewards of trust, cooperating with Christ to further the interests of God's cause. (p. 35)

In other words, with Christians, managing money is institutionalized in that it is values-driven.

The increased use of technology also has repercussions in terms of time management. Internet users, for example, commonly share stories of inadvertently

consuming their time by moving from one topic to another. While the Internet and other sources of information can be tremendous blessings, God calls for temperance in all things including the use of time. In one of her classic works, *Christ's Object Lessons*, White (1900) elaborates on the importance of effective time management from God's perspective: "Our time belongs to God . . . and we are under the most solemn obligation to improve it to His glory. Of no talent He has given will He require a more strict account than of our time" (p. 343). In educating students on the wise use of technology, therefore, teachers need to ensure that time management is addressed.

With the ready availability of music of all kinds through technology, Adventist educators are also challenged to guide their students in the wise selection of music that can meet God's approval. White (1948b) deems appropriate music an important aspect of worship that "can be a great power for good" (p. 71), including evangelism. In keeping with this proposition, she expounds on the positive effects of music even on Lucifer himself after his apostasy and before his expulsion from heaven:

The angels joyfully acknowledged the supremacy of Christ, and prostrating themselves before him, poured out their love and adoration. Lucifer bowed with them; but in his heart there was a strange, fierce conflict. Truth, justice, and loyalty were struggling against envy and jealousy. The influence of the holy angels seemed for a time to carry him with them. As songs of praise ascended in melodious strains, swelled by thousands of glad voices, the spirit of evil seemed vanquished; unutterable love thrilled his entire being; his soul went out, in harmony with the sinless worshippers, in love to the Father and the Son. (White, 1890, pp. 37, 38)

While the right kind of music can be effective in quelling even the worst kind of rebellion against God, the wrong kind can have the opposite effect and students need to be taught the difference. White (1958) warns that "a bedlam of noise shocks the senses and perverts that which if conducted aright might be a blessing" (p. 36). She attests that while such "is termed the Holy Spirit's working . . . Satan will make music a snare by the

way in which it is conducted,” rendering “its effect like the poison sting of a serpent” (pp. 36, 37). She further laments that some kinds of music that professed Christians use make angels weep (White 1988, pp. 418-419). She proposes that “music has occupied the hours which should have been devoted to prayer,” and “is the idol which many professed Sabbath-keeping Christians worship” (White, 1930, p. 295).

In another of her related remarks, White (1988) proposes that theatrical overtones in music intended for Christian worship displease the angels and they do not join the singers:

In some of our churches I have heard solos that were all together unsuitable for the service in the Lord’s house. The long-drawn-out notes and the peculiar sounds common in operatic singing are not pleasing to the angels. They delight to have the simple songs of praise sung in a natural tone. The songs in which every word is uttered clearly, in a musical tone, are the songs that they join us in singing. (p. 416)

While musical tastes and choices can be considered highly subjective, teachers can teach their students to apply timeless, Bible-based principles in the choices they make in this regard.

As previously stated, students’ listening choices should be values-driven; the same principle applies to their reading and viewing choices. Values-based critical thinking in these areas is becoming increasingly important with the wide availability of the gruesome and sensual on the Internet and in other forms of media. The following are a few among many scriptural references that allude to God’s demands for purity: “Keep thyself pure” (1 Tim 5:22). “Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God” (Matt 5:8). “I will not set before my eyes anything that is base” (Ps 101:3, RSV). “Turn my eyes away from worthless things” (Ps 119:37—NIV). “Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure

heart” (2 Tim 2:22). Since the messages received through the senses affect the thoughts and actions, students who are taught to heed the foregoing directives will be inclined to think of the things that are true, noble, right, pure, lovely, admirable, excellent, and praiseworthy (Phil 4:8, NIV).

In concert with the biblical injunctions, White (1948a) expounds on the need for purity in reading and viewing choices:

Many of the young are eager for books. They read everything they can obtain. Exciting love stories and impure pictures have a corrupting influence. Novels are eagerly perused by many, and, as the result, their imagination becomes defiled. In the cars, photographs of females in a state of nudity are frequently circulated for sale.

This is an age when corruption is teeming everywhere. The lust of the eye and corrupt passions are aroused by beholding and by reading. . . . Avoid reading and seeing things which will suggest impure thoughts. . . . I know of strong minds that have been unbalanced and partially benumbed, or paralyzed, by intemperance in reading. . . . It is impossible for the youth to possess a healthy tone of mind and correct religious principles unless they enjoy the perusal of the word of God. (p. 410)

Advances in technology especially over the past three decades have rendered various kinds of information, both wholesome and unwholesome, increasingly accessible to practically everyone including the younger generation. More than ever before today’s adolescents have their own portable computers, cell phones, and tablets with Internet access, exposing them to oceans of unfiltered music, lewd pictures, beguiling advertising, social media connections some of which might be risky, and other kinds of information.

Should only wholesome information be available to students in the quantities made possible by the onset of the information age, teachers would have been challenged to educate their students to choose the best of the good. However, with the influx of tainted information within easy reach of the average K-12 student, the challenges teachers face to guide them in the varied aspects of choice including purchasing,

listening, viewing, reading, sharing, and time management are even greater. In these areas perhaps more than in others, students need to be taught critical thinking skills guided by God-ordained values so that they can intelligently govern themselves not only in the classroom, but under all circumstances.

Summary of Major Findings Related to Technology

1. Schools have been increasing their computer technology assets for both students and teachers but availability of technical support is a cause for concern.
2. By 2007, Internet access in schools had leveled off to over 80%. Some schools do not access the Internet for philosophical reasons.
3. Only 0.2% of K-12 teachers reported having computer projectors in their schools in Profile 1997. It had leveled off to 53% in 2007, representing an increase of over 52% in 10 years.
4. Fax machines have declined in K-12 schools while email use has increased.
5. The use of video cameras and digital cameras has increased in K-12 schools.
6. The presence of DVD players increased substantively in K-12 schools from 2004-07.
7. For instruction/administration and communication, the e-Gradebook and Copier were used most frequently as opposed to Chat-rooms, PowerPoint, and Fax.
8. For Specific Tasks, teachers use Email, the Internet, and Word Processing most frequently as opposed to Tele/Web Conferencing and PowerPoint.
9. From 1995 -2001, more than three quarters of K-12 teachers perceived themselves as not being proficient (“in low gear”) in the use of technology in education.

CHAPTER VI

OTHER SYSTEM-WIDE ISSUES

We need certain pedagogical tools in order to teach critical thinking. Studies from cognitive science seem to quite conclusively suggest that the most efficient and effective way to increase a student's ability in the arena of critical thinking is through extensive deliberate practice, and in particular, through extensive use of argument mapping. Indeed, it is no wonder that mapping arguments increases students' abilities to think critically, since to think critically just is to be able to accurately grasp the inferential connections between statements.

—Jennifer Mulnix

Introduction

Chapter 6 addresses the fourth research question targeting trends related to system-wide issues in K-12 Adventist education. These include vision-making and implementation, in which the Journey-to-Excellence (J2E) initiative features prominently, and teacher concerns. Due to the limitations of this study, only the four top-rated teacher concerns have been addressed in this chapter: spirituality in schools, instruction-related concerns, professional development, and teacher burnout.

As has been addressed in Chapter 1, the fragmentation issue in K-12 Adventist education has been largely resolved. The NADCC has strategized to ensure that, system-wide, teachers receive curriculum guides, textbooks, and other resources to enhance pedagogy. On the other hand, some aspects of implementing the vision, including the J2E initiative, remain a cause for concern. As subsequently shown, a historical overview of

the J2E initiative links the innovations discussed in Chapter 3 to the current Preferred Practices in this enterprise.

Journey to Excellence: Historical Overview

In 1995, after several cycles of the Profile Surveys had begun to make an impact, educational administrators at the Union and Division levels in the NAD sensed a need for developing a curriculum initiative to face the challenges of the 21st century within the unique framework of the Adventist philosophy of education. With this mission in mind, they organized the North American Division Curriculum Futures Commission (North American Division Office of Education [NADOE], 2003, p. 1). With James Epperson and Richard Osborn leading out as co-chairs, the NADCFC developed a report termed *Focus on Adventist Curriculum for the 21st Century, or FACT-21* (Epperson & Osborn, 1995). This report was based on Brantley's four-dimensional Quality Cycles model as shown in Figure 29 (Brantley, 1999).

The four dimensions, Purposes, Plans, Practices, and Products, were to operate cyclically so that plans and practices would be purpose-based and lead to desired products (Brantley, 1999). In conjunction with this venture, Preferred Practices were developed as a means of assessing the effectiveness of the various elements of FACT-21. While FACT-21 was a worthwhile initiative and well received by educators and administrators Division-wide, it was incomplete in that it addressed Grades 9-12 only:

That group [the NADCFC] focused on the 9-12 secondary program. Its report, titled *Focus on Adventist Curriculum for the 21st Century* and often referred to as the FACT-21 report, was approved by the North American Division Board of Education in 1997. Secondary schools across the Division began to develop initiatives for change based on this report. (NADOE, 2003, p. 1)

Figure 29. Brantley's Quality Cycles Model—Profile 1999. This graphic is from *Profile '99: A Report of Curriculum and Instruction in Seventh-day Adventist Schools* (p. 20), by P. S. Brantley, 1999, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Reprinted with permission.

In order to adjust its parameters to include elementary schools as well, the key components of the Quality Cycles Model (Figure 29) were expanded and revised to become the new K-12 overarching framework. Under the new name, Journey to Excellence (J2E), it was approved for Division-wide publication in 2002 (NADOE, 2003, p. 1). The remainder of this section analyzes responses to the fourth research question involving system-wide issues including trends relating to the J2E initiative.

FACT-21 in the Profile Surveys

With the inroads that FACT-21 had been making especially in senior academies Division-wide by the mid-to-late 1990s, it should not be surprising that it had infiltrated

curriculum guides prepared by the NAD as well. The following excerpt helps to explain how elements of the FACT-21 initiative shaped curriculum guides and found their way into the Profile 1997 survey instrument as innovative educational practices:

Educational leadership at all levels in the North American Division has determined that the content of this report [FACT-21] is vital to the school improvement process in Adventist schools. Thus, the features of this program are being integrated into a variety of Adventist educational publications and resources such as curriculum guides and evaluation instruments. (NADOE, 2003, p. 1)

Since the Profile Surveys address curricula-related issues including curriculum guides and other related resources, survey items have appropriately targeted teachers' responses to that initiative with its related curricular innovations. Table 22 provides a snapshot of some relationships between those innovative educational practices and the current Preferred Practices in the J2E Initiative.

Table 22

Innovations in Profile 1997 as Precursors to Preferred Practices in Journey to Excellence Initiative

Profile 1997 Curriculum-related Innovations	Corresponding J2E Preferred Practices
Portfolios Multiple Intelligences & Learning Styles Innovative Instruction	Classroom Instruction Classroom Instruction Classroom Instruction
Integrated Curriculum Curriculum in Witnessing & Service	Integrated Curriculum Integrated Curriculum
Flexible Scheduling Teacher Networks EMG/CD Multimedia Inclusion for Disabilities School/work Programs	Time Utilization Staff Development Educational Technology Diversity Partnerships

As shown in Table 22, the 10 innovations included in Profile 1997 relate to several of the current J2E Preferred Practices. During that survey the majority of both system-level administrators and K-12 teachers admitted that they were not proficient in using those innovations. Implementation of the J2E initiative, which is foundational for the vision for excellence in K-12 Adventist education, therefore, is sadly at risk. As will be discussed later, however, K-12 teachers reported making substantive progress at the highest proficiency level of the J2E Preferred Practices, especially in the last survey in 2007.

The Connecticut State Education Resource Center (SERC) “describes the term ‘Best Practice’ as ‘what works’ in a particular situation or environment” (n.d., par. 4). According to this source, “we must keep in mind that a particular practice that has worked for someone within a given set of variables may or may not yield the same results across educational environments” (n.d., par. 4). In emphasizing the need for school personnel to create the right kinds of learning environments for students, Blum (n.d.) of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health proposes that school administrators should provide teachers with “time, training, and support” (summary paragraph, p. 6). This, she affirms, is essential in order for them to engage students at the “interpersonal, physical, emotional, and academic levels” (par. 6).

Approval of J2E: 2002

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the overarching framework for the J2E initiative resulted from an expansion and refinement of the Quality Cycles Model. The following excerpt regarding J2E sheds light on the beginnings of the initiative:

Recognizing that the material in the FACT-21 report had value for Adventist education K-12, the North American Division appointed a committee to revise and update the report, developing a document that would be fully K-12 in scope and current in content. This work was subsequently approved for publication in 2002. The primary components of the FACT-21 report—Philosophy, Goals, Essential Core Elements, and Preferred Practices—have been revised, expanded and integrated into this model for school improvement: *Journey to Excellence*. (NADOE, 2003, p. 1)

Following are the three J2E Preferred Practices without corresponding items from previous Profile Surveys: Administrative Leadership, Climate, and Student Assessment. As a backdrop, the expanded Quality Cycles Model which is the basis for the J2E Framework is subsequently discussed in relation to its interrelated components and characteristics.

Components of the J2E Framework

Foundational to this K-12 school improvement model are 10 philosophy-based goals for Adventist curricula presented below in summary form:

1. Acceptance of God
2. Commitment to the Church
3. Interpersonal Relationships
4. Responsible Citizenship
5. Healthy Balanced Living
6. Intellectual Development
7. Communication Skills
8. Personal Management
9. Aesthetic Appreciation
10. Career and Service. (NADOE, 2003, p. 6)

These goals reflect the holistic aspects of the Adventist philosophy of education: “It is the harmonious development of the physical, mental, and spiritual powers” (White, 1903, p. 13).

As chronicled by NADOE (2003) the J2E initiative promotes 10 Preferred Practices which fall under the canopy of two of the components of the J2E Model: *Plans*

(Resources) and *Practices* (Realities). See Figure 30. These are intended to enhance educational institutions when put into effect. *Plans* embrace the following four Preferred Practices: Educational Technology, Partnerships, Professional Development, and Time Utilization. Planning always should be results-oriented and carried out with the desired product in focus. *Practices* require expertise for effective assessment of existing structures and for integration of innovative, research-based ideas in collaboration with others. Associated with *Practices* are the following six Preferred Practices: Administrative Leadership and Development, Classroom Instruction, Climate, Diversity, Integrated Curriculum, and finally, Student Assessment.

Figure 30. Journey to Excellence (J2E) Model: 2003. This graphic is from *Journey to Excellence: A Focus on Adventist Education in the 21st Century*, p. 24 (DVD and related booklet), by North American Division Office of Education, 2003, Silver Spring, MD: Author. Reprinted with permission.

The two other components of the J2E Model, *Product* (Results) and *Evaluation* (Improvement), operate cyclically and recursively with Plans and Practices so that quality improvement is dynamic (Brantley & Hwangbo, 2000; NADOE, 2003). Seventh-day Adventist Christian schools always need to evaluate the kinds of graduates (products) they are releasing into society. While the school might be only one of the many factors influencing student characteristics, it certainly is an important one considering that K-12 students spend a substantial part of their time at school (Hofferth & Sandberg, 2001; Stevenson, 1992; Wherry, 2004).

Access to J2E Report

In the 2004 survey K-12 teachers were asked to respond to 11 questions related to the J2E initiative. The first sought to determine whether or not respondents had received a copy of the J2E report and the other 10 related to awareness and use of the 10 Preferred Practices. Responses to the first question, “*Have you received a copy of the Journey to Excellence (J2E) report?*” are shown in Table 23.

Overall the statistics in Table 23 communicate significant improvement in terms of the numbers of teachers who reported having the J2E report over the 3-year period spanning the last two Profile Surveys. In Profile 2004, 41.7% (190) of K-12 teachers reported receiving a copy of the J2E report versus 63.4% (492) in Profile 2007, an increase of 21.7 percentage points. The increased ratings in Profile 2007 over those of 2004 could be attributable to the time lapse between the two surveys.

Considering that 3 years intervened between the two studies, it should not be surprising that the J2E initiative had made some further headway among K-12 educators, with 21.7% more teachers affirming that they had received a copy of the report in Profile

Table 23

Responses From K-12 Teachers: “Have You Received a Copy of the Journey to Excellence (J2E) Report?”

Options	2004		2007	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
No	166	36.4	157	20.2
Yes	190	41.7	492	63.4
Not Sure	100	21.9	127	16.4
TOTAL	456	100.0	776	100.0

Note. From *Profile 2007: Final Report* (p. 32), by L. D. Burton (Ed.), 2009, December. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews International Center for Educational Research. Adapted with permission.

2007 than in the previous survey. However, the 36.8% who reported that they either had not received a copy, or were uncertain as to whether or not they had, is a cause for concern. Since the report was available online when the 2007 survey was conducted, one would expect fewer teachers indicating that they had not received a copy. The 21.9% (100 teachers) and 16.4% (127 teachers) indicating uncertainty in terms of having the J2E report in Profiles 2004 and 2007 respectively possibly could be mostly newer teachers who were unaware of the resource.

The J2E Preferred Practices

As displayed in Table 24, K-12 teacher ratings of the 10 Preferred Practices were included in six of the Profile Surveys spanning the years between 1995 and 2007. As mentioned earlier, some of the Preferred Practices were under the umbrella of FACT-21

until 2002. In those surveys K-12 teachers were asked to select from six options to indicate their degrees of awareness and use of the 10 Preferred Practices. While the wording of survey items differed slightly from year to year, responses to questions representing similar goals, and included in both FACT-21 and J2E, have been included in Table 24. Teachers were offered the following six options or their equivalents from which to select their responses: (a) Never Heard of; (b) Heard About; (c) Basic Understanding; (d) Attempted; (e) Quite Knowledgeable of; and (f) Proficient in Helping Teachers. While option “f” would also relate to system-level administrators, many principals in K-12 schools serve as administrator, teacher, and peer coach. Helping teachers with the J2E Preferred Practices therefore would apply to them as well. This explains the reason for its inclusion in the K-12 data in Table 24.

Each of the three major headings in Table 24 comprises a combination of two of the response options. The first, “Never Heard of/Heard About,” represents the lowest two options in the ratings. The second, “Basic Understanding/Attempted,” reflects the two middle choices; and the third, “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers,” embodies the two highest proficiency levels based on the ratings.

In order to provide varied perspectives of the data, Figures 31-40 have been generated from Table 24, three for each of the two lower proficiency levels, and four for the highest. The first graphic at each level reflects the raw data; another is based on the lowest and highest ratings for each Preferred Practice for the years included. For the “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” level, yet another figure compares data from the last two surveys.

Table 24

Awareness/Use of Preferred Practices as Reported by K-12 Teachers: Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, & 2007 (in Percentages)

Preferred Practices	Year	Never Heard of/ Heard About	Basic Understand- ing/Attempted	Quite Knowledgeable of/ Proficient in Helping Teachers	Total <i>N</i>
Administrative Leadership	1999	227 (40.5)	169 (30.2)	62 (11.1)	560
	2004	146 (31.2)	88 (18.8)	58 (12.4)	468
	2007	385 (44.8)	300 (34.9)	167 (19.4)	859
Classroom Instruction	1995	148 (22.0)	439 (65.1)	137 (13.2)	674
	1997	185 (42.4)	206 (47.2)	29 (6.7)	436
	1999	141 (25.2)	178 (31.8)	117 (20.9)	560
	2004	102 (21.8)	78 (16.7)	104 (22.2)	468
	2007	278 (32.4)	203 (23.6)	370 (43.1)	859
Climate	2004	121 (25.9)	55 (11.8)	105 (22.4)	468
	2007	313 (36.4)	103 (12.0)	335 (39.0)	859
Diversity	1995	533 (79.1)	128 (19.0)	12 (1.8)	674
	1997	189 (43.3)	186 (42.7)	37 (8.5)	436
	1999	129 (23.0)	184 (32.9)	139 (24.8)	560
	2004	112 (23.9)	65 (13.9)	103 (22.0)	468
	2007	292 (34.0)	220 (25.6)	339 (39.5)	859
Educational Technology	1997	127 (29.3)	266 (61.1)	30 (6.9)	436
	1999	159 (28.4)	142 (25.0)	166 (29.6)	560
	2004	104 (22.2)	68 (14.5)	108 (23.1)	468
	2007	280 (32.6)	269 (31.3)	302 (35.2)	859

Table 24—*Continued.*

Preferred Practices	Year	Never Heard of/ Heard About	Basic Understand- ing/Attempted	Quite Knowledgeable of/ Proficient in Helping Teachers	Total <i>N</i>
Integrated Curriculum	1995	215 (31.9)	377 (55.9)	78 (11.6)	674
	1997	118 (27.1)	221 (50.7)	72 (16.5)	436
	1999	119 (21.3)	243 (43.4)	164 (29.3)	560
	2001	73 (11.7)	436 (69.6)	105 (16.8)	626
	2004	101 (21.6)	95 (20.3)	86 (18.4)	468
	2007	276 (32.4)	262 (30.8)	313 (36.8)	859
Partnerships	1995	368 (54.6)	295 (43.8)	10 (1.5)	674
	1997	184 (42.2)	221 (50.7)	11 (2.5)	436
	1999	262 (46.8)	160 (28.6)	45 (8.0)	560
	2004	142 (30.3)	99 (21.2)	40 (8.5)	468
	2007	374 (43.5)	318 (37.0)	160 (18.6)	859
Staff Development	1995	266 (39.5)	372 (55.2)	36 (5.3)	674
	1997	131 (30.0)	270 (61.9)	20 (4.6)	436
	1999	158 (28.2)	158 (28.2)	134 (23.9)	560
	2001	168 (26.8)	405 (64.7)	36 (5.8)	626
	2004	118 (25.2)	78 (16.7)	85 (18.2)	468
	2007	340 (39.6)	271 (31.5)	239 (27.8)	859

Table 24—*Continued.*

Preferred Practices	Year	Never Heard of/ Heard About	Basic Understand- ing/Attempted	Quite Knowledgeable of/ Proficient in Helping Teachers	Total <i>N</i>
Student Assessment	1995	319 (47.3)	335 (49.7)	17 (2.5)	674
	1997	163 (37.4)	236 (54.1)	19 (4.4)	436
	2001	218 (34.8)	350 (55.9)	38 (6.1)	626
	2004	105 (22.4)	71 (15.2)	106 (22.6)	468
	2007	278 (32.4)	217 (25.3)	354 (41.2)	859
Time Utilization	1995	264 (39.2)	361 (53.6)	46 (6.8)	674
	1997	140 (32.2)	218 (50.0)	48 (11.0)	436
	1999	148 (26.4)	157 (28.0)	157 (28.0)	560
	2004	119 (25.4)	87 (18.6)	78 (16.7)	468
	2007	332 (38.6)	260 (30.3)	257 (29.9)	859

Finally, the last graphic in each subsection compares the aggregates for earlier years to corresponding aggregates for Profiles 2004 and 2007, the last two surveys.

“Never Heard of/Heard About”

Figures 31, 32, and 33 display trends related to K-12 teachers who “Never Heard of/Heard About” the 10 Preferred Practices, the lowest proficiency level. One would hope that the numbers of teachers who never heard or barely heard about the Preferred Practices would decrease over time with the higher proficiency levels concurrently increasing. However, the data in Figure 31 show a fluctuating pattern instead.

Figure 32 paints another picture: the highest and lowest data for each of the Preferred Practices over the years. It also compares the data from Profile 2007 to the highest and lowest statistics. At a glance, the highest statistics in terms of teachers who “Never Heard of/Heard About” the 10 Preferred Practices peak at three points: Diversity (79.1%), Partnerships (54.6%) and Student Assessment (47.3%), all of which are included in surveys prior to Profile 2007, and therefore not a recently added perspective. For the seven other Preferred Practices, however, the highest numbers of K-12 teachers who never heard or only heard about the Preferred Practices belong in the Profile 2007 data. This is possibly attributable to staff turnover as new teachers who do not know about the initiative enter the system.

The three lowest ratings went to Integrated Curriculum (11.7%), Classroom Instruction (21.8%), and Diversity (22.2). It also should be noted that some of the Preferred Practices, namely Administrative Leadership, Partnerships, Staff Development, and Time Utilization, are administrative by nature and would not directly relate to most classroom teachers.

Figure 31. Percentage ratings of K-12 teachers who have “never heard of/heard about” the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, & 2007 (based on Table 24).

Figure 32. Highest and lowest statistics for K-12 teachers who “never heard of/heard about” J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, & 2007 (based on Table 24). Profile 2007 data included in “High” and “Low” aggregates; also included separately for comparison with highest and lowest aggregated ratings. Profile 2007 data have been included only for comparison since they are the most current available.

Figure 33. Aggregates of K-12 teachers who “never heard of/heard about” each of the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001 vs. Profile 2004, & 2007 (based on Table 24). For Administrative Leadership, data for the 1995-2001 category are available for 1999 only. Similarly, for Climate, no data are available for 1995-2001.

Figure 33, the last for this low proficiency level, shows averages based on teacher ratings for each of the Preferred Practices using two groupings: aggregated data from Profiles 1995 to 2001 versus averaged data from Profiles 2004 and 2007. For five of the Preferred Practices the differences in the aggregated data from 1995 to 2001 versus from 2004 to 2007 are negligible as they fall within the standard margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points. Those comprise Classroom Instruction (28.4% vs. 28.6%), Educational Technology (28.7% vs. 28.9%), Time Utilization (33.1% vs. 34.0%), Staff Development (31.5% vs. 34.5%), and Administrative Leadership (40.5% vs. 40.0%). Teachers who reported never hearing of the other four Preferred Practices with comparative aggregates from 1995 to 2001 out-numbered those for 2004 to 2007 in all but one instance by several percentage points. The exception was for Integrated Curriculum (22.9% vs. 28.4%), showing that 5.5% more K-12 teachers reported never hearing of this Preferred Practice in the two most current Profile Surveys than in the previous ones. For Student Assessment (40.3% vs. 28.9%), Diversity (51.0% vs. 30.4%), and Partnerships (48.7% vs. 38.9%), the data show that teachers have improved in this area in terms of more of them hearing about the Preferred Practices, by 11.4%, 20.6%, and 9.8% respectively.

“Attempted/Have Basic Understanding”

Figures 34, 35, and 36 showcase ratings of K-12 teachers who have “Attempted” the Preferred Practices or have a “Basic Understanding” of them. Figure 34 shows that as with the lowest proficiency level, the data for the middle proficiency level fluctuates over the years. While the graphic portrays a general trend of more teachers attempting or

having a basic understanding of the Preferred Practices between 1995 and 2001 than in 2004 and 2007, the “loss” is positive as perusal of the data for the highest proficiency level validates.

Figure 35 depicts the highest and lowest ratings for each of the Preferred Practices between 1995 and 2007 and further compares Profile 2007 statistics to those data.

“Educational Technology” (61.1%), “Staff Development” (64.7%), and “Classroom Instruction” (65.1%) earned the three highest ratings between 1995 and 2007 in terms of teachers who had “Attempted” or “[Had a] Basic Understanding” of the J2E Preferred Practices. Conversely, “Climate” (11.8%), “Diversity” (13.9%) and “Educational Technology” (14.5%) earned the three lowest ratings during the same period. Practically all of the ratings for Profile 2007 are sandwiched somewhere between the highest and lowest scores, but “Climate” ratings dip significantly.

Finally in this subsection, Figure 36 displays aggregates of K-12 teachers who have “Basic Understanding/Attempted” the Preferred Practices for 1995 to 2001 versus averages for 2004 and 2007. The averages based on data for 2004 and 2007 are all lower than the corresponding aggregates from previous years. However, the data communicate improvement especially when compared with corresponding data at the highest proficiency level (see Figure 37).

A superficial look at Figure 36 might seem to communicate retrogression on the part of teachers, since in the two most current Profile Surveys, fewer of them reported having attempted the Preferred Practices, or understanding the basics about them, than in the earlier years. However, when compared with Figure 37, the statistics show that many more teachers now claim proficiency at the highest level than ever before. This suggests

Figure 34. Percentage ratings of K-12 teachers who “attempted/have basic understanding” of” J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2007 (based on Table 24).

Figure 35. Highest and lowest statistics for K-12 teachers who “have basic understanding/attempted” the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2007 (based on Table 24). Since Profile 2007 data are the most recent they have been included for comparison.

Figure 36. Aggregates of K-12 teachers who have “basic understanding/attempted” the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001 vs. Profiles 2004, and 2007 (based on Table 24). Statistics for Administrative Leadership prior to 2004 available for 1999 only; similarly, Climate statistics available for 2004 and 2007 only.

that some of those who were at the lowest and middle proficiency levels in previous surveys may have moved up to the third and highest level, or new teachers may have entered the system and changed the mix.

“Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient
in Helping Teachers”

The last four graphics related to the J2E Initiative, Figures 37 through 40, display ratings of K-12 teachers who were “Quite Knowledgeable of” the J2E Preferred Practices at the time the surveys were conducted. While the statistics in Figure 37 show some fluctuation from one Profile Survey to another, they also indicate that the ratings from Profile 2007 were substantively higher than those of previous years. In addition, even a casual look at the data in Figure 38 also confirms considerable growth at the highest proficiency level between Profiles 2004 and 2007. The lower five rate increases for the 10 Preferred Practices during that 3-year period ranged from 7.0% to 13.2% versus 16.6% to 20.9% for the upper five. Again it should be noted that the four Preferred Practices related to the administrative role were all included in the lower five rate increases, possibly because they do not apply to the majority of K-12 teachers.

Figure 39 provides yet another snapshot of the data. The statistics display the percentage ranges in the “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” skill level for each of the 10 Preferred Practices for the six surveys from Profiles 1995 to Profile 2007. No effort was made to deliberately isolate the Profile 2007 figures, but since they happened to be rated the highest in all the years represented for each of the Preferred Practices, they stand out as a separate category. The lowest ratings for the 10

Figure 37. Percentage ratings of K-12 teachers who are “quite knowledgeable of/proficient in helping teachers” with the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2007 (based on Table 24).

Figure 38. Comparative ratings of K-12 teachers who were “quite knowledgeable of /proficient in helping teachers” with the J2E preferred practices—Profile 2004 vs. Profile 2007 (based on Figure 37).

Figure 39. Comparative ratings of K-12 teachers who were “quite knowledgeable of/proficient in helping teachers” with the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, and 2004, vs. Profile 2007 (based on Table 24).

Figure 40. Aggregates of K-12 teachers who were “quite knowledgeable of/proficient in helping teachers” with the J2E preferred practices—Profiles 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001 vs. Profiles 2004 and 2007 (based on Table 24). Data for Administrative Leadership prior to 2004 available for 1999 only: not aggregated. Data for Climate available for 2004 and 2007 only.

Preferred Practices in the “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” category through the years ranges from 1.5% to 22.4%. Conversely, the highest comparative ratings ranged from 18.6% to 43.1%, all in Profile 2007.

Finally, the statistics in Figure 40 show the aggregates for each of the Preferred Practices from Profiles 1995 to 2001 compared with the averages from the two most current surveys, Profiles 2004 and 2007. Based on Figure 40, averages from the 2004 and 2007 data all outshine those from 1995-2001. Overall the ratings for the “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” category indicate substantive improvement and are therefore encouraging.

Perspectives on J2E Best Practices

Based on Profile 2007 qualitative comments as subsequently illustrated, some K-12 Adventist teachers are hardly acquainted with the J2E initiative or its goals:

1. What's "Journey to Excellence?" (Yes, I've seen the phrase on stuff.) I just went and looked at the site. I now remember checking it out a year or two ago after getting something in the mail. Someone's put together some interesting looking stuff--what do we do with it?! If there were some "thrust" or initiative going, we might be looking here for resources or direction. (Burton, 2007, p. 80)
2. As I explored the Journey to Excellence website I was looking for something like a PDF file where I could read the Journey to Excellence document. It seems to just move from link to link without giving a lot of substance. (p. 78)
3. I have never had the whole "Journey to Excellence" concept explained to me. I REALLY don't get how we are supposed to be using it. (p. 79)
4. Could this website be put into a one week seminar class for the regular classroom teacher along with the NAD and the Circle websites to offer the regular classroom teacher access to these sites and see how it would be useful for the teacher? (p. 80)

One respondent wrote that in an effort to boost teacher acquaintance with the J2E initiative, the goals could be made available in “printable poster” format. In addition, they

could be rewritten “for lower elementary use” (p. 79). Another suggested providing online chat sessions and books about innovations such as the J2E initiative “from a Best Practices perspective” (p. 72).

In his thought-provoking article titled, “Can We Trust ‘Best Practices?’” Rozycki (2005) attests:

Positive signs that a purported best practice can be trusted fall into three types: firm basis, proper focus, and reasonable expectation. We should check whether the basis of a practice is broad experience and uncontroversial theory. . . . Second, does the “best practice” we are reviewing focus precisely on our need? Or is it a stretch to bring it into our context of application? . . . Does the “best practice” we are reviewing address expectations? Is what is expected prevention, avoidance, amelioration, or restitution? A practice that works very well for prevention, say, may do little if our goal is restitution. Locking the barn door is pointless once the cow is gone. (pp. 227-228)

On the issue of proper focus, Fullan (2008) submits that many curricular reforms fail because the focus is on the innovation itself rather than on classroom practice. Many teachers who are willing to adopt innovations do so only superficially because they have not been effectively oriented in the related changes they need to make at the core of their pedagogy in order to successfully implement the innovation. Essentially, any kind of reform in education requires much time and careful planning.

Teacher Concerns

As with other professionals, teachers experience stressful situations and one of the goals of the Profile Surveys was to determine their greatest concerns. Only as needs are known can they be addressed. “In 1986, members of the NADCC independently listed what each considered to be the greatest needs of the field requiring the most urgent attention by NADCC” (Brantley, 1987, p. 9). Brantley used those lists as “a nucleus” for

the 30 concerns listed below. In Profiles 1987 and 1989, teachers were asked to indicate their four most prominent and urgent concerns based on this list:

1. Better coordination between secondary and college
2. Career education
3. Critical thinking skills
4. Discipline/classroom management
5. Home Economics
6. Improving instructional strategies
7. Language Arts / English
8. Making teaching more attractive
9. Professional development of teachers
10. Reading
11. Sex Education—AIDS
12. Social Studies
13. Spiritual commitment in SDA Schools
14. Supervision of teaching
15. Teacher evaluation
16. Board member orientation
17. Computer issues
18. Disadvantaged / inner city
19. Foreign language
20. Implementation of the curriculum
21. Library improvement
22. Mathematics
23. Multi-ethnic racial adjustment
24. Music & Art
25. Secondary Bible
26. Secondary Science
27. Special education; mainstreaming
28. Standardized testing/classroom assessment
29. Teacher burnout
30. Work education (Brantley, 1987, p. 9).

Along with this list of 30 items in the first two surveys, teachers were asked to rank a list of 16 potential “work-related problems” on a scale of 1-9. A comparative look at the 16 problems shows that seven of the items overlap with the first 30. Table 25 displays the similar items from the two lists. This explains the reason for discussing both lists under “Teacher Concerns.” The major concerns depicted in Table 26 are based primarily on responses related to the 30 “Teacher Concerns.” However, ratings from the

“Work-related Problems” list provided in Profiles 1987 and 1989 also have been included in the numbers of occurrences in each category.

1. Time management/work overload
2. Lack of student spirituality
3. Inadequate budget for classroom instruction
4. Keeping physically fit
5. School morale
6. Reaching students with effective teaching methods
7. Conference Education Department’s supportiveness of classroom instruction
8. Racial/ethnic adjustment problems in this school
9. Coping with many ability levels
10. Feelings of professional stagnation & isolation
11. Classroom discipline problems
12. Inadequate space for instruction/overcrowded conditions
13. Supportiveness of parents
14. Lack of basic teaching supplies
15. Principal’s supportiveness of classroom instruction
16. Carrying out standardized testing (Brantley, 1990, p. 10).

Since addressing all teacher concerns within the confines of this study would be impractical, it was necessary to strategize in order to determine which of them to include. The first step was to make a master table comprising “Teacher Concerns” and “Work-related Problems” using the four highest ratings in each year that such items were included in the surveys. The next step was to manually count and record the number or occurrences of each concern and problem in the master table for elementary and academy subgroups combined. The third and final step, the result of which is shown in Table 26, was to extract the four most frequently repeated concerns through the years based on the counts from the master table and showcase them separately for inclusion in this study.

The wording of the items and the rating scales varied with the surveys. However, sufficient similarity existed for continuity among the various survey items through some years. Results also might have been different had teachers been given the same list of options from which to choose for all of the surveys. In Profiles 1987 and 1989 for

Table 25

Areas of overlap between “Teacher Concerns” and “Work-related Problems” from Profiles 1987 and 1989

Teacher Concerns	Work-related Problems
1. Discipline, classroom management	1. Classroom discipline problems
2. Improving instructional strategies	2. Reaching students with effective teaching methods
3. Professional development of teachers	3. Conference Education Department’s supportiveness of classroom instruction
4. Spiritual commitment in SDA schools	4. Lack of student spirituality
5. Multi-ethnic racial adjustment problems	5. Racial/ethnic adjustment problems in this school
6. Special education; mainstreaming	6. Coping with many ability levels
7. Teacher burnout	7. Feelings of professional stagnation and isolation

Note. Information in left column from *Curriculum and Instruction in Seventh-day Adventist Schools—A Profile of Teacher Concerns: An Executive Summary* (p. 9), by P. S. Brantley, 1987, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Information in right column from *Curriculum and Instruction in Adventist Schools—A Profile of Teacher Concerns: A Final Report of the Profile ’89 Survey* (p. 10), by P. S. Brantley, 1990, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. Adapted with permission.

example, teachers were given the original list of 30 concerns from which to select the top four, and the selections for the two surveys were similar, with “Spirituality,” “Teacher Burnout,” and “Critical Thinking” topping the ratings in both years. Ratings were different in subsequent years, conceivably based on changes in the options presented.

In tabulating the items for Table 26, the following three closely related concerns were combined for analysis: having increasing numbers of children with special needs, teaching students critical thinking skills, and learning effective ways to improve student

achievement. For analysis purposes these were grouped under “Instruction-related Concerns.”

As shown in Table 26 the four most prominent K-12 teacher concerns based on ratings from the Profile Surveys were “Spirituality in SDA Schools,” “Instruction-related Concerns,” “Professional Development,” and “Teacher Burnout.” “Spirituality in SDA Schools” as a Teacher Concern featured 14 times in the master table. Comparatively, the combined data for “Instruction-related Concerns” also featured 14 times. The two other categories, “Professional Development” and “Teacher Burnout,” were included nine and eight times respectively. These concerns have been analyzed in the order displayed in Table 26.

Spirituality in Adventist Schools

Concerns about spirituality in schools and integrating faith with learning have been featured as paramount among K-12 teachers from the inception of the Profile Surveys. Among the 30 items listed earlier in this chapter, “Spirituality in Adventist Schools” was cited most often as an urgent concern in Profiles 1987, 1989, and 1995 by both elementary and academy teachers. In addition, Profile 1993 data related to concerns about teaching show that “‘implementing spiritual concepts into teaching’ is of perennial interest to educators as is ‘learning up-to-date teaching strategies’” (Brantley & Burton, 1993, p. 18). While actual percentage ratings are not available for 1987 and 1989, related statistics from Profile 1995 show that 77% (518) of the 671 K-12 teachers who responded to the “Teacher Concerns” item expressed concern about themselves and their students “developing a more vibrant faith in God” (Brantley, 1996, p. 6).

Table 26

Most Prominent K-12 Teacher Concerns (Including “Work-Related Problems”): Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2007

Top Four Urgent Concerns	Number of Occurrences in Master Table		
	Teacher Concerns	Work-Related Problems	Total <i>n</i>
1. Concerns about Spirituality in Adventist Schools	10	4	14
2. Instruction-related Concerns:	10	4	14
a. Increasing numbers of children with special needs			
b. Teaching students to think critically			
c. Strategizing to improve student achievement			
3. Professional Development Concerns	7	2	9
4. Teacher Burnout (Related to the Following):	4	4	8
a. Coping with special needs students			
b. Lack of networking opportunities with peers			
c. Conflicting time demands/work overload			

Note. “Number of Occurrences” is based on separate ratings for elementary and academy teachers for each year represented.

Research findings indicate that attendance at Christian schools does impact students positively and holistically. Based on a CognitiveGenesis survey conducted from 2006-2009, students who attended Adventist schools “were above average in achievement compared to national norms. . . . The more years students attended Adventist schools, the higher they achieved” (Thayer & Kido, 2012, p. 1). Also, in a *Cardus Education Survey* conducted in 2012 and 2013, and featuring administrators,

teachers, and graduates from various religious and nonreligious persuasions, results indicated that “graduates of Protestant Christian schools excel spiritually, academically, and culturally” (Jeynes, 2008, par. 2). A related study by Uecker 2009 yielded similar results. Integrating spirituality into the entire ethos of educational institutions can reciprocate both in spiritual advancement and in improved academic performance. In discussing the most potent basis for academic improvement, White (1913) wrote:

There is nothing more calculated to energize the mind and strengthen the intellect than the study of the Word of God. No other book is so potent to elevate the thoughts, to give vigor to the faculties, as the broad, ennobling truths of the Bible. If God’s Word were studied as it should be, men would have a breadth of mind, a nobility of character, and a stability of purpose that are rarely seen in these times. (p. 460)

She also stated that “as an educating power the Bible is of more value than the writings of all the philosophers of all ages” (White, 1913, p. 428). While faith-and-learning integration in no way negates the need to study and apply relevant findings of scholars in academia for learning enhancement purposes, it should certainly, for optimal results, permeate every aspect of school life.

On a related note, Profile 1999 included an item on integrating faith and learning at schools as a Preferred Practice. Teachers were provided with a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “No Interest” to “Proficient” from which to select their responses. The cumulative mean indicated that from a total of 553 K-12 teacher respondents, 19% (105) would “Like to Try” integrating faith throughout instruction; 43% (239) had “Started Implementing” that practice by the time Profile 1999 was conducted, and 30% (167) considered themselves Proficient at integrating faith throughout instruction. The data show that the majority of K-12 teachers, 62%, were willing to try integrating faith with instruction or had actually started doing so at the time of the 1999 Profile Survey.

Perhaps a lack of proficiency in integrating faith with instruction undergirds the consistent perception of waning spirituality in schools.

In their qualitative comments, Adventist teachers have often elaborated on their concerns regarding spirituality in schools. In commenting on desirable curricular improvements, one teacher wrote: “I am very concerned that students reaching 9th and 10th grade levels have little or no knowledge of end-time events or basic fundamentals of SDA beliefs” (Brantley & Burton, 1994, p. 5). Another Profile ’93 respondent wrote:

I would like to see some sort of booklet giving important religious and SDA events correlated with world and U.S. History. It would help in teaching and studies with a Biblical perspective. A booklet would be nice because it could contain more detail than just a timeline. (p. 5)

Following are some additional related comments from Profile 2007: “Incorporate the Christian experience with practical ideas within each subject area” (Burton, 2007, p. 122). Another wrote about the need for having Christian principles permeate learning: “[Teachers need to know] how to make religious education a life-changing, faith-building experience for students. Emphasize the mission of the church and require students to get involved in this mission at an early age” (p. 99). Still another wrote about the need for having Christ-centered lessons daily in the classroom (Burton, 2007).

As stated in Chapters 3 and 4, both classroom teachers and students use textbooks for several hours each day in the classroom, and with such extensive use, the content cannot but impact users either positively or negatively. In view of the need for using textbooks to integrate faith with learning, Cox et al. (2007) advocate that Christian values should permeate all textbooks used in Christian schools. On a similar note, G. Knight (2010) concurs: “Adventist education that does not provide a Biblical understanding of the arts, sciences, humanities, and the world of work is not Christian” (p. 47).

In the most closely related Profile 2001 survey item, K-12 educators were asked to respond to the following question: *“In general, do you feel that Adventist schools are putting their educational philosophy into practice?”* Respondents were offered a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “Definitely Yes” to “Definitely Not” from which to choose their responses to this question. Of the 626 K-12 respondents, only 15% (95) opted for “Definitely Yes”; the 70% majority (437) selected “Yes; somewhat”; 12% (76) chose “Not Really,” and 2% (10), “Definitely Not.” Again, the perception of the majority of K-12 teachers at least up to 2001 was that Adventist schools are only “somewhat” implementing the Adventist educational philosophy. According to Dr. R. L. Davidson, chair of the Curriculum and Instruction department at Andrews University, this could be partly attributable to regional perceptions/interpretations of the Adventist educational philosophy. “Some areas of the country are much more conservative than others and that will relate to whether [or not] they think the Adventist philosophy is being implemented” (R. L. Davidson, personal communication, January 30, 2013).

While textbook use is a major factor in representing Christian principles or lack of them in the curriculum, disseminating Christian values depends largely on Christian teachers in the classroom. White (1913) submits that if instructors are truly converted and have a vital connection with God, they will be able to communicate to their students what they have themselves experienced. In a similar vein, Gaebelein (1968) emphasizes:

The school or college that would develop a Christ-centered and Biblically grounded program must fly from its masthead this standard, “No Christian education without Christian teachers,” and must never, under any condition, pull its colors down. Compromise of this issue, if persisted in, always results in the progressive de-Christianizing of an institution. (p. 37)

Indeed, Christian teachers are needed to integrate faith with learning in the classroom. However, not every teacher is at the same stage of Christian development, and even practicing Christians may need to be taught how to purposefully integrate faith with learning. As G. Knight (1980) advocates, the entire school ethos should vibrate with Christian values. Without schools that are truly Christian, the purpose of “Christian” education is defeated.

Quantitative items directly related to spirituality in schools as a teacher concern were not included in Profiles 2004 and 2007. However, as displayed in Figure 9, means derived from survey results show that a range of about 45% to 62% of teachers perceived the curriculum guides in some key subjects as supporting the Adventist philosophy of education. While this range represents the highest ratings from the three options including ease of use and representation of best practices, substantive numbers still see a shortfall in that direction.

Instruction-Related Concerns

Three categories of data reflected teacher concerns related to classroom instruction: having increasing numbers of children with special needs, with seven occurrences; teaching students to think critically, with four occurrences; and finally, learning effective ways to improve student achievement, with three occurrences, adding to a total of 14 occurrences for “Instruction-related Concerns.”

Students With Special Needs

In the first four Profile Surveys, K-12 teachers ranked mainstreaming concerns in either first or second place among “Work-related Problems” or “Teacher Concerns.” In

addition, while mainstreaming was not featured under those categories in subsequent surveys, teacher responses to related items continued to highlight it as a leading cause of concern through the years. In the first two Profile Surveys conducted in 1987 and 1989, respectively, K-12 teachers ranked items related to mainstreaming second among “Work-related Problems.” In the third and fourth surveys, Profiles 1991 and 1993, teachers also rated mainstreaming problems second and first, respectively, among “Teacher Concerns.”

Among the 16 “Work-related Problems” that K-12 teachers were asked to rank in Profiles 1987 and 1989, “Time management/Work overload” topped the ratings, seconded by “Coping with many ability levels.” Mainstreaming was not rated prominently among the 30 teacher concerns, possibly because it had been rated under “Work-related Problems” in the same survey. In Profile 1991, 525 elementary/junior academy teachers were asked to rate nine teacher concerns. The item relating to mainstreaming received the second highest rating with 72% (378) of teachers opting for “getting more children with special needs” as a cause for concern (Brantley, 1992). In Profile 1993, ratings surged upward with 80% of elementary teachers ($N = 451$) and 76% of academy teachers ($N = 203$) rating mainstreaming as the leading concern.

Realizing a problem existed, the NAD created the *Exceptional Child Curriculum Guide* designed to help alleviate the mainstreaming challenge for all grade levels from K-12. Unfortunately, as verified in Table 7 and Figure 4, data from Profiles 1987, 1989, and 1991 show that at least up to 1991 the curriculum guide was little known or used among K-12 teachers. On a related note, ratings from Profiles 1997, 1999, 2004, and 2007 indicated that mainstreaming is still a prominent problem in K-12 classrooms.

While the goals of the survey items for those years differed from those of previous surveys, the results shed light on the same issue.

As shown in Table 3 based on Profile 1997, teachers were asked to rate their perceptions of several innovative practices, including “Inclusion for Disabilities.” In rating this item, 10% of elementary teachers ($N = 381$) and 6% of academy teachers ($N = 129$) reported that they used inclusion proficiently. In addition, 21% of elementary teachers and 22% of academy teachers opted for “Would like to try.” While teachers who have been using the innovation and those who would like to try are to be commended, the majority of K-12 teachers who are not included in these groupings are a cause for concern.

As shown in many of the Profile Surveys, the issue of inclusion has generally been a major concern for instructors. In Profile 1999 teachers were asked to write qualitative responses to the following question: “If you could choose ONE TOPIC you would like to see featured at a national convention of SDA educators, what would it be?” (Brantley, 1999, p. 13). Stakeholder responses, including those from 276 elementary teachers and 90 academy teachers, were tabulated. Among 42 topics related to “Student Issues” submitted by elementary teachers, “special education” featured 17 times, making it the third most prominent single topic choice from that subgroup (Brantley, 1999). Students with special needs did not feature in academy teacher responses for this question. Table 27 sheds additional light on teachers’ perspectives of having students with special needs in their classrooms.

In the 2004 Profile Survey, K-12 teachers were asked to rate their responses to the item: “*I welcome students with special needs in my classroom.*” The five options ranged

Table 27

Students With Special Needs in the Classroom: Elementary and Academy Teacher Perspectives—Profile 2004 (in Percentages)

Respond to the following: *“I welcome students with special needs in my classroom.”*

	Elementary Teachers	Academy Teachers	K-12 Teachers
Strongly Disagree	4 (1.5)	1 (0.1)	5 (1.1)
Disagree	26 (9.7)	13 (8.1)	39 (9.1)
Neutral	80 (29.7)	42 (26.1)	122 (28.4)
Agree	111 (41.3)	80 (49.7)	191 (44.4)
Strongly Agree	48 (17.8)	25 (15.5)	73 (17.0)
TOTALS	269 (100.0)	161 (100.0)	430 (100.0)

Note. From *Profile 2004 Final Report* (p. 85), by L. D. Burton, 2005, Tucson, AZ: Author. Adapted with permission.

from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*. Table 27 summarizes the responses of the 269 elementary and 161 academy teachers who responded to this item. Results showed some degree of consistency in the way both groups of teachers prioritized their responses. Both elementary and academy teachers selected “Agree,” “Neutral,” “Strongly Agree,” “Disagree,” and “Strongly Disagree” in descending order in terms of the number of ratings for each option. In other words, “Agree” enjoyed the highest rating with a total of 191 teachers (44.4%) selecting that option, followed by “Neutral” ($N = 122$: 28.4%). Adding the “Strongly Agree” responses ($N = 73$: 17.0%) to these, 2004 survey results indicated that nearly 90% of teachers agreed to, or at least did not mind (neutral) having students with special needs in their classrooms. This is notwithstanding the challenges

that mainstreaming presents to teachers. On another note, the 10.2% of K-12 teachers who opted for “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” is a cause for concern. It might be interesting to study outcomes for the special-needs students from the classrooms of those teachers.

While superficially it might seem that ratings from the 10.2% of K-12 teachers who disagree about having students with special needs in their classrooms appear cold and heartless, I hypothesize that those teachers’ responses at least in part relate to institutional factors. Glazzard (2011) reported that in a focus group targeting inclusion, and comprised of both teachers and teaching assistants, one participant commented on a possible correlation between teacher attitudes towards inclusion and standardized testing:

I was at a meeting before the child started school and the teacher who was going to be involved with John actually put up strong barriers before he arrived. She said she couldn’t cope with him before he started at the school and that she had to focus on getting her class through the SAT’s. She was negative from the word go. She never gave him a chance. John never actually really went into the classroom. He went into a classroom by himself and barricaded himself in. He was isolated in his own room. The school failed him. (p. 56)

Such a course is undoubtedly at odds with the goals of policy-makers. However, with the launching of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) initiative and its derivatives including Race to the Top (U.S. Department of Education, 2009), teachers have become increasingly stressed about their classroom performance. The relatively recent introduction of Common Core Standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010) and the imposition of high-stakes testing complicate matters, as teachers whose students are required to take the tests are rated, at least informally, on student test outcomes. The more students with special needs in a given classroom, the lower overall student test performance is likely to

be with its resulting negative impact on teacher rating, whether formal or informal; and teacher attitudes reflect their feelings about their work environment. No wonder some teachers and school principals alter student responses or coach them on test answers (“Bomshell Reports Show,” 2013; Lattanzio, 2014; Osunsami & Forer, 2011).

In some instances, especially in the public sector, the livelihood of teachers in terms of whether they will be hired or fired depends on test scores (Jacob & Levitt, 2003; Jonsson, 2011; van der Linden & Jeon, 2012). Unethical conduct is not excusable, especially in Christian circles. However, the legalities in the organizational fields in which both public and private schools operate tend to foster dishonest and negative behaviors. Without having to live with the stigma of being incompetent based on student performance on those standardized tests, it is likely that more teachers would welcome students with special needs in their classrooms.

Results from the final survey to date, Profile 2007, shed additional light on the mainstreaming issue. In that survey respondents were given the opportunity to air their views in various areas including issues impacting the educational system. Under this subsection, 32 qualitative comments regarding special education were included, a few of which addressed concerns regarding students with physical and mental limitations. “Although the issue of inclusion was discussed, most [of the comments] focused on gifted students” (Burton, 2009, p. 99). One respondent recommended that “[the NAD should] embed suggestions for classroom teachers on how to adapt and modify curricula for students of differing abilities” (Burton, 2007, p. 129). Another proposed “dual enrollment for exceptional, motivated high school juniors and seniors” (p. 112).

One teacher aired intense views on mainstreaming in the following words:

I have strong feelings that our schools have a Christian responsibility to be inclusive. I know of too many sad stories of students that have been turned away from our schools. . . .The truth is research shows that students do not do better in special education classrooms or pull-out settings. Teachers need to know that they CAN do it! The Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy do NOT support excluding students from our schools. We must stand up and be leaders of inclusive education as Jesus was. (Burton, 2007, p. 97)

Yet another shared the need to provide PD opportunities on inclusion and also to orient teachers in ways to reach non-Adventist students and parents, since increasing numbers are attending Adventist schools (Burton, 2007). While many teachers perceive mainstreaming as a challenge that needs to be addressed, the majority seem to share the view that keeping students with special needs in the regular classroom is the best among alternatives.

Outside of Adventist education, teachers communicate varied attitudes towards inclusion. De Boer, Pijl, and Minnaert (2011), for instance, reviewed 26 studies from different countries related to teacher attitudes towards inclusion and arrived at the following conclusion: “The majority of teachers hold neutral or negative attitudes towards the inclusion of pupils with special needs in regular primary education. No studies reported clear positive results” (p. 331). In another review of the literature, this time focusing on inclusion in the Netherlands, participants included parents and students as well as teachers. Results indicated “that all three groups hold neutral attitudes [about inclusion].” Results also showed that “a part of [*sic*] children with disabilities experience difficulties in their social participation and cannot find social connection with their classmates” (De Boer, Pijl, & Minnaert, 2012, p. 39).

In some individual studies, however, additional perspectives toward inclusion prevail among teachers. In an evaluative study conducted by Idol (2006) involving four

elementary and four secondary schools in the southwestern United States, for instance, it was determined that while teachers were willing to mainstream, they questioned the best methods to apply in order to have it work optimally. Overall they preferred to have the students with special needs “accompanied by a special education teacher or instructional assistant or continuing to have resource room services” (p. 77). Ross-Hill (2009) conducted another study using the Scale of Teachers’ Attitudes Towards Inclusive Classrooms (STATIC) involving 73 participants from rural elementary and secondary public schools in the southeastern United States. Results showed that a majority of them supported inclusion or were neutral towards it.

Some other sources also indicate that a majority of teachers in training favor inclusion. In a study conducted by Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden (2000) involving 135 teachers in training, for example, results indicated that, in general, they harbored positive attitudes towards inclusion. However, their ratings in terms of perceived competence plummeted in proportion to the severity of student needs, especially cognitive and behavioral. Results from yet another study conducted by Selesho (2012) involving 120 students from a teacher-preparation program indicated that the student teachers were in favor of inclusion as “it enhances social interaction and thus minimizes negative attitudes towards learners with special needs” (p. 539). Longitudinal studies following such groups of teacher candidates into their classrooms could yield interesting preservice versus inservice comparisons in attitudes toward inclusion.

Teaching Critical Thinking Skills

As reported in Table 26, another prominent instruction-related concern among both elementary and academy teachers was teaching students to think critically. In

Profiles 1987 and 1989, K-12 educators rated critical thinking among the top four most important and urgent concerns from 30 options, and for good reason. In her classic work, *Education*, White (1903) submits:

Every human being created in the image of God is endowed with a power akin to that of the Creator—individuality, power to think and to do. . . . *It is the work of true education to develop this power, to train the youth to be thinkers, and not mere reflectors of other men's thought* [emphasis mine]. (p. 17)

Adventist educators who are committed to the unique “Adventist” philosophy of education are concerned about taking the above challenge seriously. In the Profile 1997 qualitative comments one teacher wrote: “Critical thinking skills relative to life need to be [taught] more extensively” (p. 9). Teachers, however, need to learn to strategize in order to carry out this mandate with confidence.

Mulnix (2012), professor of philosophy at University of Massachusetts, reasons that a correct understanding of what critical thinking is and what it is not should undergird the teaching of critical thinking skills. Some scholars propose characteristics of the skill-set while others offer definitions. Kuhn (1993), for instance, defines it as the ability to use evidence to identify falsehood and defend truth. Rudd (2007) submits the following proposition:

Although thinking critically utilizes higher order thinking, critical thinking and higher order thinking are not equivalent. Critical thinking is not a ‘catch-all’ category for higher order thinking. It is one of a family of closely related forms of higher order thinking. Others include problem solving, creative thinking and decision making. (p. 48)

Mulnix (2012), who analyzed and critiqued definitions of critical thinking as perceived by several scholars, subsequently offers the following definition:

Reasoning well, or thinking critically, consists first in the ability to grasp inferential connections holding between statements in order to see a progression of evidence in the form of an argument to a specified conclusion. To be a proficient critical thinker,

then, is to see clearly the relationship between evidence and conclusion, *and to be proficient at providing reasons in support of one's beliefs* [my emphasis]. This must also include the ability to recognize what would count as evidence against one's beliefs. (p. 473)

Part of Mulnix's definition alludes to the biblical injunction: "Always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you" (1 Pet 3:15, NKJV). Students should be able to defend their Bible-based beliefs and offer intelligent reasons for rejecting opposing perspectives. Teaching students to think critically is a mandate supported both by the Bible and by other inspired writings and should be taken seriously.

Mulnix argues that critical thinking skills relate to the "how" rather than the "what" of thinking, and like any other skill its acquisition varies by degrees depending on the amount of practice involved. Based on this premise she advocates engaging students in much targeted practice (Mulnix, 2012). A virtuoso pianist, for instance, is likely to have practiced far more than an amateur, and no amount of music theory can ever replace hands-on practice. According to Mulnix, the same principle applies with teaching critical thinking skills to students.

In this age when information of all kinds is so readily available, students perhaps need to be taught to think critically more than ever before. According to Rasi (1987), teachers are challenged in this direction based on three factors:

(1) The rapid expansion of knowledge in nearly all disciplines; (2) The easy access to information through the media, publications, libraries, and computers; (3) The increasing complexity of the issues—many of them ethical—raised by this new knowledge and the technologies derived from it. (p. 5)

In light of the exponential growth of information through various media over the last several years, the current situation is undoubtedly far more acute in 2014 than it was

when Rasi wrote in 1987. With such an influx of information both desirable and undesirable, students need to be taught to think critically (White, 1903) so that they can make positive choices in terms of media and other aspects of life.

Cederblom and Paulson (2012) propose various reasons for teaching critical thinking skills. They submit that acquisition of such skills requires reflection on the part of learners and forces them to obtain rational reasons for their beliefs. In addition, they learn to refute illogical views offered by others, thereby basing their choices on evidence. As Mulnix (2012) affirms, “critical thinking is . . . closely tied to the development of autonomy, or the ability to decide for ourselves what we believe according to our own deliberations and not on the basis of what others claim” (p. 473). This stance obviously resonates with White’s 1903 injunction to teach students to think for themselves rather than reflect the thoughts of others. Could the teaching of critical thinking skills to students closely correlate with their informed decisions to accept Jesus?

Several scholars have vouched for the leading role of argument mapping in improving the critical thinking skills of learners (Harrell, 2007; Mulnix, 2012; Twardy, 2004; van Gelder, 2005). As the term suggests, argument mapping is a process by which learners use boxes and arrows to diagrammatically organize arguments, showing all of the related parts leading to the conclusion. “[It] focuses on maps of inferential structures and logical connections” (M. Davies, 2011, p. 15). Examples of parts of an argument include the proposition, key supporting evidence, key opposing views, refutation of opposing views, and logical conclusions. Argument mapping computer software programs (such as *Rationale* and *Reason*) have been on the increase (W. Davies, 2009; Harrell, 2007). However, Harrell (2008), who has tested pencil-and-paper argument

mapping as well as related computer software programs in her philosophy classes, argues that even the former has been shown to significantly improve the critical thinking skills of learners.

Improving Student Achievement

The third of the three instruction-related concerns, learning effective ways to improve student achievement, connects with the “innovative educational practices” in Figure 3 in which less than 10% of elementary and academy teachers considered themselves proficient in implementing the innovations. As mentioned earlier, professional development plays a major role in curriculum implementation and the data in this research show that it is one of the areas demanding attention.

In addition to PD, Fullan (2008) proposes that many innovations are not likely to be implemented unless embraced as part of systemic reform. On a positive note the 10 J2E Preferred Practices, all geared towards attaining excellence in teaching and learning, are systemic in extent in that they include system-level administrators along with local school personnel and at least some of the entities in the organizational fields in which those schools operate (Partnerships). The following four Preferred Practices relate primarily to administrators: Administrative Leadership, Partnerships, Staff Development, and Time Utilization. The remaining six, on the other hand, also relate to administrators, but more so to classroom teachers: Classroom Instruction, Climate, Diversity, Educational Technology, Integrated Curriculum, Student Assessment, and Time Utilization. Ideally, the 10 practices should be implemented in an integrated manner in order to enhance the kind of school climate conducive to teaching and learning.

As educators recognize the holistic nature of education, forming partnerships at various levels with entities in the organizational fields in which schools operate can help to create the enriched learning climates in which students can thrive academically. As early as 1971 Sarason attested that school-related innovations fail to be implemented because they are designed without aligning the demands with the peculiarities of the school culture. Psychologists concur on Maslow's (1943) premise that individuals need to have their basic needs, such as food, shelter, and clothing, supplied before they can focus on secondary and tertiary needs. By way of example some children are neglected and may arrive at school unwashed, hungry, in soiled or torn clothing, and with no school supplies. Children in such situations are not in a position to focus on academics, and schools may need to partner with service providers in their organizational fields that can help to meet the needs of such children in order to enhance learning readiness. The challenge is to make this possible without adding to the workload of teachers and principals who are already overworked. The foregoing is only one example, but improving student achievement can be multi-dimensional, involving the school, parents, church, and larger community.

Professional Development

From the inception of the Profile Surveys in 1987, professional development has also been rated as a prominent teacher concern. Based on results from Profiles 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1997, 2004, and 2007, K-12 teachers have been reporting their PD-related concerns including feelings of "stagnation and isolation" and would welcome more of the synergy ensuing from consistently networking with their peers. One teacher's qualitative comment effectively illustrates this position:

I need to work with innovative and creative people who inspire me to try new and better ways to achieve my goals. Visiting a local public school and observing a creative English teacher's efforts to help her students become good writers make me long to teach next door to someone who teaches concepts, not pages from a textbook. I need to be inspired and challenged to constantly seek new and better ways to meet the needs of my students. (Brantley 1987, p. 8)

In a similar vein Profile 1993 results showed that more than 70% of K-12 teachers shared concerns about insufficient time to network with their peers in other schools. In the Profile 2007 qualitative comments another teacher wrote:

Incorporate time for teachers to communicate with each other to share ideas so we are not so isolated. For example, I teach math and would like the opportunity to discuss math textbooks with other teachers (not in the US, but in Canada where I teach). Teacher conventions could be more practical. (Burton, 2007, p. 116)

Other qualitative suggestions regarding PD included creating easy-to-navigate "subject area blogs or question/answer" forums (p. 107). In addition, one teacher desired "meaningful professional development, especially in the Secondary area," including "interventions" for students with special needs (p. 109)

Survey items have been changing over the years and the slant of the questions differs from one survey to another. However, various items and qualitative comments related to professional development and networking with peers have continued to reflect the yearning of K-12 teachers for more opportunities to interact with their colleagues. In Profile 1999, teachers were asked to use a range of 1-7 showing degrees of involvement from least to greatest in terms of being given "release time for professional development" as a Preferred Practice. Elementary teachers averaged 3.80 compared to 4.01 for academy teachers. A related item in Profile 2001 targeted proficiency levels in using "Teacher-to-Teacher Networks" as a Preferred Practice. For this item teachers used a continuum with six levels. Forty-seven percent of elementary teachers and 46% of academy teachers

representing the largest subgroups opted for “Like to Try.” Perhaps this helps to explain the underlying reason for the NAD Teachers’ Convention topping the options for in-service choices; but this convenes only sexennially.

In a study conducted by Yoon et al. (2007), it was determined that relatively few studies claiming to link professional development with student outcomes were sufficiently rigorous to use as bases for any such claims. In addition, the team reported that in the few studies in this area, “substantial professional development” (p. iii) can positively impact student outcomes:

Of the more than 1,300 studies identified as potentially addressing the effect of teacher professional development on student achievement in three key content areas, nine meet What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards, attesting to the paucity of rigorous studies that directly examine this link. This report finds that teachers who receive substantial professional development—an average of 49 hours in the nine studies—can boost their students’ achievement by about 21 percentile points. (Yoon et al., 2007, p. iii)

In spite of the dearth of such sources in the literature, professional development is nonetheless important. As Guskey (2009) reports, perusal of the literature on educational research has failed to yield even one school improvement effort “occurring without professional development” (p. 226).

Guskey (2009) further argues that since professional development is effective only as it results in positive yields in teaching and learning, it follows that such endeavors need to be assessed not simply in terms of implementation, but in terms of the effects of such implementation on student outcomes. He suggests that implementing multiple innovations simultaneously could account in part for the gap in the research linking professional development to student learning, since attributing differences in outcomes to any single innovation could be challenging to researchers.

It is worthy of note that while the local and regional conferences in the NAD are primarily responsible for professional development in the K-12 schools under their jurisdiction, school principals often supplement conference endeavors with professional development opportunities offered in the educational fields within which the schools operate. Examples include various workshops such as those offered for grant-writing, and attending professional conferences such as those offered by Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Principals and teachers even in K-12 private schools can sometimes use information gained from such sources to apply for grants with which they can purchase resources to enhance teaching and learning (personal experience as teacher in NAD).

Teacher Burnout

Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) define burnout as “a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job, and is defined by three dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy” (p. 397). They further posit: “The past 25 years of research has established the complexity of the construct and places the individual stress experience within a larger organizational context of people’s relation to their work” (p. 397).

Other voices in the literature concur on the premise that burnout can impact practically all aspects of an individual’s life, and is not limited to time spent on the job (Hastings & Bham, 2003; Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Vlăduț & Kállay, 2010). With its all-encompassing effects, teacher burnout can pose several risk factors system-wide. Such can include social problems such as marital issues, mental and emotional problems impacting school climate, student-teacher relationship problems, and physical problems.

Finally, burnout can result in teacher absenteeism and staff turnover with their financial and other repercussions (Hastings & Bham, 2003; Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Vlăduț & Kállay, 2010).

Although teacher burnout was directly presented and rated as a “teacher concern” in only the first two Profile Surveys, K-12 teachers have been repeatedly reiterating the various problems they face which could potentially result in burnout, especially in the qualitative comments in the respective surveys. Those have included feelings of stagnancy and isolation, work overload/time management challenges, teaching too many grades while carrying out administrative duties, working with students of varied ability levels, and trying to cope with parents who fail to shoulder their own responsibilities at home and blame teachers for the outcome. In the Profile 2007 qualitative comments, for instance, one teacher commented on the reasons for future plans to leave the job: “Withdrawal will be due to burnout and some lack of support” (p. 132). Another teacher experiencing burnout commented on its complexity:

I feel VERY burned out. I'm tired of the parents—they expect us to be the parents, too, and get angry at us, the teachers, for things that they should be doing at home (monitoring homework, etc.). I LOVE the kids, though—even the challenging ones. I also am tired of juggling family and work. I have two small children with another one on the way, and in the Adventist system, we have NO family time. Even my weekends are consumed with school-related things. I love the Adventist system, but the expectations of our time are very high. I'm just plain tired. (Burton, 2007, p. 136)

According to Hastings and Bham (2003), many studies, both correlational and longitudinal, have identified student misbehavior as a significant predictor of teacher stress and burnout. However, in instances where institutional variables such as “role ambiguity and administrative pressures” (p. 3) also contribute to stress, student misbehaviors pale in comparison in terms of teacher ratings. This suggests that in spite of

their positive correlation with teacher burnout, behavior problems seldom place in the top ratings.

In Profiles 1987 and 1989 K-12 teachers ranked “teacher burnout” among their top four concerns/work-related problems. In the next Profile Survey, Brantley (1991) cited educational statistics comparing job satisfaction of Adventist teachers with data from the public schools in North America. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (1990), 50% of public school teachers reported satisfaction with their jobs, compared with 24% of Adventist teachers (Brantley, 1991). As previously stated, Profile 1993 results indicated that more than 70% of K-12 Adventist teachers considered mainstreaming and insufficient opportunities to collaborate with peers leading causes of concern, and therefore, potential reasons for burnout. In Profile 1999, Brantley observed: “In every study so far, teachers have indicated the need for collaboration to help prevent burnout” (p. 9).

The mainstreaming issue discussed earlier in this chapter also might be a factor in teacher burnout, as some teachers would prefer not to have students with special needs in their classrooms. In Profile 2004 some teachers also shared their concerns about needing assistance to work with students of varied ability levels. In the qualitative comments from K-12 teachers, similar issues potentially leading to teacher burnout again featured in Profile 2007. Included among those were 10 comments concerning teacher stress, 16 about professional development, and 18 regarding students with special needs (Burton, 2009, pp. 97, 98).

The 10 Preferred Practices from the J2E initiative discussed earlier in this chapter have been crafted to help teachers acquire excellence in teaching. With this in focus, Ho

et al. (2010) conducted a correlational study using the Profile 2007 results in order to identify possible relationships between use of the 10 Preferred Practices and teacher burnout. Using Pearson's correlation, the authors found positive though weak relationships between "buy-in" to the Preferred Practices and resistance to teacher burnout. As Ho et al. (2010) affirmed, "The findings showed a degree of relationship between "buy-in" for the innovation and aspects of burnout even though the correlation between the two variables is weak" (p. 21).

As was discussed in Chapter 3, teachers sometimes implement innovations only superficially, or do not implement them at all, because implementation strategies are unclear to them. Even when they are willing to adopt an innovation, they are often not afforded the practice and related training in order to successfully effect change at the core of their pedagogy (Joyce & Showers, 2002). As previously discussed, multiple factors can contribute to teacher burnout. Identifying those factors and strategies by which they may be countered are positive steps towards finding solutions.

Relationship to Institutional Factors: Other System-wide Issues

Scholars agree that a gap exists in the literature on institutional research related to private schools (Bridges, 1982; Erickson, 1983; Scott & Meyer, 1994). In discussing the limited availability of institutional research about such schools in America, Scott and Meyer (1994) observed that data related to the numbers of private schools are uncertain since some of the schools "are small and short-lived while others wish to avoid surveys" (p. 143). In addition, the authors stated that different private schools receive varying

degrees of financial support from the government and therefore differ in terms of degrees of regulatory demands.

Based on various sources of research, Sullivan (1974) estimates that over 26% of the budget of private schools is derived from government sources, divided about equally between tax exemptions and funding of various services (p. 93). Encarnation (1983) enumerates some of those services: transportation, child nutrition programs, special education programs, textbooks and other materials, health and welfare services, federal programs such as Title 1 of the ESEA, and Science programs (pp. 179-186).

With the receipt of services and/or funds comes accountability, which translates into additional responsibilities. Examples include the keeping of accurate records, attending additional meetings, and responding to additional correspondence including phone calls and emails. Encarnation (1983) provides a glimpse of the issue of government regulations of private schools as follows:

Along with the expansion of public aid programs, there has been a proliferation of public regulatory policies that are imposed on nonpublic schools when they receive public aid. Almost all direct and indirect financial aid programs regulate their recipients in some way, placing constraints on the generation and allocation of financial resources or on the use of publicly funded in-kind services. While public finance and public regulation are intertwined, there are also numerous federal, state, and local policies that regulate without providing aid. These regulations may be applied to all profit and nonprofit business undertakings, or they may be applied exclusively to educational institutions. (p. 187)

According to Encarnation, those regulations can be grouped under the following five broad classifications, each with its subcategories: (a) Licensure, (b) Records and reports, (c) Compulsory education standards, (d) Curriculum requirements for selected schools, and (e) Teacher certification requirements (based on Table 10-2, p. 189).

Additional responsibility from external service providers impacts the work of school principals as they liaise between the schools and the external environment in varying degrees. In addition, since some of the required regulations directly impact the individual student beneficiaries, part of that responsibility is inevitably passed on to classroom teachers, including the many school principals who fill the dual role of principal/teacher. Based on Profile Survey results through the years, teachers in the Adventist school system consider themselves overworked and additional demands are generally unwelcome. Further, as previously discussed, teacher perceptions of their work environments, whether realistic or not, can impact their ratings of related survey items.

On a related note, some Adventist schools struggle financially, and parents in economically disadvantaged communities can hardly afford tuition, especially if there are several school-aged children in the family. These problems tend to impact student enrollment and school finances, and in such situations, government services such as School Choice are perceived by principals and teachers as a welcome solution to at least part of the economic and low enrollment problems. While, in survey ratings, personnel at relatively affluent schools might say no to services such as School Choice for various reasons, those in more economically challenging situations are likely to welcome such services in spite of possible repercussions.

Scott and Meyer (1994) affirm that current proponents of institutional theory studying educational systems have gradually shifted their focus to “the external context as a basis for explaining internal features of organizations” (p. 137). Conversely, earlier institutional theorists such as Selznick (1957) and Stinchcombe (1965) attest that foundational values continue to impact development throughout the lifespan of

institutions. Institutional theory in general consists of a merger of the earlier and later perspectives which essentially include both the external context and founding values as players in institutional development.

Adventist education has been faith-based and values-driven from its very foundations and those values have impacted the way educators respond to the changing features of the external environment. As has been discussed in earlier chapters, God demands the development of the entire person—head, heart, and hand. In the efforts of Adventist school administrators to uphold this directive while integrating innovations from the wider environment, the J2E initiative, an overarching framework with the following 10 Preferred Practices to guide Adventist education, was developed:

(a) Administrative Leadership, (b) Classroom Instruction, (c) Climate, (d) Diversity, (e) Educational Technology, (f) Integrated Curriculum, (g) Partnerships, (h) Staff Development, (i) Student Assessment, and (j) Time Utilization (see Table 24). While the terminology used for those Preferred Practices communicates nothing religious and they technically can be adopted by any school system, an analysis of each of those practices in the Adventist context communicates that each is viewed through the lens of Bible-based faith and values (see NADOE, 2003).

Adventist schools were initially organized because the schools in the external environment did not cater to holistic education with emphases both on this life and the future eternal life. As White (1903) proposes, education is synonymous to redemption, and educators are to “[prepare their students] for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come” (p. 13). The K-12 Adventist school system is part of a dynamic organizational field characterized by scientific, mathematical,

and technological innovations with which it must keep abreast. In addition to competing with other school systems in the environment if only inadvertently, the organization must also meet the demands of regulatory agencies such as accrediting bodies and testing services, partly to retain legitimacy and accreditation while hoping to uphold its philosophy.

In addition to concerns related to the overarching J2E initiative, Adventist teachers have been concerned with other issues that impact the system at large.

Uppermost on the list are the following four concerns: (a) waning spirituality in schools, (b) instruction-related concerns, (c) professional development, and (d) teacher burnout.

Several factors can contribute to waning spirituality in schools, and teachers would like to find solutions to that problem. Similarly, instruction-related concerns are multifaceted. In their quest to effectively teach children with special needs, for instance, teachers desire strategies that work. In addition, teaching students to think critically is in ever-increasing demand and teachers need to know how to apply effective strategies to make it happen.

Adventist teachers also express concerns about learning effective ways to improve student achievement. A key purpose of professional development presumably is to target the issues and concerns that teachers face in their classrooms and to find solutions that can be measured in improved learner outcomes. In the Profile Surveys, Adventist teachers have been communicating their desire for more relevant PD experiences.

Finally, burnout is an intangible but very real problem which helps to explain frequent turnover in teaching staff at schools. Adventist teachers report feeling isolated and overworked, and having little time to network with peers. These, along with any other

unmet needs, can lead to increased stress resulting in burnout. Such issues all relate to institutional factors, both internal and external.

The problem of waning spirituality in schools is of great concern to teachers as it undermines the very basis for the existence of Adventist schools. Beginning in 1990, three comprehensive studies of youth attending Adventist schools in Grades 6-12 in North America were conducted to assess the faith, values, and commitment of those young people in relation to the home, school, and church—the primary institutions having to do with the values that the youth adopt and reflect in their individual lives. The studies, termed Valuegenesis, were conducted in 1990, 2000, and 2010. Based on summary results focused on all three studies, teachers do make a positive difference in the lives of students. However, the faith, values, and spiritual commitment of many youth attending Adventist schools leave much to be desired (NADOE, 2011). Essentially, student spirituality is a product of not only what happens in schools, but also in the wider environment including the home and church. In the Profile Surveys, teachers have always communicated their concerns and desire for improved spirituality in the lives of their students.

Instruction-related concerns also relate to internal and external institutional factors. In the Profile Surveys, teachers indicated that some leading concerns in that area were as follows: coping with students with special needs, teaching critical thinking skills, and learning effective strategies to improve student achievement. In Chapter 3, some of the challenges teachers face in coping with cognitively challenged learners were addressed. Teachers are counseled in the E. G. White writings to ensure that students acquire the basics such as reading, spelling, and grammar before having them proceed to

the “higher rounds” of the educational ladder (White, 1913). However, those teachers are torn between following this directive, and preparing all their students—challenged or not—for high-stakes testing, a top-down, external organizational demand. Similarly, core standards more recently have been imposed from the top down on all students including those with special needs, whether or not they are ready for work at the specified level. Little wonder many students leave high school without acquiring reading skills, and teachers are blamed for not doing their job effectively.

As was discussed in Chapter 5, rapid changes in the environment, especially in the areas of technology and other media, demand more than ever before that students learn to apply critical thinking skills in their decision-making. In this age when so much unfiltered information is available to students with so little effort, they need to apply the rules of temperance in their selections. Whether for formal education, general information, or entertainment, they need to be taught that pleasing God in every decision is the only wise course to take. They need to learn that there is virtue in shunning the base and sensual and choosing wisely from what is good. The Adventist philosophy, which upholds that education is synonymous with redemption, is the underlying factor in such critical thinking.

Strategizing for improvement in student learning outcomes is another leading instructional concern with institutional overtones among K-12 teachers. Traditionally, school systems have used a variety of strategies through PD in their efforts to teach teachers innovative strategies, with hopes that those will transfer to classroom practice. However, as was discussed in Chapter 3, the outcomes for traditional PD in the absence of coaching (which includes extensive practice) amount to limited knowledge acquisition

and skills development for teachers, but little or no implementation in classroom practice (Joyce & Showers, 2002). It was shown that peer coaching correctly conducted can be a viable antidote to boost implementation of innovations (Currier et al., 2012; Elder & Padover, 2011; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Stover et al., 2011). One of the strengths of a vibrant academic community is sharing research-based information and applying the findings in professional practice.

Earlier in this chapter it was shown that Adventist teachers desire more relevant PD experiences including more time and opportunities to network with their colleagues and avert the sting of feeling stagnant and isolated. As was discussed in Chapter 3, peer coaching can be a potent solution to such problems, but only when the local school situation allows. In addition, peer coaching has been shown to boost implementation of innovations like no other strategy. However, it demands allocation of blocks of time which might not always be practical in some Adventist school settings especially those with limited personnel such as one-teacher schools. The situation demands the study of coaching models with potential for such settings.

In their book titled *Models of Professional Development*, Joyce and Calhoun (2010) affirm their belief that “all models can succeed if properly implemented” (back cover). In light of this perspective they discuss the following five kinds of PD models:

1. Models to support individuals
2. Collaborative personal/professional direct service models such as mentoring and coaching
3. Collaborative and cooperative models
4. Models designed to achieve curricular and instructional change
5. The traditional workshop model and how it can be improved (Back cover)

While the scope of this study does not allow for discourse of each of those kinds of models, it would be worthwhile to study them closely in the quest for workable PD alternatives to align with various institutional situations.

Burnout, the last of four major teacher concerns discussed in this chapter, generally does not occur in a vacuum but results from environmental problems both internal and external. In other words, multiple teacher concerns are likely to result in burnout, suggesting that responding positively to those concerns can indirectly help to resolve the burnout problem. According to Vlăduț and Kállay (2010), burnout can occur in any occupation but is more prevalent in jobs in which the professional has to interact with other individuals (p. 264). In comparing the occurrence of severe job-related burnout among various professionals nationally and internally, the authors present a synopsis of findings in related research:

The prevalence of severe burnout in western countries ranges between 4-10% in the working population (Shirom, 2005). More specifically, in high-risk populations for instance, burnout prevalence in physicians is estimated to be 22% in USA, 27% in the UK, and 20% in Germany (Maslach et al., 2001; Linzer, Visser, Oort, Smets, McMurray, & de Haes, 2001). Among teachers, burnout rates vary between 30%-40% (Bauer, Stamm, Virnich, Wissing, Kriston, Muller, et al., 2005; Jarvis, 2002). (p. 264)

The data show that as compared to other professionals, teachers are impacted by burnout to far greater degrees than are other professionals. They have to relate not only to their students, but to the local school administration, to district personnel, to parents, to the school board, and the wider community. With this in view, teachers need supportive institutional environments if they are to survive and thrive.

Based on research findings, the degree of support in the institutional environment impacts burnout either positively or negatively. In a study conducted by Lavian (2012)

with 302 elementary school teachers as subjects, “school organizational climate was found to have a significant impact on burnout” (Abstract). Results from the study communicated that stress levels and burnout increased or decreased in proportion to the degree of support or lack of it in the climate of the institution. With such data in focus, the factors which lead to stress and burnout need to be studied and addressed.

Summary of Major Findings Related to Other System-wide Issues

1. In Profile 2007, 63.4% of K-12 teachers reported that they had received a copy of the J2E report versus 41.7% in Profile 2004.
2. The numbers of teachers who never heard about the Preferred Practices at the lower levels decreased over the course of the last two Profile Surveys.
3. Increasing numbers of K-12 teachers have “Attempted/Have Basic Understanding” of the Preferred Practices, with highest ratings in that category going to Educational Technology, Staff Development, and Classroom Instruction.
4. In the last two Profile Surveys, the numbers of teachers perceiving themselves as “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” with the J2E Preferred Practices have increased substantively, ranging from 18.6% for Partnerships, to 43.1% for Classroom Instruction.
5. Statistics at the “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” proficiency level for the last Profile Survey (2007) outshine corresponding data for all other years.
6. As reported in the Profile Survey results, areas of greatest concern to teachers include the following:

- a. Decline of spirituality in Adventist schools
- b. Instruction-related concerns including coping with special-needs learners, teaching critical thinking skills, and improving student achievement
- c. Professional development (including insufficient opportunities to network with peers)
- d. Teacher burnout related to multiple factors such as coping with special-needs students, isolation and stagnation, and work overload.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Until we have more comprehensive and dispassionate descriptions of the process of change in the school culture—which, of course, would be revealing of the formal and informal structure of the school—any effort to introduce change maximizes the role of ignorance with its all too familiar consequences.

—Seymour. B. Sarason

Introduction

A fragmented vision for K-12 education on the part of system-level administrators in the North American Division (NAD) resulted in the launching of the Profile Surveys in 1987 (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 8, 2011). Over the next 20 years, 10 comprehensive studies were conducted. Participants consisted of key stakeholders: K-12 teachers, system-level administrators, and teacher educators throughout the NAD including the United States, Canada and Bermuda. Results from those 10 comprehensive studies were used to generate a database for the current research endeavor.

While many of the curriculum-related concerns that K-12 teachers shared over those 20 years were undoubtedly related to the internal workings of the Adventist school system in the NAD, institutional theorists support the notion that interaction with the organizational fields in the various school communities impacts school and curricula-based perceptions and decisions as well (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Meyer & Rowan,

1992; Scott et al., 1994), even if imperceptibly. This inductive analysis focused on responses to the four research questions guiding the study through the lens of institutional theory.

Much of the literature connecting curriculum studies to institutional theory focuses on public school systems. However, proponents of that school of thought such as DiMaggio and Powell (1991) and Scott and Meyer (1994) propose that private schools operate within the same organizational fields as public schools, are subject to the same federal and state impositions, and use the same services. They are therefore impacted in similar ways as are public school systems, although the degree of impact is likely to differ based on the complexity of the organization.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to navigate the 10 Profile Studies from 1987 to 2007 to identify trends and patterns in selected areas related to curriculum. Educational theorists McMillan and Schumacher (2001) advance the thesis that identifying overall trends can be beneficial to curriculum developers in their quest for positive change. The current study is intended to respond to the need for an integrated perspective of recurrent themes from these studies.

Research Questions

The following four research questions guided this study:

1. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what trends emerge in K-12 teacher responses with regard to curriculum resources?

2. As reported in the Profile Survey results from 1987 to 2007, what trends emerge in K-12 teacher responses with regard to textbooks?
3. As reported in the Profile Surveys from 1987 to 2007, what K-12 technology issues feature most prominently?
4. As reported in the Profile Surveys from 1987 to 2007, what other system-wide issues feature most prominently in K-12 education?

Research Design

For this inductive analysis a quantitative approach was utilized using descriptive statistics. In addition, selected qualitative comments from stakeholders were integrated into the analysis when needed to clarify or strengthen assertions based on quantitative data. Further, the Institutional Influences Model of K-12 Adventist Teachers (1987-2007) was used to analyze the four research questions, thereby showing connections between the dependent and independent variables. The dependent variables consist of internal and external job-related factors—specifically normative, regulative, and cognitive—whereas the independent variables comprise teacher ratings of survey items related to curriculum guides, textbooks, technology in education, the J2E initiative, and teacher concerns including spirituality in schools, mainstreaming, teacher burnout, and professional development.

The model reflects a dual role of representing institutional influences from both internal and external environmental perspectives, and how those influences impact teachers and their work environments. Whatever impacts individuals and their work environment, whether positively or negatively, in turn helps to color their perspectives and the way they respond to related survey items. As discussed in earlier chapters,

founding values infuse institutional activities with meaning beyond the technical aspects (Selznick, 1957), and an institutional model failing to include this perspective in Adventist education would have been incomplete.

Data Sources

The database for this study was created using written reports, articles, and SPSS files containing results of the 10 Profile Studies from 1987 to 2007. These were supplemented with archived data from CDs, other hard copy sources, and personal communication with L. D. Burton, principal investigator for two Profile Studies conducted in 2004 and 2007. Fitzgerald and Dopson (2009) submit: “The simplest form of triangulation is using archival data to support and partially verify interview data” (p. 469)—survey data in this instance, since that was the primary method of data collection.

Sample/Data Collection Procedures

Preparing the data for analysis was no straightforward task, as participant role stratification was compounded by the inclusion of a plethora of curriculum-related items. Each of the 10 Profile Studies included teachers representing all grades ranging from K-12; each also included system-level administrators, teacher educators, and school principals throughout the NAD—in effect, several studies within a study. By contrast, other curriculum-related studies in contemporary research generally target single grades and single subjects in the curriculum, often at a single school.

After reading through the resources, the next step was to create several master tables including all variables related to the four research questions for all years represented. All relevant variables occurring in a minimum of two of the studies were

then retabulated and retained for analysis. Since response scales used in the various Profile Surveys differed to some degree, the need for uniformity demanded retabulating variables into common response scales to facilitate analysis. Further, since the focus was on identifying trends in the surveys, and separate reports and journal articles had been published on each one separately, the approach for this study was primarily integrative. On a limited basis, however, statistics occurring in single studies were included in this research when they were of such import or substance as to have implications for the study as a whole.

After completing the tables with variables from a minimum of two studies, the data were further organized for integration. In some instances in which a 6-point Likert scale had been used in data collection, for example, the scale was reduced to three levels for analysis purposes. The two lowest levels became Level 1, the two middle ones—Level 2, and the two top ones, Level 3. Moreover, since this is an integrative study, the data for each table were aggregated for all years represented. In addition to representing the data in tabular form, much of it was presented graphically for greater visual impact and to aid the reader's interpretation of the findings. The resultant data have been analyzed by induction, using descriptive statistics.

Data Analysis

Analysis targeted trends in the data related to each of the four research questions. Bar graphs were used extensively for visual comparison of various sets of data. Based on aggregated data through the 20-year duration of the surveys, analysis sometimes reflected modes or ranges; more often it reflected lowest, middle, and highest statistics and in multiple areas of analysis.

Cumulative results primarily from K-12 teachers, the largest stakeholder group, provided concise perspectives of trends in several areas through the duration of the 10 studies, examples of which follow: (a) survey demographics, (b) awareness, availability, and perceived helpfulness of selected curriculum guides, (c) quality and use of selected curriculum guides and textbooks, (d) differences in patterns of use of selected resources by elementary versus academy teachers, (e) proficiency levels in the use of educational technologies and other innovations, (f) various issues related to use of educational technologies, (g) knowledge and application of the J2E initiative, and (h) most prominent teacher concerns.

Delimitations

The one delimiting factor that featured prominently in this research was the scope of the study. As stated in earlier chapters, each individual Profile Study is in effect several studies within a study. While analysis of 10 studies may superficially not seem monumental, reality defies the possibility of analyzing all of the issues addressed in the Profile Surveys within the limited scope of this research. It was therefore necessary to set parameters in terms of what aspects of the studies would be included in the research. This problem was inadvertently resolved by the NADCC in a cyber-conference in which committee members disclosed the curriculum-related issues which were of greatest interest to them. Due to the limited scope of this research, the analysis explores relatively few areas covered by the Profile Studies.

Results and Discussion

Exploring results from the 10 Profile Studies with specific reference to the four questions guiding this research has resulted in several related findings. In this section the major findings are summarized and discussed in the context of extant literature.

The purpose for this study was to produce an integrated version of selected findings of the Profile Survey results in an effort to render key findings accessible to policy makers in more succinct format than previously available. McMillan and Schumacher (2001) propose that identifying overall trends can be useful to curriculum developers in their quest for positive change.

Curriculum Guides

Several major findings emerged in terms of trends in teacher ratings of curriculum guides produced by the NAD:

1. Availability of curriculum guides is no longer an issue as K-12 teachers reported having those resources, especially for the subjects they teach (Brantley & Ruiz, 2001/2002; Burton, 2005).
2. Teachers perceived that curriculum guides align with the cognitive and spiritual goals of Adventist education to greater degrees than they do the physical and social goals (Burton, 2005, 2009).
3. Increasing numbers of K-12 teachers have been using curriculum guides through the duration of the Profile Surveys, especially in core subject areas. However, significant numbers still do not use them (Brantley, 1996; Burton, 2005, 2009; Burton, Gittens-St. Juste, & Davidson, 2006/2007).

4. Cumulative survey data revealed that multiple factors including professional development, time limitations, format, and appropriateness of content (for Canadian and multigrade teachers, for example) impact teacher ratings of perceived helpfulness and use of curriculum guides (Brantley, 1996/1997, 1997; Brantley & Burton, 1993; Burton, 2005, 2009).

With availability of curriculum guides no longer being an issue as the findings confirm, the NAD is to be commended for making those resources available to all schools under its jurisdiction, not only in hard copy format, but also through the online resources website namely, circle.adventist.org. K-12 teachers do perceive some disadvantages including format, relevance, and lack of integration with some curriculum guides. The findings also confirm that some teachers perceive curriculum guides as being deficient in adequately meeting the social and physical goals of Adventist education. However, Adventist educators also concur on a variety of advantages that the resources afford. Those include providing direction for teachers, facilitating some degree of uniformity for learners throughout the school system, and including standards for instructional objectives. The examples which follow illustrate teacher satisfaction with curriculum guides. In the “Profile 1993 General Comments,” one teacher in referring to the resources simply wrote: “Overall, I am quite pleased” (Brantley & Burton, 1994, p. 3). In corresponding comments from Profile 1997 another wrote: “Our materials are excellent. We need to find a way for them to be consistently used by all of our teachers. It concerns me to find teachers doing their own thing and often their students perform below normal” (p. 4). Yet another teacher shared the following positive remarks:

We are very fortunate to have the curriculum help we have available. Many other private schools flounder in this area and have to try to pick and choose for

themselves. I think it is a good thing to have the curriculum guides include K-12 for all subject areas. (Burton, 2007, p. 126)

The findings also validate a majority view on the part of K-12 teachers that NAD curriculum guides adequately reflect the cognitive and spiritual goals of Adventist education (see Figure 11).

While increasing numbers of teachers have been using NAD curriculum guides, the fact that significant numbers do not use them is a cause for concern. One teacher wrote:

Most teachers use the scope and sequence in the textbooks already. Having to scrutinize the curriculum guide would be additional advance planning and take more of my limited time! The Science curriculum guide is copied right out of the NAD Science textbooks! (Burton, 2007, p. 127)

As another finding confirms, professional development positively correlates with perceived helpfulness and use of curriculum guides by teachers (Brantley, 1996), suggesting that improvements in this area could conceivably result in greater use of the resources. One of the issues addressed in detail in Chapter 3 concerned problems with the coaching system for orienting K-12 teachers in the use of new curriculum resources. It was determined that the system-level administrators assigned to coach teachers are not proficient in using the resources and face time constraints as well. As proponents of institutional theory readily concur, practices are often retained in organizations, not necessarily because they work, but because they have become habitual (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 2006; Scott et al., 1994).

Other factors shown to impede use of curriculum guides include time, format, and relevance (Brantley, 1997; Brantley & Burton, 1994; Burton, 2005, 2009). Teachers who face time constraints typically do not welcome bulky curriculum guides which fail to meet their needs for various reasons. The NAD has made efforts to create curriculum

guides in more user-friendly formats; also, much has been done in efforts to create resources for multigrade teachers; however, Canadian teachers still find NAD curriculum guides irrelevant, since they are required to teach the Provincial curricula (Brantley & Burton, 1994; Burton, 2005, 2009). In a different context one teacher remarked:

Freedom of choice at the local level though a very popular theme among public educators is even more a factor when discussing NAD curriculum. Remember that we are influenced by many local factors, including state mandates and community needs! Trust us to make good, sound, moral, spiritual, pedagogical decisions for our schools and classrooms. (Brantley & Burton, 1994 [Senior Academy section], p. 2)

The foregoing examples illustrate the impact that interaction with various organizational fields can have on school curriculum development and implementation.

Textbooks

As with curriculum guides, several major findings emerged from the aggregated data with regard to textbooks in K-12 Adventist education:

1. Elementary teacher ratings of textbooks for selected subjects including Social Studies and Music improved during the years in which survey items targeted those subjects, while those for some other subject ratings remained relatively stable. In contrast, textbook ratings for Reading, Math, and English—three core subjects, declined between Profile 1987 and Profile 1999 (see Figure 14).

2. For senior academy, available data show improved “Excellent” ratings for Science, Language Arts, and Mathematics textbooks, and relatively stable ratings for Vocational Arts and History textbooks, each of which was featured in two of the Profile Surveys. Conversely, Bible textbook ratings, included in five of the 10 surveys, exhibited a zigzag trajectory (see Figure 16).

3. Teachers generally rate newly adopted or revised textbooks more favorably than they do older versions.

4. Finally, affordability is sometimes a factor in acquisition and use of NAD textbooks.

The cumulative data on both elementary and secondary ratings revealed that textbooks for some subject areas fared better than others in terms of “Excellent” ratings through the years (see Figures 14 & 16). The data also showed that in addition to other factors, teachers generally rate newly adopted textbooks more favorably than they do older ones (Brantley, 1990, 1996; Brantley & Burton, 1993). Such has been the case in some instances for both the elementary and secondary grades. With elementary Social Studies, for instance, the highest available “Excellent” rating (51%) was in 1991, 17% higher than the next highest score of 34% in 1989. A look at Appendix D shows that new Social Studies textbooks were adopted during the 1989-1990 school year, affording teachers sufficient time to acquire and use them by the time Profile 1991 was conducted. As for Science textbooks, the highest rating (51%) was in 1997; new Science textbooks for all elementary grade levels were adopted between 1993 and 1997 (see Appendix D). The data for Music show that ratings also escalated after the *Life Music Program* was adopted in 1993-1994 (see Appendix C).

A look at Figure 16 showing “Excellent” ratings for the academy grades communicates relatively high and stable ratings for all subject areas excluding Bible. The fact that the majority of academy teachers select their own textbooks “with the possible exception of Bible” (Brantley & Burton, 1993, p. 19) could be a factor in the high ratings. With Bible, the highest “Excellent” rating of 65%, a lead of 19 percentage points over the

next highest, was in 1997; again, a look at Appendix D communicates that new academy Bible textbooks were adopted during the 1995-1996 school year, affording teachers sufficient time to become acquainted with the resources by the time Profile 1997 was conducted. Available data have sometimes been insufficient to substantiate this trend in all subject areas. Ratings in elementary Reading and Math, for instance, declined after 1987; but in the available data, textbook adoption dates for the *Gateway to Reading* series begin in 1991. It might be interesting to determine what factors triggered the relatively high 1987 and 1989 “Excellent” ratings of 74% and 65% respectively for Reading before the ratings plunged to 51% by the time Profile 1991 was conducted. As for Mathematics, various textbooks have been used and the “Excellent” ratings have been quite uneven beginning with 76% in 1987 and ending with 28% in 1999.

Finally, based on their subjective comments, some teachers communicated that affordability is a major factor in acquiring and using some NAD textbooks. One teacher, for example, lamented that the cost of textbooks for one subject area nearly depleted the school’s textbook budget for the year. Others expressed that a need existed to find creative funding strategies for Adventist education. One teacher suggested the following solution: “Bring costs down for smaller schools (or everyone, actually) by forming a co-op where textbooks can be purchased at reduced rates” (Burton, 2007, p. 108). A related conversation with L. D. Burton verified that steps were taken in this direction as far back as the 1990s and continue to the present (L. D. Burton, personal communication, June 27, 2013). In addition, the emergence of e-textbooks and tablets has gradually begun to result in the need for fewer hard copy textbooks. According to Davidson (2014), the newly

released textbook series, *Science by Design*, is available in e-book format (R. L. Davidson, personal communication, December 10, 2014).

In discussing textbooks used in public schools Apple (2008) submitted: “Texts are simultaneously economic, political, and cultural” (p. 26). He affirmed that at the state level, textbooks are regulated, and often special committees determine the content as well as publication choices for adoption by schools. In their qualitative comments included in some of the Profile Surveys, teachers have often rated some of the textbooks they use in schools, especially from commercial sources, as not Christ-centered (Profiles 1993, 1997, 2004, & 2007). Unfortunately, due to economic and other factors, the NAD is not yet in a position to produce every textbook series used in its schools, and it is likely that some commercial books will continue to be used indefinitely. Again, the situation shows that institutional factors including the kinds of textbooks available in the wider community can impact curriculum development and implementation.

Technology

Based on K-12 teacher ratings, several technology-related findings were also deduced from the aggregated data:

1. The majority of Adventist schools in the NAD have access to computers, the Internet, and many other kinds of technology.
2. Some teachers use their own computers and other technologies to supply the lack of quality equipment at their schools and in their classrooms.
3. Inadequate technical support was still an issue at the majority of K-12 schools at least up to the time Profile 2007 was conducted.

4. From 1995 to 2001, more than 75% of K-12 teachers rated themselves as deficient in technology-related skills (see Figure 25).

5. In addition to lack of expertise on the part of teachers, several factors interplay to impact the degree of integration of the technology into instruction. Those include inadequate technical support, the location of computers in schools, and the computer/student ratio in each classroom.

The findings regarding computers with their related accessories and other kinds of educational technologies substantiate that K-12 schools in the NAD have been adding to their resources through the years so that most schools had student and/or teacher computers and various kinds of multimedia technologies by the time the last two Profile Surveys were conducted in 2004 and 2007 (see Figures 18 and 22). However, some teachers reported using their own equipment ranging from laptop computers, cassette and CD players, printers, scanners, copiers, and home Internet services, to fill various voids at their schools whether related to availability, quality, or location.

The following examples in the qualitative data from Profile 2007, the most current available, illustrate some of the issues which will need to be addressed in the future: “Computers and other technological devices are not provided in my classroom . . . NOTHING” (Burton, 2007, p. 9). “Computers [at my school] are old and barely run; I have PowerPoint, Internet, and email on my home computer” Burton, 2007, p. 2). “I have purchased my own cassette/CD player for use in my own classroom. I also use my own personal laptop computer as my school computer as the technology is better than what the school provided for me” (Burton, 2007, p. 4).

Even when schools have procured computers and other technologies, multiple issues can arise regarding their use. As stated in an earlier section of this chapter, more than 75% of K-12 teachers rated themselves “in low gear” or lower, up to the time Profile 2001 was conducted. The examples which follow further illustrate the issues. One teacher wrote: “I use the Internet from home; I have the electronic Grade-book but don’t know how to use it” (Burton, 2007, p. 6). Another bewailed a crisis situation regarding the use of computers at a small school:

The use of computers in my one teacher school has been a strong point of political control. The board chairman purchased some of the computers and felt she then had the authority to dictate the way in which they were used. The students in recent years were allowed free use and access to the computers and Internet in an unsupervised setting. What I found on the computers and flash drives was alarming to me. For this reason I have used the computers in a very limited way. I have plans to increase [their] use in the year to come. (Burton, 2007, p. 14)

Still others lamented the lack of technical support at their schools (see Figure 18).

Evidence from both the Profile Surveys and extant literature confirm that lack of technical support is only one of the factors that can negatively impact the level of technology integration into pedagogy. In their subjective comments, for example, some K-12 teachers attested that although their schools have Internet service, it is often acutely dysfunctional to the extent that it would be impractical to plan on integrating Internet-related activities into instruction (Burton, 2007). On a similar note Inan and Lowther (2010) argue that availability of technical support is one of the significant variables impacting adoption of technology use in classroom instruction—another area in which the organizational field impacts curriculum implementation. Adventist schools generally do not hire on-site technical support personnel, and even when those may be available

outside of the institution, budgetary constraints often pose challenges for schools to obtain the needed services.

Some K-12 teachers have also indicated that the location of computers in schools is another factor impacting integration. Following is one such example:

I would use more of the above technologies if they were available in my own classroom rather than having to prebook and cross campus to get them. Two student computers are available in our classroom, but programs have not been supplied, so we don't use them. Internet and computers are available in other classrooms and are used regularly. (Burton, 2007, p. 7)

As Becker (2000) stated, more than 75% of teachers who had a minimum of five computers in their classrooms were comfortable with using the technology, and those who had a strong constructivist philosophical stance were likely to have their students use computers regularly, especially for word-processing, but also for “at least one other type of software besides skill-based games” (p. 1).

Other System-wide Issues

Aggregated data yielded the following summary results on the final research question:

1. Knowledge of the Journey to Excellence initiative has been gaining momentum among K-12 educators in the NAD; however, as it is a “top-down” endeavor, some teachers are still unaware of the framework and its goals and application.
2. Teachers are especially troubled about (a) decline of spirituality in Adventist schools; and (b) instruction-related concerns consisting partly of mainstreaming challenges, teaching critical thinking skills, and improving student achievement.
3. Teachers yearn for more relevant PD experiences to better equip them for classroom instruction while helping to dispel isolation and stagnation.

4. Some teachers reported experiencing burnout, potentially triggered by multiple factors including isolation and stagnation, challenges in coping with varied ability levels, and work overload.

Journey to Excellence

A key finding based on the final research question targeting “other system-wide issues” concerned the J2E initiative. Analysis of the data from Profile 2004, the first after J2E was officially voted as a K-12 curriculum framework in 2002, showed a rift in access, awareness, and use of the initiative on the part of teachers. Shortly after its debut, a CD explaining the concepts with suggestions for application of the 10 Preferred Practices was released to teachers throughout the NAD. While this effort is to be commended, teachers can easily lay aside even a very important CD for perusal at a more convenient time unless its importance is underscored by someone even before it arrives. With the multitude of well-intended mail that teachers receive, any CD can easily get to the bottom of a pile in quick time and become forgotten. Moreover, staff turnover needs to be kept in focus when circulating resources. The CD might have been distributed to all teachers in a given school year; however, it would need to be redistributed as new teachers enter the system. In addition to its relative newness in the K-12 educational system, the above conditions might have accounted for the lack of awareness and use.

Burton (2005) reported that when Profile 2004 was conducted, teachers were asked to state whether or not they had received a copy of the J2E report. Of the 523 who responded, 48.0% ($n = 251$), representing the largest subgroup, reported that they had received a copy. Conversely, 32.1% ($n = 168$), representing the second largest subgroup, stated that they had not received a copy. Another 19.9% ($n = 104$) reported uncertainty as

to whether or not they received a copy. Responses to items related to levels of proficiency in awareness and use of the Preferred Practices also left much to be desired (see Table 24). These statistics, however, are within expectations based on the context:

In interpreting these results one must remember that these data were collected in April and May 2004. Some Union Conferences had not yet officially launched the Journey to Excellence initiative; therefore some teachers had not received any professional development related to J2E at the time of data collection. (Burton, 2005, p. 8)

When Profile 2007 was subsequently conducted, ratings by teachers who considered themselves “Quite Knowledgeable of/Proficient in Helping Teachers” with the framework were at their highest as compared with those of prior years (see Figures 37-40) when survey items targeted FACT-21, the precursor of J2E. On another note, substantial numbers of K-12 teachers still had not heard about J2E (see Figures 31-33). In the Profile 2007 qualitative comments one teacher wrote: “I have never had the whole ‘Journey to Excellence’ concept explained to me; I REALLY don’t get how we are supposed to be using it” (p. 79). Another wrote: “As I explored the J2E website I was looking for something like a PDF file where I could read the Journey to Excellence document. It seems to just move from link to link without giving much substance” (Burton, 2007, p. 78). Yet another wrote:

What's "Journey to Excellence?" (Yes, I've seen the phrase on stuff.) I just went and looked at the site. I now remember checking it out a year or two ago after getting something in the mail. Someone's put together some interesting looking stuff—what do we do with it?! If there were some "thrust" or initiative going, we might be looking here for resources or direction. (Burton, 2007, p. 80)

In addition to showcasing J2E at the related website and through the specialized CD, efforts have been made to discuss the framework at conference-level PD workshops and at subsequent teachers’ conventions. While cumulative data from the Profile Surveys communicate progress in understanding and use of the initiative, more needs to be done

to orient the significant numbers of teachers who still do not know about J2E and how it relates to Adventist education. As a top-down innovation, it needs to make sense to stakeholders at the local school level if they are to buy into and implement it.

Spirituality in Schools

Another system-wide concern among Adventist educators regards waning spirituality in schools. Through the years K-12 teachers have supplied a plethora of qualitative comments regarding this issue, a few examples of which follow: “Create curriculum that is ‘Second Advent’ oriented” (Brantley & Burton, 1994, p. 4—Senior Academy section). In another qualitative comment a few years later, one educator focused on the need for integrating biblical perspectives in all learning:

I think a Bible series needs to be created that can be combined with other subjects and give students ideas to implement the concepts at home. Right now I think Bible comes across as another subject to teach/learn. It should be viewed as the subject that is a part of life and talked about throughout the entire day. (Brantley, 1997b, p. 2)

On a similar note a Profile 2007 respondent affirmed: “[Teachers need to know] how to make religious education a life-changing, faith-building experience for students.

Emphasize the mission of the church and require students to get involved in this mission at an early age” (Burton, 2007, p. 99). Yet another educator expressed the need for improvement in classroom materials: “[Provide] classroom materials that are truly Adventist in nature and reflect our values and culture” (Burton, 2007, p. 101).

Examples of other suggestions included integrating “history with Bible” and showing the “creation-flood-science” connections (Burton, 2007, p. 116), educating parents and pastors to partner with schools in evangelism, and “integrating faith concepts into all subject areas” (Burton, 2007, p. 117). Some teachers applaud their pastors for

promoting Adventist education, but others lament a deficiency in that area as the next two comments illustrate. One teacher wrote: “Our pastor is very concerned that our children be in church school and does his very best to promote Christian education” (Burton, 2007, p. 50). Another wrote:

Pastors and church leaders need to promote our Adventist education all the time: [at] parents’ meetings, children’s Sabbath School, Pathfinders/Adventurers. I feel that our churches do not promote our school and that is one of the first reasons why Adventist education is not viewed as a priority these days in Christian families. (Burton, 2007, p. 49)

Several teachers communicated through their qualitative comments that in addition to actively promoting Adventist education in various forums and enrolling their children in Adventist schools, dedicated pastors impacted spirituality in schools in multiple ways by visiting and connecting with students at schools and helping with their service-related efforts targeting fellow students and the wider community (Burton, 2007).

Other Teacher Concerns

In conjunction with faith-and-learning integration, K-12 teachers share key concerns related to instruction including coping with mainstreaming challenges, and helping students to think critically and improve academically. In both their quantitative and qualitative feedback through the years, K-12 teachers have consistently rated coping with students with special needs as a leading cause for concern (Brantley, 1987, 1990, 1992, 1996; Brantley & Burton, 1994; Burton, 2005, 2009). One teacher expressed felt needs as follows:

[Provide] teachers inservice and tools to deal with ever increasing numbers of students that have learning disabilities and social disabilities as well as how to reach students and parents that are not of the Adventist faith, as more and more of these students are coming to our schools. (Burton, 2007, p. 100)

Various scholars advocate the need for including mainstreaming education in teacher preparation programs (Allday, Neilsen-Gatti, & Hudson, 2013; Cavanaugh, n.d.; Gehrke & Cocchiarella, 2013; Harvey, 2010). Such a course of action would possibly result in an increase in the numbers of Adventist and other teachers who favor inclusion in spite of its challenges.

K-12 teachers in general exhibit various attitudes toward inclusion. In a study conducted in Lebanon by Khochen and Radford (2012) with 40 teachers and some “key” school principals as subjects, results indicated that, in general, they viewed inclusion positively. However, they also communicated their reservations about inclusion depending on the nature of the challenges, “especially those with social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties” (Abstract). An earlier study conducted by Gitlow (2001) with occupational therapy educators as subjects yielded similar results. Yet another study using simulated physical limitations focused on attitudes of “student music therapists and preservice music educators” (Abstract) toward inclusion. According to Gitlow (2001), survey results after simulations correlated with more positive attitudes toward inclusion when compared with results obtained 2 weeks prior to simulations. However, results were again hierarchical depending on the nature of the challenges. Moreover, in a study conducted by Varcoe and Boyle (2014) with 342 preservice primary school teachers as subjects, results indicated that “studying an elective unit on inclusive education had a positive influence over preservice teachers’ attitudes” (Abstract). Conversely, it was determined in the same study that “teaching experience had a significantly negative impact on preservice teachers’ attitudes” (Abstract). Essentially, as far as attitudes

towards inclusion were concerned in this study, a dichotomy seems to exist between theory and practice.

Teaching students to think critically is another key concern of K-12 Adventist teachers. As discussed in Chapter 6, the acquisition of any skill, playing the piano or driving a car, for example, requires practice; and the level of expertise depends to a great extent on the amount of practice obtained. Acquiring critical thinking skills is no different and should not be left to chance. According to Cederblom and Paulson (2012), Mulnix (2012), and Rudd (2007), teaching critical thinking involves specific strategies which teachers need to learn in order to be able to effectively teach the related skills to their students. Mulnix (2012) characterizes critical thinking as follows:

Reasoning well, or thinking critically, consists first in the ability to grasp inferential connections holding between statements in order to see a progression of evidence in the form of an argument to a specified conclusion. To be a proficient critical thinker, then, is to see clearly the relationship between evidence and conclusion, *and to be proficient at providing reasons in support of one's beliefs* [my emphasis]. This must also include the ability to recognize what would count as evidence against one's beliefs. (p. 473)

At least in part, Mulnix's description of critical thinking aligns with White's (1903) emphasis on the importance of teaching students to think for themselves and not simply reflect the thoughts of others (p. 17). Students need to know why they accept the tenets of one religion and reject those of another. They need to "always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks [them] a reason for the hope that is in [them]" (1 Pet 3:15, NKJV). By deduction, critical thinking lies at the very root of accepting biblical teachings.

Integrating faith with learning and teaching students to think critically, two propositions heavily underscored in God's education directives through the writings of E.

G. White, have the potential to help students advance both spiritually and academically. It should be well worth the effort for all Adventist colleges and universities, especially those offering teacher-preparation programs, to develop courses (or at least course components) in those two areas and to make them mandatory for teacher certification. Moreover, since critical thinking lies at the very root of intelligent acceptance of biblical teachings, college students in general would benefit from having it among their required courses as well.

Professional Development was the penultimate subset of findings related to teacher concerns in this study. In order to be optimally effective, PD should exhibit some specific characteristics. Yoon et al. (2007), who analyzed over 1,300 research endeavors focusing on PD, labeled the nine studies in which teachers engaged in related inservice activities for an average of 49 hours, “substantial professional development” (p. iii), and concluded that the results from such activity boosted student outcomes by about 21 percentile points. The same authors further propose that the following elements characterize “high quality” PD: “coherence, active learning, sufficient duration, collective participation, a focus on content knowledge, and a reform rather than traditional approach” (p. 1). Research by Joyce and Showers (2002) has also validated the positive impact of on-going peer coaching as a viable aspect of professional development (see Table 6). The authors conclude that if classroom implementation is the desired outcome of PD, peer coaching should include study of the theory, demonstration of the concept, much practice, and on-going application in a simulated environment replicating the classroom situation as closely as possible (p. 78).

Finally, teachers rated burnout among the top four concerns analyzed in this study. Burnout is multifaceted and can impact practically all aspects of a person's life and is not limited to time spent on the job (Hastings & Bham, 2003; Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Vlăduț & Kállay, 2010). With its all-pervading attributes, its influences can be far-reaching and exhibit itself in marital issues, mental and emotional problems impacting school climate, student-teacher relationship problems, and physical problems. Finally, burnout can result in teacher absenteeism and staff turnover with their financial and other repercussions.

Some possible contributors to teacher burnout as reported in the Profile Surveys include feelings of stagnancy and isolation, work overload/time management challenges, teaching too many grades while carrying out administrative duties, working with students of varied ability levels, and trying to cope with parents' unreasonable demands (Burton, 2007). According to Hastings and Bham (2003), many studies, both correlational and longitudinal, have identified student misbehavior as a significant predictor of teacher stress and burnout. However, in instances where institutional variables such as "role ambiguity and administrative pressures" (p. 3) also contribute to stress, student misbehaviors pale in comparison in terms of teacher ratings. This suggests that in spite of their positive correlation with teacher burnout, behavior problems seldom place in the top ratings. Awareness of the multiple factors correlated with teacher burnout is an important precursor in strategizing to alleviate the problem.

Limitations

In interacting with the data resulting from the Profile Surveys I was challenged by three major restrictions. These consisted of issues with personal bias, the absence of

related models in the literature, and lack of similarity in the data for the various years, impeding my ability to use meta-analysis or research synthesis approaches.

The issue of personal bias was very real in this study as I was raised a Seventh-day Adventist and have worked as a teacher and principal in the K-12 Adventist school system in the NAD. I was therefore faced with the challenge of trying my best to report objectively versus compromising the results with my personal perspectives. According to Fitzpatrick et al. (2011), personal bias in evaluation cannot be completely eliminated; however, it can be reduced; and admitting its existence is a worthwhile step in positive intervention.

On a related note, the American Evaluation Association (2004) shares five principles to guide ethical practice:

- A. *Systematic Inquiry*: Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries about whatever is being evaluated.
- B. *Competence*: Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
- C. *Integrity/Honesty*: Evaluators ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
- D. *Respect for People*: Evaluators respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of the respondents, program participants, clients, and other stakeholders with whom they interact.
- E. *Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare*: Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of interests and values that may be related to the general and public welfare. (Under “Resulting Principles” subhead).

The principles above apply to me to some degree as I was part of the research team for the last of the Profile Surveys (2007). In addition, while this study is not primarily evaluative, but analytical, research projects in general have an evaluative component. With this in focus, I took my responsibility seriously to abide by the principles listed above. As a Christian educator I am also responsible to God for all my actions. In spite of my efforts to exclude personal bias from this study, my word choice communicated

otherwise in a few instances. Thankfully, the keen eyes of my committee members were quick to point out such inconsistencies so that I could correct them.

With regard to the next limitation, the issue of suitable research models in the literature, I could find none to emulate and had to proceed by trial and error. When I first interacted with the vast amounts of data resulting from 20 years of comprehensive research studies, I initially thought of conducting a meta-analysis to synthesize the results. Since my course-work in statistical methods did not include this category, I proceeded to take an online meta-analysis course in my efforts to prepare for the challenge. As I continued to work with the survey data, however, I realized that there was not sufficient similarity from one survey to another to warrant the use of meta-analysis as a research methodology. In consultation with my chair, therefore, I had to seek an alternative as described in Chapter 2. It involved creating several master tables including all variables related to the four research questions for all years represented, and then isolating and retabulating those occurring in more than one survey for analysis.

While many of the items and related responses from the various Profile Surveys did not reflect the commonality required for meta-analysis, some were sufficiently similar to be grouped together for descriptive purposes. In instances where such combinations might have seemed questionable, I consulted with my chair and proceeded to group them only if we both thought they were sufficiently close for this purpose. Then a related problem surfaced. The groupings of data were sufficiently close to be described together, but not sufficiently similar for the precise demands of inferential statistics. This situation accounts for the decision to use descriptive rather than inferential statistics. The greatest repercussion from this situation is the inability to apply the findings to populations other

than the one targeted in the Profile Surveys. In other words, the results are not generalizable to unrelated populations.

Conclusions

Summary conclusions based on analysis of the data related to the four research questions follow:

Question 1—Curriculum Guides: Although curriculum guides are still under-used, they continue to be perceived as important resources among K-12 Adventist school teachers in the NAD. Throughout the 20-year duration of the Profile Surveys, much has been done to improve those resources in response to teacher feedback. Such efforts have included the creation of new resources designed to meet the needs of multi-grade teachers, the creation of integrated units to simplify teaching across the curriculum, reduction in the size of curriculum guides to make them more user-friendly, and accessibility in various formats. Data analysis showed that the majority of teachers perceived NAD curriculum guides as effectively meeting the spiritual and cognitive goals of Adventist education but as lacking in addressing the physical and social goals. The use of curriculum guides by Adventist teachers has increased between 1987 and 2007 but improvement is still needed in this area.

Question 2—Textbooks: Data analysis showed that K-12 teachers favor newly revised or new textbooks over older ones. This suggests that a system should be put in place for continuously upgrading NAD textbooks (one teacher suggested every 5 years). Lack of proactive planning in that direction is likely to result in prolonged time lapses between revisions and engender decreases in teacher satisfaction. As textbooks are key

resources used daily in the K-12 classroom, one way to enhance teacher satisfaction is to keep those resources current.

Question 3—Technology: Based on data analysis, technology acquisition in K-12 schools increased substantively through the 20-year duration of the Profile Surveys. However, integration of technology into instruction is still lacking for various reasons. A key reason for this lack possibly relates to low proficiency levels in using the technologies in instruction on the part of the majority of teachers. Effective, research-based PD is likely to make a positive difference in this area.

Question 4—Other System-wide Issues: Although K-12 teachers face multiple issues needing attention, faith and learning integration, teaching critical thinking skills, and professional development all have very far-reaching effects on teaching. Based on data analysis the majority of K-12 teachers in the NAD are not proficient in integrating faith with learning or in teaching critical thinking skills to their students. These two aspects of pedagogy are of paramount importance both for preparing students for service in this life and for increasing the likelihood that they will not miss out on the life to come. Targeted requirements for teacher certification in these two areas could help to alleviate the problem. As for providing effective PD for teachers, experience in the Southern Union of Seventh-day Adventists shows that teacher study groups modeled after Joyce and Showers's work (2002) have had a positive impact on school improvement initiatives (Forbes, 2011).

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

1. Ensure that integration of faith and learning is a required component for teacher certification throughout the NAD (e.g., Rasi, 1991-2012—38 volumes; Taylor, 1989, 2001a, 2001b, 2005; Taylor, Lapat, & Oberholster, 2001).
2. Since critical thinking lies at the root of acceptance of biblical truths and general intelligence, develop a research-based critical thinking component (e.g., Mulnix, 2012) for teacher certification with a strong focus on application in teaching.
3. Professional development for the NAD should be consistently designed and implemented using research-based strategies (e.g., Joyce & Showers, 2002) which include massed and distributed practice and continues over time with support in the local school.
4. Specific areas identified by teachers for professional development include use of curriculum guides, J2E preferred practices, new textbook orientation, students with special needs, integrating faith and learning, and integrating technology in teaching.
5. System-level administrators might want to consider archiving the detailed history of J2E as a permanent part of a related website so that teachers visiting the site can access a complete picture of what the initiative entails. It seems that no details about the J2E initiative are available anywhere on the Internet (at the time this dissertation was completed).
6. While efforts have been made to acquaint teachers with J2E, additional efforts need to be made if its principles are still expected to shape and permeate K-12 Adventist education. Administrators need to keep staff turnover in mind and ensure that newer teachers and principals have opportunities to become acquainted with the initiative and its

goals. More should be done to *keep acquainting* teachers with the initiative and to effectively teach them to apply the Preferred Practices in their instruction. Based on Profile Survey results, some teachers seem to know nothing of this initiative.

7. Strategize in efforts to follow God's directives through White's writings in terms of Mastery Learning: "climb[ing] the lower rounds of the ladder before reaching for the higher rounds" (White, 1913, p. 219). Teachers need to ensure that academically challenged students acquire the basics such as grammatical skills, spelling, and writing at varied levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, even at the expense of neglecting other subjects for some time (see White, 1913, pp. 218-219).

8. As Adventist teachers in Canada often report the NAD curriculum guides as being incompatible with their mandated Provincial curriculum, conversations between these teachers and NAD educational leaders could help identify what specific types of Adventist resources would best serve the need of Adventist schools in Canada.

9. Textbooks that have enjoyed the highest excellent ratings through the years should be analyzed in efforts to replicate their positive features in future new and/or revised series.

10. Textbooks should be revised or updated more frequently, as teachers rate newly adopted and revised textbooks more favorably than their older counterparts. Perhaps alternative forms of textbooks would make the revision process easier to complete and distribute. For example, updates could take the form of new units of study delivered electronically to reduce printing costs.

11. A system to effectively coach teachers in technology integration in teaching needs to be put in place to make a positive difference in classroom implementation.

Interactive online workshops could be one possible avenue to help achieve this goal.

12. Technical support for schools needs to be given priority as a means of enhancing integration of technology into classroom instruction. Even when technology is available it is practically useless when technical challenges frequently get in the way of use.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research endeavors could focus on the following:

1. Work overload seems to be a continual problem for Adventist teachers.

Conduct research on teachers or principals who were successful in diminishing the problem of work overload; such could provide new models to effect solutions.

2. Conduct ethnographic or other kinds of studies to determine the strategies practitioners use to teach critical thinking skills.

3. Conduct ethnographic or other kinds of studies to determine the strategies practitioners use to integrate faith and learning in their classrooms.

4. Conduct ethnographic or other kinds of studies to determine the strategies practitioners use to integrate educational technologies, including computer use, into their pedagogy.

5. Research PD models to determine their effectiveness and levels of teacher satisfaction.

6. Conduct longitudinal studies on preservice and inservice teacher attitudes towards inclusion of students with special needs in the regular classroom.

7. Research private school teacher attitudes towards inclusion to see if differences exist between those whose students are required to take standardized tests versus those that do not.

8. Conduct comparative research of outcomes for students with special needs in classrooms where teachers approve versus disapprove inclusion.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE SURVEYS

CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE SURVEYS

1. Create future survey items with longitudinal analysis in mind.
2. Monitor future online surveys even more closely than previously done to ensure that respondents can skip sections as needed.

Note: The document on Survey Monkey allowed respondents to skip sections during the piloting stages but was problematic when the teachers accessed it. In future research endeavors, this needs to be monitored even more carefully.

3. Survey length: Should an interactive website be created where teachers can voice their views on an ongoing basis, formal surveys may not need to be as long as the Profile Surveys have been.
 4. Ensure that each survey item covers more than the two extremes of any continuum: offer at least three options.
-

APPENDIX B
LETTERS OF PERMISSION

SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTIST
CHURCH

**North America
Division**

12501 Old Columbi
Silver Spring, Ma
20904-6600 USA
Telephone (240) 2
Fax (301) 680-6624

March 23, 2015

Dear Dr. Desir:

IT IS MY PLEASURE TO GRANT YOU PERMISSION to use the specified graphics from my original works related to the Profile Surveys in your doctoral dissertation. As per your request they consist of the following:

Adaptations

Profile 1997: Leaders' Preparedness to Help Teachers with Innovations. *Profile '97 Preliminary Report*, p. 9 (Table 3 in your dissertation).

Profile 1997: Teachers' Perceptions of Innovative Educational Practices, by P. S. Brantley, 1998/1999, *Journal of Adventist Education*, 61(2), p. 30. (Table 4 in your dissertation).

Profile 1995-2001: K-12 Teacher Perceptions of Their Position on the Information Highway (p. 18), by P. S. Brantley, 1996/1997, *Journal of Adventist Education*, 59(2), 14-20. (Table 19 in your dissertation).

Profiles 1987 and 1989: Excerpts from Lists of "Teacher Concerns" and "Work-related Problems." (Table 25 in your dissertation).

Reprints

Profile 1987: "Teachers' Estimate of Usefulness of Resources." (Table 5 in your dissertation—title only changed).

Profile 1995: Use of Curriculum Guided by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately or Inadequately Inserviced. From *Profile '95: Present Realities . . . Future Perspectives*, p. 18. (Table 9 in your dissertation—some headings changed).

Profile 1995: Helpfulness of Curriculum Guides by Senior Academy Teachers Who Perceived Themselves as Adequately or Inadequately Inserviced: From *Profile '95: Present Realities . . . Future Perspectives*, p. 18. (Table 10 in your dissertation—some headings changed).

Profile 1999: Quality Cycles Model. From *Profile '99: A Report of Curriculum and Instruction in Seventh-day Adventist Schools*, p. 20. (Figure 29 in your dissertation).

Journey to Excellence Model: 2003. *Journey to Excellence: A Focus on Adventist Education in the 21st Century*, p. 24 (DVD and related booklet), by North American Division Office of Education, 2003, Silver Spring, MD. (Figure 30 in your dissertation).

I wish you continued success in your academic endeavors.

Paul Brantley

Paul S. Brantley, Ph.D.
NAD Vice President for
Strategic Planning and Assessment

Permissions

<permissions@ascd.org>

to
me

In response to your request below, please consider this permission to use the excerpt(s) from the referenced publication for your personal research purposes. Should you include excerpts or cite content in a paper or some other report form, please credit the source accordingly. If your research results in use of our content in a product or publication for commercial release, please contact me again to secure further rights to do so.

Sincerely yours,

KATY WOGEC • Sr. Paralegal

1703 N. Beauregard Street • Alexandria, VA 22311-1714

P [703-575-5749](tel:703-575-5749) • F [703-575-3926](tel:703-575-3926) • www.ascd.org • www.wholechildeducation.org

Join us:

From: desir@andrews.edu [mailto:desir@andrews.edu]

Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2015 8:19 AM

To: member@ascd.org

Subject: Contact Us (Thread:1316993)

I defended my doctoral dissertation at Andrews University two days ago and I'm seeking permission to use a table from one of your publications which I included in the dissertation. It is from Joyce & Showers book, Student Achievement Through Staff Development, 2002, p. 78. The table is titled "Training Components and Attainment of Outcomes in Terms of Percentage of Participants." Kindly provide a response in writing so I can include it in my dissertation Appendix.

Full Name: Monica Desir

Larry Burton

to me

Dr. Desir

I am happy to give you permission to use the adaptations of the tables from the Profile 2004 & 2007 reports. Best wishes as you move into the next phase of your career.

Larry D Burton, PhD
Professor of Curriculum Studies
Bell Hall #013A
4195 Administration Dr.
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0101

APPENDIX C

CURRICULUM GUIDE ADOPTION DATES THROUGH THE LIFESPAN OF THE PROFILE SURVEYS TO DATE (1987-2007)

CURRICULUM GUIDE ADOPTION DATES THROUGH THE
LIFESPAN OF THE PROFILE SURVEYS TO DATE
(1987-2007)

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Elementary/Junior Academy Curriculum Guides

Adoption Date (school year) Curriculum Guides

1991-1992	<i>A Child's World</i> (Kindergarten Program)
1991	<i>Stories of Ellen—Volume II</i> (available on CD)
1992-1993 / 2005-2006	<i>Social Studies Curriculum Guide K-8</i>
1992-1993	<i>The English Teacher's Manual</i> (35 Folders)
1993-1994	<i>Life Music Program</i> (4 books with eight units in each)
1993-1994	<i>Elementary Music Program</i>
1993-1994	<i>Elementary Resource Manual</i> (for PE)
1993-1994	<i>Language Arts Curriculum Guide K-8</i>
1995-1996	<i>Social Studies Curriculum Guide K-8</i>
1999-2000	<i>Science/Health</i> Grades 1 & 2
2000-2001	<i>K-8 Computer Curriculum Guide</i>
2000-2001	<i>Integrated Curriculum</i> Grades 5-8
2004-2005	<i>Integrated Language Arts Curriculum, K-8</i>
2006-2007	<i>Integrated Units, 5-8</i>
2005-2006	<i>Elementary Integrated Units</i>

CURRICULUM GUIDE ADOPTION DATES

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Small Schools Curriculum Materials

Adoption Date (school year)	Curriculum Resources
-----------------------------	----------------------

1990	<i>Small Schools Survival Guide: “completed and being used throughout the NAD”</i>
1992-1993	<i>Small Schools Language Arts Program: Spelling, Series B</i>
1992-1993	<i>Small Schools English Program (with Teacher’s Manual)</i>
2004-2005	<i>Multi-grade English Manual</i>
2005-2006	<i>Lifeline for Teachers: A Roadmap for Survival in Small Schools</i>
2005-2006	<i>Small Schools Social Studies Correlation</i>

CURRICULUM GUIDE ADOPTION DATES

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

K-12 Curriculum Materials

Adoption Date (school year)	Curriculum Resources
-----------------------------	----------------------

1991	<i>Music Curriculum Guide: K-12</i>
1992-1993	<i>Christian Service Curriculum Guide</i> (reprinted and shipped to Union offices)
1993-1994	<i>Physical Education Curriculum Guide K-12</i>
1993-1994	<i>Computer Education Curriculum Guide K-12</i>
1993-1994	<i>Technology Education Curriculum Guide K-12</i>
1996-1997	<i>K-12 Mathematics Curriculum Guide</i>
Dec 1997	<i>K-12 Art Curriculum Guide completed</i>
1998/1999	<i>K-12 Health/Science Curriculum Guide</i>
1999-2000	<i>K-12 Business and Computer Education Curriculum Guide</i>
2000-2001	<i>K-12 Religion Curriculum Guide</i>
2004-2005	<i>Arts Attack</i> (contract to be renewed)
2005-2006	<i>Integrated Unit: Over the Edge</i>

CURRICULUM GUIDE ADOPTION DATES

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Senior Academy Curriculum Materials

Adoption Date (school year)	Curriculum Resources
-----------------------------	----------------------

1991	<i>Social Studies Curriculum Guide 9-12</i>
1992-1993	<i>Science Curriculum Guide 9-12</i>
1993-1994	<i>Secondary Resource Manual</i> (for PE)
1995-1996	<i>Business Education Curriculum Guide 9-12</i>
1995	<i>9-12 Language Arts Curriculum scheduled to be reviewed by an editing committee during the summer of 1995. (Does not surface in future minutes.)</i>
1996-1997	<i>Keyboard Competency Test</i>
1996-1997	<i>Computer Literacy Test</i>
1996-1997	<i>9-12 Second Language Curriculum Guide</i>
1999-2000	<i>Secondary Integrated Units</i>
2004-2005	<i>Health Grades 9-12 Curriculum Guide</i>
2006-2007	<i>9-12 Science Curriculum Guide</i>
2006-2007	<i>9-12 Music and Visual Arts Curriculum Guide</i>

APPENDIX D

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION DATES THROUGH THE LIFESPAN

OF THE PROFILE SURVEYS TO DATE—(1987-2007)

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION DATES—(1987-2007)

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Elementary/Junior Academy Textbooks

Adoption Date (school year)	Textbook Series
1989-1990	<i>The Earth: Origins and Early History</i>
1989-1990	<i>Into His Likeness</i> (Grades 7/8)
1990/91	<i>God is Victor</i>
1991-1992	<i>A Child's World</i> (Kindergarten Program)
1992-1993	<i>God is Like This: Grade 6</i>
1993-1994	<i>What Shall I Live For: Activity Book</i> for Bible 5/6
	Science/Health (Grades 5/6 and 7/8):
1993-1994	<i>Discover God's Creation</i> Grades 5/6
1994-1995	<i>Discover God's World</i> Grades 5/6 (Series A—Gr. 6)
1995-1996	<i>Explore God's Creation</i> Grades 7/8 (Series B—Gr.8)
1991, 1994, 1996 editions	<i>Gateway to Reading</i> —(K-10)
1996-1997	<i>Explore God's World</i> Grades 7/8 (Series A: Gr. 7)
1996-1997	Social Studies Textbooks for Grades 7 and 8: <i>Adventures and Time and Place</i> (Grade 7: Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill 1997) <i>The American Nation</i> (Grade 8: Prentice Hall 1995)
Dec 1997	Bible Grades 1-4 First year in press (should be ready for 1998/1999)
1997-1998	<i>International Children's Bible</i> (Grades 1-4)
1999-2000	Adopt Kindergarten Materials at Level 1
2000-2001	<i>Life Series</i> 1-4

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION DATES

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Elementary/Junior Academy Textbooks—*Continued.*

Adoption Date (school year)	Textbook Series
1998-1999	<i>Belonging to His Family: Series 1</i>
1999-2000	<i>Exploring His Power: Series 2</i>
2000-2001	<i>Accepting His Plan: Series 3</i>
2001-2002	<i>Following His Way, Series 4</i>
2004-2005	New Bible Textbooks: Grades 5/6 <i>Fruit of the Spirit: Gifts of God</i> (Grade 5)
2005-2006	Grade 6 Bible book to be published
2005-2006	Grade 7/8 Bible textbooks [to be] revised.
2005-2006	Scott Foresman Social Studies, K-5
2005-2006	Social Studies for Grades 6-8 <i>World Studies</i> (for Grades 6/7—Prentice Hall) <i>American Nation</i> (for Grade 8—Prentice Hall)
2006-2007	Bible Grades 5/6 Textbooks adoption
Nov/Dec 2007	Completed Bible Textbooks for Grades 5-8 classified as Level 1
Nov/Dec 2007	Science Curriculum Guide K-8 classified as Level 1

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION DATES

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Senior Academy Textbooks

Adoption Date (school year) Textbook Series

1995-1996	<p>Bible 9-12—four units:</p> <p>Unit 1: <i>The Old Testament: The Gospel in Shadow</i></p> <p>Unit 2: <i>The New Testament: The Gospel in its Fullness</i></p> <p>Unit 3: <i>The Christian Era: The Gospel in The Decline and Restoration</i></p> <p>Unit 4: <i>The Advent Movement: The Gospel in Completion</i></p>
1995-1996	<p>Bible: Grade 9 (two student texts)</p> <p><i>In the Beginning God</i> (first semester)</p> <p><i>God's Gift—Our Choice</i> (second semester)</p>
1995-1996	<p>Bible: Grade 10--four units:</p> <p>Unit 1: <i>Life and Times of Israel: The Gospel in Story and Symbol</i></p> <p>Unit 2: <i>The Advent of Christ and Christianity: The Gospel in Person and Proclamation</i></p> <p>Unit 3: <i>Christianity as a World Religion: The Gospel in Prosperity and Adversity</i></p> <p>Unit 4: <i>Adventism and the Second Coming: The Gospel in Full Proclamation</i></p>
1998-1999	<p><i>Crossroads Bible Series</i>: Several nine-week units as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Daniel and Revelation 2. Romans 3. Friendships 4. Worldviews and Religion
1999-2000	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Marriage and Family 6. Hebrews 7. Beliefs 8. John 9. Choices and Challenges 10. Life Philosophy and Moral Issues

TEXTBOOK ADOPTION DATES

(All items in this document are based on the NADCC Minutes, 1987-2007)

Senior Academy Textbooks—*Continued.*

Adoption Date (school year)	Textbook Series
-----------------------------	-----------------

2006-2007	Secondary Science Textbooks, 9-12 (as reported by North Pacific Union)
2006-2007	Secondary Social Studies Textbooks, 9-12 (as reported by Lake Union)
Nov/Dec 2006	Secondary English Literature Textbook List (by Southern Union)
Nov/Dec 2006	9-12 Fine Arts Textbooks List
Nov/Dec 2006	9-12 Modern Languages Textbooks List (by Columbia Union)
Nov/Dec 2007	Secondary Health Textbooks adopted (as recommended by Southwestern Union)

APPENDIX E

SAMPLES: PROFILE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

SAMPLES: PROFILE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

INQUIRE '87

A Curriculum Assessment for Seventh-day Adventist Schools — Secondary teachers

Directions: Read each question and provide a complete, candid response. Your comments will be held in strict confidence. Do not sign your name anywhere on this form.

1. How many years have you taught? _____ Total; _____ in SDA schools; _____ in THIS school
2. From what type college did you receive your bachelor's? _____ SDA; _____ Other; _____ not finished
3. Are you currently working on a master's degree? _____ If yes, Where? _____
4. Have you completed a master's degree? _____ If yes, Where? _____
5. Which best describes your classroom instruction workload? _____ Fulltime in classroom _____ Parttime in classroom
6. Check your certification status: _____ Conditional _____ Standard _____ Professional _____ Not sure
7. Have you ever served on a curriculum development or textbook committee? _____ Yes; _____ No; _____ Don't know

8. The North American Division Curriculum Committee is considering a number of concerns related to improving curriculum and instruction within division. However, priorities must be set as to the most urgent needs. WITHIN THE BOX BELOW, **CIRCLE FOUR**, AND **ONLY FOUR** CONCERNS YOU FEEL DESERVE PRIORITY ATTENTION.

a. Better coordination between secondary and college	k. Improving instructional strategies	u. Sex education — AIDS
b. Board member orientation	l. Library improvement	v. Secondary science
c. Career education	m. Language Arts/English	w. Social studies
d. Computer issues	n. Mathematics	x. Special education; mainstreaming
e. Critical thinking skills	o. Making teaching more attractive	y. Spiritual commitment in SDA schools
f. Disadvantaged/inner city	p. Multi-ethnic racial adjustment problems	z. Standardized testing classroom assessment
g. Discipline; classroom management	q. Professional development of teachers	aa. Supervision of teaching
h. Foreign language	r. Music & Art	bb. Teacher burnout
i. Home economics	s. Reading	cc. Teacher evaluation
j. Implementation of the curriculum	t. Secondary Bible	dd. Work education

9. In addition to the ones you've circled, ARE THERE OTHER CONCERNS regarding curriculum and instruction which you feel should receive urgent, priority attention not listed above? _____

10. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU AWARE OF AND DO YOU USE THE FOLLOWING? 4 - VERY MUCH; 0 - NONE AT ALL

	AWARENESS	U S A G E		AWARENESS	U S A G E
1. Drug Education Program (Pacific Un.)	4 3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1 0	4. Reading Curriculum Guide (Pac.)	4 3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1 0
2. Christian Service in the Curriculum	4 3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1 0	5. Reading Curriculum Supplement	4 3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1 0
3. Quest/Vista (Southern Union)	4 3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1 0	6. Exceptional Child Guidelines	4 3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1 0

11. In the past MONTH, how many times have you referred to curriculum guides as a resource in your teaching?
 - a. twice or more
 - b. once
 - c. not at all
12. So far this year, has anyone (principal, supervisor, fellow teacher) observed your teaching and provided suggestions for improvement? (circle the letter)
 - a. twice or more
 - b. once
 - c. not at all
13. Would you like to have feedback on your teaching effectiveness? (circle the letter)
 - a. definitely YES
 - b. Yes, perhaps
 - c. Not really
 - d. Definitely NO

Who would you prefer to provide this feedback? _____

14. Indicate below the extent to which each of the following was considered by you to be a **problem** THIS SCHOOL YEAR. **CIRCLE** the appropriate number on the scale and provide comments to the right.

	A Real Problem	Not a Problem	C O M M E N T S
a. Classroom discipline problems	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		(Please identify your comments by question number)
b. Feelings of professional stagnation and isolation	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
c. Coping with many ability levels	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
d. Your principal's supportiveness of classroom instruction	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
e. Inadequate budget for classroom instruction	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
f. Inadequate space for instruction; over-crowded conditions	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
g. Racial/ethnic adjustment problems in this school	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
h. Time management/work overload	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
i. Supportiveness of parents	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
j. Keeping physically fit	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
k. Lack of spirituality among the student body	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
l. Reaching students in your classroom with effective teaching methods	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		
m. School morale	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1		

15. AN ASSESSMENT OF YOUR CURRENT CURRICULUM MATERIALS: How adequate are the published curriculum materials (e.g., textbooks)?

- In column A, below, LIST EACH CLASS making up your teaching assignment for this year. classes this year.
- In column B, WRITE THE NAMES OF THE TEXTBOOK and publisher for the class listed in column A.
- In column C, INDICATE HOW SATISFIED YOU ARE with the textbook(s) cited in column B.

	Column A NAME OF EACH CLASS YOU TEACH	Column B TEXTBOOK(S) USED		Column C Are you satisfied with the textbook(s) used? Circle one	
EXAMPLE:	English-grade 9	Language Structure & Use/Scott-Fore.	YES	<u>SOMEWHAT</u>	NO
Class #1	_____	_____	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
Class #2	_____	_____	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
Class #3	_____	_____	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
Class #4	_____	_____	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
Class #5	_____	_____	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
Class #6	_____	_____	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO

COMMENTS:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR OBSERVATIONS. PLEASE SEAL IN ENCLOSED ENVELOPE AND MAIL IMMEDIATELY!

Profile'91

An Assessment of SDA Curriculum by Elementary/Jr. Academy Teachers

This survey solicits teachers' candid ideas about curriculum used in SDA schools. Information from the Profile surveys helps determine the direction of curriculum development in the North American Division.

All individual responses and comments are securely kept in confidence. Please do not place your name anywhere on this form.

Part 1 Teacher Profiles

1. **Directions:** For each subject area below, CIRCLE ONLY THE GRADES YOU TEACH.
For example, Mrs. Susan Smith teaches music for grades five to eight:
EXAMPLE: MUSIC 1 2 3 4 (5 6 7 8) 9

HANDWRITING:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ENGLISH:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
SPELLING:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BIBLE:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
READING:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MATH:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
SCIENCE & HEALTH:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ART:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
SOCIAL STUDIES:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MUSIC:	K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. Age: ___ 20-29 ___ 30-39 ___ 40-49 ___ 50-59 ___ 60-69 ___ 70+
3. Teaching experience: ___ years in all; ___ years at this school.
4. Bachelors degree? ___ no ___ yes; if yes, from where? _____
5. Masters degree? ___ no ___ yes; if yes, from where? _____
6. Are you currently working on a degree? ___ no ___ yes; what kind of degree (e.g. M.A. in English)? _____
Where? _____
7. Are you thinking of working on another degree? ___ no ___ yes; what kind of degree? _____
Where? _____
8. In what type classroom do you teach?
___ self-contained ___ departmentalized ___ other (specify) _____

Part 2
Concerns about
Teaching

Circle the symbols that apply.

	Definitely Yes	Yes, Somewhat	Not Really	Definitely not	Doesn't Apply
1. Are you getting more children with special needs and problems in your classroom?	++	+	-	--	na
2. Do you feel you're able to keep sufficiently current in your profession?	++	+	-	--	na
3. Are you able to adequately cope with competing time demands (for work, family, hobbies, etc.)?	++	+	-	--	na
4. Would you characterize the morale in your school this year as basically positive?	++	+	-	--	na
5. Do you have sufficient occasions to network with your peers in other schools?	++	+	-	--	na
6. Do you feel adequate support from your local church(es)?	++	+	-	--	na
7. Are you on a consistent regiment for keeping physically fit?	++	+	-	--	na
8. Do you see yourself as teaching at your present location five years from now?	++	+	-	--	na
9. Do you see yourself remaining in the education profession five years from now?	++	+	-	--	na
10. Do you feel you receive adequate support from parents?	++	+	-	--	na
11. Has school discipline been more of a problem this year?	++	+	-	--	na

Part 3
A Teaching
Report Card

Please assess the following facets of your work appraising effectiveness of each on a scale from 'A' to 'F'.
(A = most effective)

1. Your school library	A	B	C	D	F	na
2. Conference teachers inservice workshops	A	B	C	D	F	na
3. The union standardized testing program	A	B	C	D	F	na
4. The Journal of Adventist Education	A	B	C	D	F	na
5. Your local conference office of education	A	B	C	D	F	na
6. Your salary/benefits	A	B	C	D	F	na
7. Your union conference office of education	A	B	C	D	F	na
8. SDA Curriculum guides	A	B	C	D	F	na

Part 4
Instructional
Support

12. Teachers who receive expert and timely feedback on their teaching, according to research, are more apt to develop and maintain competence. When the number of conference personnel are limited how do you feel this can best be done? From the list of ideas below, check two ideas which appeal to you most. Check only TWO.

- ☐ Institute a conference mentoring program where experienced teachers can work with newer teachers.
- ☐ Set up a peer coaching plan hiring substitutes to free up teachers for collaboration.
- ☐ Enlist greater support from college and university faculty particularly for beginning teachers.
- ☐ Develop teacher exchange networks so teachers within a certain region can visit and share ideas and materials.
- ☐ Utilize the talent and expertise of retired teachers in coaching and mentoring.
- ☐ (Your ideas please) _____

13. In future years considerable effort will go into developing SDA curricular guides for teacher use, but how should the guides best be used? From the list below, check your preference for the way curriculum guides SHOULD BE used. Check only ONE.

- ☐ As a benchmark to give teachers a general idea what they should be teaching and when.
- ☐ As a resource for suggesting general approaches and methodologies teachers should use in their instruction.
- ☐ As a specific and ongoing planning guide for day-to-day classroom instruction.
- ☐ Should be a compilation of high quality, ready-made lesson plans teachers can use in day to day instruction.
- ☐ (Your ideas please) _____

14. What subject area within the curriculum do you feel needs the most attention as the North American Division sets an agenda for the selection and/or development of curriculum materials over the next five years? What should be done in that area?

**Part 5
Curriculum
Delivery**

**How effectively are
SDA curriculum materials
delivered to teachers?**

15. **DIRECTIONS:** We would like to assess how effectively materials are delivered to teachers for their use. For each item listed below, indicate by circling a numeral how much you **KNOW ABOUT** the material (awareness) and how much you **USE** the material (usage), and how satisfied you are with it. Answer on a scale from "3" to "1" where:
3 = VERY MUCH; 1 = LITTLE; none = NONE; NA = I don't teach this subject; materials don't apply.

ITEM	How AWARE are you of materials?				How much do you USE materials?				Quality of mat'ls? (Rate from A to F)					
For ALL teachers:														
A Reason for Writing	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Adventist Reading Management System (ARMS)	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
AIDS Teachers Resource Unit (SDA)	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Christian Service in the Curriculum	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Curriculum Guide-English & Language Arts K-12 (SDA)	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Earth's Story	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Exceptional Child Guidelines	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Columbia Union Music Program	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
North Pacific Union PE Skilpak	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Atlantic Union Native American	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Pacific Union Drug Education	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
SDA African American Heritage	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
For teachers in small schools:														
Art Works for Small Schools	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Bible Activities for 1-teacher Schools (Series E)	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Small Schools Survival Guide	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Video: Reading Management in Small Schools	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Video: Small School Digest	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
For teachers of grades 9 & 10:														
The Earth: It's Origins and Early History	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Curriculum Guide Health Education 9-10 (SDA)	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Curriculum Guide Religion 9-10	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na
Secondary Reading Materials 7 vols. (Pacific Union)	3	2	1	none	3	2	1	none	A	B	C	D	F	na

THANK YOU! NOW, ENCLOSE IN ENVELOPE PROVIDED AND MAIL RIGHT AWAY!

140
Assessment 2

Goals: ① Related to I+BS & SDA goals.
② Increase?
③ Possible qual. content

Profile'93

An Assessment of SDA Curriculum by Senior Academy Teachers

This survey solicits teachers' candid ideas about curriculum used in SDA schools. Information from the Profile surveys helps determine the direction of curriculum development in the North American Division. All individual responses and comments are securely kept in confidence. Please do not place your name anywhere on this form.

Part 1 Teacher Profiles

Directions: For item below, place a check ☒ in the space that best supplies the answer.

1. Age: ☐ 20-24 ☐ 25-29 ☐ 30-39 ☒ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60+
2. Teaching experience: 8 years in all; 2 years at this school.
3. Is your *teaching* load at least half time? ☒ Yes ☐ No
4. Do you work in a boarding school? ☐ Yes ☒ No

What are your areas of work? Place a "1" in the blank next to your primary work assignment and a "2" in the blank next to your secondary work assignment, if you have one.

☐ Princ/Vice prin	☐ Guidance/Registrar	☐ Bible	☐ Business ed
☐ Computer science	☐ English/reading	☐ History	☐ Home Econ
☐ Modern Languages	☐ Music	<u>2</u> Science, physical	☐ PE & health
<u>1</u> Science, life	☐ Vocational	☐ Other (specify) _____	

Part 2 Concerns about Teaching. How do you view aspects of your job? What are your concerns about the profession. Circle the symbols that apply.

++=definitely yes +=yes, somewhat -=not really --=definitely not ?=unsure/no opinion

1. Are you getting more students with special needs and problems in your classroom?	++	(+)	-	--	?
2. Do you have sufficient occasions to network with your peers in other schools?	++	+	(-)	--	?
3. Do you feel adequate support and respect from the constituency which operates your school?	(++)	+	-	--	?
4. Do you see yourself as teaching at your present location five years from now?	++	+	(-)	--	?
5. Do you feel you have a sufficient voice in determining the curriculum you teach?	++	(+)	-	--	?
6. Do you feel you have a sufficient voice in the selection of your textbooks?	++	(+)	-	--	?
7. Do you often spend time outside of school time assisting students with personal problems?	(++)	+	-	--	?

Part 3 Concerns about testing

Does your school participate in the ITBS standardized testing program?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, when is it given?

☒ fall

☐ spring

☐ fall & spring

++=definitely yes +=yes, somewhat -=not really --=definitely not ?=unsure/no opinion

1. Do the teachers in your school use the test results in ways that really benefit students?	++	+	(-)	--	?
2. Are you satisfied with the time(s) in the school year the testing is done?	++	+	-	(--)	?
3. Do students in your classroom become "test weary" from too much standardized testing?	++	+	-	(--)	?
4. Are these standardized test results important to parents and school boards?	++	(+)	-	--	?
5. Does the standardized test adequately sample the full spectrum of students' abilities?	++	+	-	(--)	?
6. Do you feel the standardized test measures the important goals and objectives of SDA education?	++	+	-	(--)	?
7. How well do you think the standardized test matches what you teach each day (textbooks, etc.)	++	+	(-)	--	?
8. Does your school have a comprehensive and well-organized student assessment program?	++	+	-	(--)	?

Comment:

Part 4 Helpful supplements. Teaching is difficult. The NAD and your union would like to coordinate the preparation of tools and aids that would help make teaching more manageable and effective. How helpful do you think the following aids would be to you? Circle the symbols that apply.

+++ = most essential ++ = quite helpful + = of some use - = not helpful ? = unsure/no opinion

1. A one-page statement which articulates SDA philosophy and provides direction for the curriculum	(+++)	++	+	-	?
2. A set of essential learnings for all SDA schools	(+++)	++	+	-	?
3. A scope and sequence to let you know of the kinds of student outcomes expected at each teaching area or level	(+++)	++	+	-	?
4. Creative, classroom-ready teaching units with concrete ideas for supplementing textbook instruction	(+++)	++	+	-	?
5. Correlation charts that relate what you wish to teach with relevant portions of a variety of textbooks	(+++)	++	+	-	?
6. Gateway. A review of appropriate literature for SDA schools	+++	(++)	+	-	?
7. Commercially prepared workbooks and ditto masters which give students the opportunity to practice	+++	++	(+)	-	?

Part 5 Ideas for in-service workshops and summer short courses. The North American Division Curriculum Committee is considering a number of concerns related to improving professional development of teachers within our division. What areas do you feel you would MOST like to see featured as workshops are planned? CIRCLE ONLY FOUR letters a. through p.

- 1 a. Learning up-to-date strategies to help me improve my instruction
- 2 b. Discipline and classroom management strategies
- 3 c. More preparation in subject area content
- 4 d. Preparation on unit and lesson planning for the coming school year
- 5 e. Orientation to textbooks & curriculum materials in area of teaching
- 6 f. Learning to better implement spiritual concepts into the curriculum
- 7 g. Better use of computers and technology in teaching
- 8 h. Learning alternative assessment strategies
- 9 i. Coping with students with special needs and learning problems *physical*
- 10 j. Multigrade instruction
- 11 k. Service education (a curriculum for helping students help others) *social*
- 12 l. More effective methods of Bible teaching
- 13 m. Cooperative learning *social*
- n. Integrated thematic instruction
- o. Concept attainment, synectics and other models of teaching (Bruce Joyce)
- p. Follow-up on Valuegenesis; developing faith

List other ideas for workshops not mentioned above

<i>4 - portfolio's for student assessment</i>

Part 6 Concerns about New Technologies. More and more, newer technologies are becoming affordable. Some of them show real promise in assisting teachers and students in their work.

Circle your answer in the appropriate box to the right

How many of the following options are available for you to use right now? circle the appropriate response.	I have right now	I can get; no problem	I don't have
One or more microcomputers in your classroom	have now	can get	don't have
A speakerphone to feature guests from around the world	have now	can get	don't have
A modem for connecting into a computer network, electronic bulletin board, etc.	have now	can get	don't have
A satellite dish for receiving read-outs	have now	can get	don't have
A videocassette recorder/player	have now	can get	don't have
How many microcomputers do you have in your classroom?	none	one	several
What type of microcomputer system do you have?	apple	IBM compat	other
Does your school have a specialized room for microcomputers?	yes	no	

Part 7 Preferred Format for Inservice and Professional Development

Which format do you feel is MOST effective for becoming oriented to new instructional programs adopted by the North American Division? RANK in "1" "2" "3" order of your preference. (give your top three preferences only where "1" equals "most desired")

- 1 Summer workshops and seminars taken at SDA colleges and universities
- 2 Beginning-of-the-year teachers' conventions where materials are displayed and explained
- ___ Periodic conference workshops held during the year at various regions of the conference
- ___ Someone to come to your classroom, explain the materials, and observe you use them
- ___ Monthly study groups (teacher exchange) where teachers experienced in the materials can share with other teachers strategies that work
- 3 Videotapes to accompany materials that explain how to use them
- ___ Other (specify) _____

Part 8 Comment

In the space below, please share any concern you have related to the curriculum which you feel needs attention on the part of those who make curriculum decisions.

<p>Do you teach the Life Reading Series?</p> <p>☒ Yes ☐ No, if no, go to -></p>	<p>Do you teach the NAD Small Schools English curriculum?</p> <p>☐ Yes ☒ No, if no, go to -></p>	<p>Do you teach <u>A Child's World</u> kindergarten curriculum?</p> <p>☐ Yes ☒ No</p>
<p>How would you rate the series?</p> <p>☒ Excellent</p> <p>☐ OK, minor reservations</p> <p>☐ Major problems</p>	<p>How would you rate the series?</p> <p>☐ Excellent</p> <p>☐ OK, minor reservations</p> <p>☐ Major problems</p>	<p>How would you rate the series?</p> <p>☐ Excellent</p> <p>☐ OK, minor reservations</p> <p>☐ Major problems</p>
<p>How well were you inserviced?</p> <p>☐ Thoroughly, with good follow-up</p> <p>☒ Adequately, but little follow-up</p> <p>☐ Minimally, very sketchy</p> <p>☐ Not at all, taught myself</p>	<p>How well were you inserviced?</p> <p>☐ Thoroughly, with good follow-up</p> <p>☐ Adequately, but little follow-up</p> <p>☐ Minimally, very sketchy</p> <p>☐ Not at all, taught myself</p>	<p>How well were you inserviced?</p> <p>☐ Thoroughly, with good follow-up</p> <p>☐ Adequately, but little follow-up</p> <p>☐ Minimally, very sketchy</p> <p>☐ Not at all, taught myself</p>
<p>Which components do you use most frequently? Choose all that apply.</p> <p>☒ skilpak ☐ Study book</p> <p>☒ criterion ☐ booster</p> <p> exercises exercises</p>	<p>Which components do you use most frequently? Choose all that apply.</p> <p>☐ textbk/workbk correlation</p> <p>☐ individual activities</p> <p>☐ student writing activities</p>	<p>Which components do you use most frequently? Choose all that apply.</p> <p>☐ Level 1 Life series ☐ activity</p> <p>☐ Teacher Handbook units</p> <p>☐ Worship resources ☐ cassettes</p>

<p>Which describes your <i>preferred</i> approach to reading instruction? Choose only one.</p> <p>(☒) phonics () basal series () look/say (☒) whole language () other (specify): _____</p>	<p>Which describes your <i>preferred</i> approach to English instruction? Choose only one.</p> <p>() centered around structured textbook & workbook exercises () centered around a writing base e.g., poetry, stories, news, etc.</p>	<p>Which describes your <i>preferred</i> approach to kindergarten instruction? Choose only one.</p> <p>() pre-first grade academics () only informal experiences, play () no formal schooling; home environment</p>
<p>Which aspect(s) of the <u>Life Reading Series</u> <u>causes</u> the most problems for you?</p>	<p>Which aspect(s) of <u>Small School English</u> causes the most problems for you?</p>	<p>Which aspect(s) of <u>A Child's World</u> causes the most problems for you?</p>

When you are finished, please check the entire questionnaire for accuracy and mail RIGHT AWAY in the envelope provided.

Part 9 Textbook Evaluations

Please answer for EACH subject area below.

Please answer for
each of the areas

	A. BIBLE	B. Spelling	C. SCIENCE/HEALTH	D. ART	E. ENGLISH
Do you teach this subject area?	☒ YES ☐ NO --omit below and go on to B. ✓	☒ YES ☐ NO --omit below and go on to C. ✓	☒ YES ☐ NO --omit below and go on to D. ✓	☒ YES ☐ NO --omit below and go on to E. ✓	☒ YES ☐ NO --omit below and go on to the other side ✓
What Textbook do you use? only one rating per subject area; If you use more than one, choose one that concerns you most.	☒ SDA Bible 1-4 ☐ SDA Bible 5-8 ☐ Other (specify)	☐ Small School ☒ Other-specify <i>Canadian Speller</i>	☒ SDA grades 1-4 ☐ SDA old 5-8 ☐ Other (specify)	☐ Art Works Hdbk for Small Sch ☒ Other <i>Random sources</i>	☐ Macmillan ☐ Silver-Burdett ☐ HBJ-regular commercial series ☐ HBJ-new NAD revised series <i>Lang. Round-up</i>
How would you rate the textbook you are using?	☐ Excellent! ☒ OK, with minor reservations ☐ Major problems	☐ Excellent! ☒ OK, with minor reservations ☐ Major problems	☒ Excellent! ☐ OK, with minor reservations ☐ Major problems	☐ Excellent! ☒ OK, with minor reservations ☐ Major problems	☐ Excellent! ☒ OK, with minor reservations ☐ Major problems

What problem areas have you noted?	() Readability problems () Inadequate teacher helps () Cumbersome to manage () Inappropriate content () Isn't Christ-centered () Difficulty in testing () Too expensive () Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	() Readability problems () Inadequate teacher helps () Cumbersome to manage () Inappropriate content <i>sometimes</i> () Isn't Christ-centered () Difficulty in testing () Too expensive () Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	() Readability problems () Inadequate teacher helps () Cumbersome to manage () Inappropriate content () Isn't Christ-centered () Difficulty in testing () Too expensive () Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	() Readability problems () Inadequate teacher helps () Cumbersome to manage () Inappropriate content () Isn't Christ-centered () Difficulty in testing () Too expensive () Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	() Readability problems () Inadequate teacher helps () Cumbersome to manage () Inappropriate content () Isn't Christ-centered () Difficulty in testing () Too expensive () Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS
	☐ Readability problems ☐ Inadequate teacher helps ☐ Cumbersome to manage ☐ Inappropriate content ☐ Isn't Christ-centered ☐ Difficulty in testing ☒ Too expensive ☐ Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS <i>I would like a more "hands-on," practical Christianity, service-oriented guide.</i>	☐ Readability problems ☐ Inadequate teacher helps ☐ Cumbersome to manage ☒ Inappropriate content <i>sometimes</i> ☒ Isn't Christ-centered ☐ Difficulty in testing ☐ Too expensive ☐ Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	☐ Readability problems ☐ Inadequate teacher helps ☐ Cumbersome to manage ☐ Inappropriate content ☐ Isn't Christ-centered ☐ Difficulty in testing ☐ Too expensive ☐ Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	☐ Readability problems ☐ Inadequate teacher helps ☐ Cumbersome to manage ☐ Inappropriate content ☐ Isn't Christ-centered ☐ Difficulty in testing ☐ Too expensive ☐ Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS	☐ Readability problems ☐ Inadequate teacher helps ☒ Cumbersome to manage ☒ Inappropriate content ☒ Isn't Christ-centered ☐ Difficulty in testing ☒ Too expensive ☐ Lacks durability OTHER COMMENTS

No attempt

Profile'97

An Assessment of SDA Curriculum -- Senior Academy Edition

What are your ideas about curriculum for SDA schools? Information from the Profile surveys helps determine the direction of curriculum development in the North American Division. All individual responses and comments are kept securely in confidence. Please, do not place your name anywhere on the face of this form.

1. Teaching Experience? In years 1 Total number of years in education 2 Year at your present location 2
 2. Highest degree completed? Check one ☒ Bachelors ☐ Masters ☐ Specialist ☐ Doctorate

3. Please circle your primary school assignment(s) below--

Bible	History	English	Science	Math	Music	PE/health
Administrator	Vocational/ Technical	Computer Studies	Home Economics	Modern Languages	Other _____	

4. Have you received a copy of the colorful report of the North American Division Futures Commission, *Focus on Adventist Curriculum and Trends for the 21st Century*?

 NO YES If yes, What is your impression of the report? [] favorable [] mixed [] unfavorable

5. Your Opinion Please: How effective is our North American Division school system in helping students reach the following NAD K-12 goals? Circle a numeral on a scale from 1 "Ineffective" to 7 "effective".

a. Accepting God and His word <i>✓</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
b. Commitment to the Church <i>2</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
c. Family and interpersonal relationships <i>?</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
d. Responsible citizenship--local, national, global <i>✓</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
e. Healthy, balanced living <i>5</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
f. Intellectual development <i>6</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
g. Communication skills <i>7</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
h. Life skills--functioning in everyday life <i>✓</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
i. Aesthetic appreciation <i>9</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective
j. Career and Service <i>3</i>	Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Effective

6. Innovative Educational Practices. How do you feel about the following innovations? Check (✓) in the appropriate space beneath the innovation. If possible, make comments in the space below the innovation.

PORTFOLIOS and alternative assessment

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

EXPERIMENTS IN FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING / CORE CURRICULUM VARIATIONS / BLOCK SCHEDULING, ETC.

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

TEACHER-TO TEACHER NETWORKS (Examples: Study groups, Beginning teacher programs, peer coaching, etc.)

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

TEACHING FOR MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES AND LEARNING STYLES

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

INNOVATIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY: (Examples: EMG / CD MULTIMEDIA / HYPERCARD, ETC)

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

INTEGRATED CURRICULUM

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

INCLUSION STRATEGIES for teaching students with disabilities within the regular classroom

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION: (Examples: EXPERIENTIAL/PROBLEM-BASED INSTRUCTION, DIMENSIONS OF LEARNING, ETC.)

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency
comment--

SCHOOL-TO-WORK PROGRAMS / BUSINESS-SCHOOL-HOME-CHURCH PARTNERSHIPS

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency

CURRICULUMS IN WITNESSING AND SERVICE LEARNING

()not interested in ()not heard of ()heard about ()would like to try ()started implementing ()using with proficiency

7. Information Technology and Teaching.

Just where are *YOU* on the information highway? Check ONE that best applies--

- ___ Still in the garage. I can't seem to get oriented into using computers to any extent.
- ___ Waiting for a ride. I'm interested but need someone to help me get moving.
- ___ Starting up my engines. I'm really excited! I've already made plans to get started.
- ___ In the driveway. I've tentatively begun doing some things that look promising.
- ___ In low gear. I'm using computer systems for some basic teaching or non-teaching things.
- ___ In high gear. I use computer systems for a wide variety of applications *in teaching*.
- ___ Near my destination. I am a sophisticated user, developer, and consultant.

8. Which approach to multiculturalism do you prefer?

- ___ Celebrate all cultures showing how each culture contributes to and enriches the whole.
- ___ De-emphasize multiculturalism and focus instead on our common cultural heritage.

9. Resources At-Your-Fingertips: How many of the following are “at your fingertips” for you to use at your place of work whenever you like? Check (✓)

FAX machine	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
The Internet/ e-mail	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
World-wide Web	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
Apple McIntosh PC	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
IBM or compatible PC	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
Computer CD applications	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
Computer printer	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
Videocassette recorder	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use
Videoprojector	☐ have and use	☐ have but don't regularly use	☐ don't have and don't use

10. Teacher Inservice and Professional Development: The North American Division's Future Report emphasizes the increased need for teacher professional development. Which format do you feel is MOST effective for becoming oriented to the innovative practices involved in teaching these days? SELECT (✓) ONLY THREE of your top preferences.

- ☐ Summer workshops and seminars taken at SDA colleges and universities
☐ Beginning of the year teachers conventions where materials are displayed and explained
☐ Periodic conference workshops held during the year at various regions of the conference
☐ Someone to come to your classroom, explain the materials, and observe you use them
☐ Monthly study groups (teacher exchange) where teachers can share ideas that work
☐ Videotapes to accompany materials that explain how to use them

11. Assessment of curriculum guides. Curriculum guides do not have to be used every day or even every month. They should be used when you make up your course outlines before the beginning of the school term. Did you use curriculum guides at the time you planned your course outlines? Circle One YES NO

IF NO, why not? ☐ didn't have a copy at that time ☐ guides too cumbersome to use
☐ guide didn't fit my teaching plans ☐ guides didn't match textbook
☐ other reason(s) for non-use? _____

12. A number of SDA curriculum resources have come out in recent years. In each box below, place a check [✓] in the box if you USED the resource; then rate the effectiveness of the resource and comment.

☐ Science Curriculum Guide 9-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems
Comment on each resource if possible			
☐ Science Concepts 9-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems
☐ Science Experiments 9-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems
☐ Business Education 9-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems
☐ Music K-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems
☐ Math Curriculum Guide K-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems
☐ Computer K-12	☐ Excellent!	☐ Minor problems	☐ Major problems

Check ☒ if you were able to use any of these curriculum resources; then give an assessment and comment.

☐] Computer Literacy Test Comment on each resource if possible	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Keyboarding Competency Test	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] English 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Second Language 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Science Curriculum Guide 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Science Concepts 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Science Experiments 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Business Education 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Physical Education	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] PE Teacher's Resource 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Health Curriculum Guide 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems
☐] Social Studies Curr Guides 9-12	() Excellent!	() Minor problems	() Major problems

13. TEXTBOOK EVALUATION: Please rate the quality of each textbook you are using and give comments.
Your assessment will help ascertain the effectiveness of textbooks being used throughout the Division.

Title of Textbook _____ comments?	_____ grade? _____	<i>Your Rating?</i>			
		A: excellent	B. good	C. fair	D. poor
Textbook _____ comments?	_____ grade? _____	A: excellent	B. good	C. fair	D. poor
Textbook _____ comments?	_____ grade? _____	A: excellent	B. good	C. fair	D. poor
Textbook _____ comments?	_____ grade? _____	A: excellent	B. good	C. fair	D. poor
Textbook _____ comments?	_____ grade? _____	A: excellent	B. good	C. fair	D. poor

THANK YOU!! NOW ENCLOSE IN ENVELOPE AND MAIL RIGHT AWAY!!!

REFERENCE LIST

REFERENCE LIST

- Ackroyd, S. (2009). Research designs for realist research. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 532-548). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Aldrich, H. E. (1979). *Organizations and environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Allday, R. A., Neilsen-Gatti, S., & Hudson, T. M. (2013, November). Preparation for inclusion in teacher education pre-service curricula. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 36(4), 298-311. doi:10.1177/0888406413497485
- American Evaluation Association. (2004). *American Evaluation Association guiding principles for evaluators*. Retrieved from <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>
- Apple, M.W. (2008). Curriculum planning: Content, form, and the politics of accountability. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), and M. F. He & J. Phillion (Assoc. Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 25-44). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Au, W. (2009). *Unequal by design: High-stakes testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local authority. *Educational Psychology*, 20(2), 191-211.
- Ball, D., & Cohen, D. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as a leaning profession* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Balli, S. J., Cooper, A. M., & Hamilton, L. D. (2007, Summer). Cultivating critical thinking skills through an interdisciplinary study of the earth's origin. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 69(5), 24-29.
- Becker, H. J. (2000, November 15). Findings from the teaching, learning, and computing survey: Is Larry Cuban right? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(51), 1-31.

- Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bigne, E., Ruiz, C., & Sanz, S. (2005). The impact of internet user shopping patterns and demographics on consumer mobile buying behavior. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 6(3), 193-210.
- Blum, L. M. (n.d.). Best practices for effective schools. *Johns Hopkins Urban Institute*. Retrieved from http://urbanhealth.jhu.edu/media/best_practices/effective_schools.pdf
- Bombshell reports show at least 100 cases of teachers cheating on standardized tests in public schools since 2006: Teachers handed out answers and gave kids extra time on exams used to promote students, decide school closings and award teacher bonuses. (2013, January 28). *New York Daily News*. Retrieved from <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/report-shows-cheating-teachers-article-1.1249570>
- Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Brantley, P. S. (in consultation with NADCC special committee on needs assessment: Marshall, N., McCune, B., Northrup, M., & Randolph, G.). (1987, May). *Curriculum and instruction in Seventh-day Adventist schools: A profile of teacher concerns*. An executive summary prepared for the NADOE and the NADCC, Berrien Springs, MI: Author. [Inquire '87 (same as Profile 1987), Document No. 1]
- Brantley, P. S. (1988a, February/March). Curriculum and instruction in S.D.A. schools: Results of the first NADCC teacher poll. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 50(3), 6-8, 30-33.
- Brantley, P. S. (in consultation with NADCC members: Marshall, N., McCune, B., Northrup, M., & Randolph, G.). (1988b, May). *Multigrade teacher concerns—Profile 1987: An assessment of curriculum usage in S.D.A. schools*. Report B prepared for the NADOE and the NADCC. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.
- Brantley, P. S. (in consultation with NADCC members: Marshall, N., McCune, B., Northrup, M., & Randolph, G.). (1988c). *Teacher concerns—Profile 1987: An assessment of curriculum usage in S.D.A. schools*. An overview prepared for the NADOE and the NADCC. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.
- Brantley, P. S. (1990, May). *Curriculum and instruction in Adventist schools: A profile of teacher concerns*. A final report of the Profile '89 survey. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.
- Brantley, P. S. (1991). *Profile '91: A curriculum impact study of Seventh-day Adventist schools in North America*. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.

- Brantley, P. S. (1992, February/March). Curriculum and teaching in Adventist schools: Results of the third North American Division teacher poll. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 54(3), 21-25.
- Brantley, P. S. (1996, May). *Present realities . . . future perspectives*. A final report presented to the North American Division curriculum committee, Collegedale, TN.
- Brantley, P. S. (1996/1997, December/January). Curriculum and instruction in North American schools: Results from the Profile '95 survey of SDA educators. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 59(2), 14-20.
- Brantley, P. S. (1997a). *Profile '97: A preliminary report of curriculum and instruction in Seventh-day Adventist schools*. Report Presented to the North American Division Curriculum Committee. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.
- Brantley, P. S. (Compiler.). (1997b). *Profile '97 comments*: Copy in data files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Brantley, P. S. (1998/1999, December/January). Curriculum and instruction in North American Division schools: Results from the Profile '97 survey. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 61(2), 26-32.
- Brantley, P. S. (1999, December). *Profile '99: A report of curriculum and instruction in Seventh-day Adventist schools*. Report Presented to the North American Division Curriculum Committee. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.
- Brantley, P. S., & Burton, L. D. (1993). *Profile '93: A curriculum impact study of North American Division Seventh-day Adventist schools*. Berrien Springs, MI: Author.
- Brantley, P. S., & Burton, L. D. (Compilers.). (1994, May). *Profile '93 general comments: Elementary teachers, senior academy teachers, conference supervisors, NADCC*. Copy in data files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Brantley, P. S., & Hwangbo, Y. (2000, October/November). Curriculum and instruction in North American schools: Results from the Profile '99 survey of Adventist educators. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 63(1), 4-9.
- Brantley, P. S., & Ruiz, A. (2001/2002, December/January). Profile '01: Results from the eighth biennial survey of Adventist educators—curriculum and instruction in North American schools. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 64(2), 16-24.

- Bridges, E. M. (1982, Summer). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 12-33.
doi:10.1177/0013161X82018003003
- Buchanan, D. A., & Bryman, A. (2009). The organizational research context: Properties and implications. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 1-18). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Buckenmeyer, J. A. (2010). Beyond computers in the classroom: Factors related to technology adoption to enhance teaching and learning. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 3(4), 27-35.
- Burch, P. (2007). Educational policy and practice from the perspective of institutional theory: Crafting a wider lens. *Educational Researcher*, 36(2), 84-95.
- Burton, L. D. (2005, December). *Profile 2004 final report*. Tucson, AZ: Author.
- Burton, Larry D. (Ed.). (2009, December). *Profile 2007: Final Report*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews International Center for Educational Research.
- Burton, L. D. (Compiler). (2007). *Profile 2007 teacher responses: Qualitative Comments*. Copy in electronic data files, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Burton, L. D., Gittens-St. Juste, P.G., McGarrell, F. A., & Nwosu, C.C. (2005, October/November). Profile 2004: What do we know about the quality and commitment of Adventist educators? *Journal of Adventist Education*, 68(1), 10-17.
- Burton, L. D., Gittens-St-Juste, P.G., & Davidson, R. L. (2006/2007, December/January). Profile 2004: K-12 teacher perceptions of Adventist curriculum. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 69(2), 19-25.
- Burton, L. D., Gittens-St. Juste, P. G., & Davidson, R. L. (2007). Adventist curriculum: Relationships between teachers' use and perceptions of quality. *Private School Monitor*, 29(1), 1-7.
- Burton, L. D., Katenga, J. E., Kijai, J., Xing, W., & Ho, Y-M. (2011). Working toward systemic change in a Christian school system. *Journal of Christian Education*, 54(3), 43-58. *Note:* Official publication date is 2011 but actual publication was released in mid-2014 as the journal was three years behind in production.
- Burton, L. D., & Telemaque, E. D. (2010/2011, December/January). Quality and commitment of Adventist educators: The latest North American Division Profile Survey results. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 73(2), 30-34.

- Cardus Education Survey. (2012/2013). The Christian school difference. *Christian School Comment*, 44(5). Retrieved from http://www.vcademy.info/editoruploads/files/11_%20The%20Christian%20School%20Difference.pdf
- Carpenter, S. K., Cepeda, N. J., Rohrer, D., Kang, S. H. K., & Pashler, H. (2012, August). Using spacing to enhance diverse forms of learning: Review of recent research and implications for instruction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24(3), 369-378. doi:10.1007/s10648-012-9205-z
- Cavanaugh, T. W. (n.d.). *Preparing teachers for the inclusion classroom: Understanding assistive technology and its role in education*. Retrieved from http://www.unf.edu/~tcavanau/presentations/preparing_teachers_for_the_inclu.htm
- Cederblom, J., & Paulsen, D. W. (2012). *Critical reasoning: Understanding and criticizing arguments and theories* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Chandrasekhar, A., Kaimal, V. P., Bhamare, C., & Khosla, S. (2011). Ambient intelligence: The next generation technology. *International Journal on Computer Science & Engineering*, 3(6), 2491-2497.
- Chin, D., Dohmen, I., Cheng, B., Opezzo, M., Chase, C., & Schwartz, D. (2010). Preparing students for future learning with Teachable Agents. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 58(6), 649-669.
- Colwell, C. M. (2013). Simulating disabilities as a tool for altering individual perceptions of working with children with special needs. *International Journal of Music Education*, 31(1), 68-77. doi:10.1177/0255761411433725
- Connecticut State Education Resource Center. (n.d.). *Best practices in education*. Retrieved from http://ctserc.org/s/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=42&Itemid=26
- Covrig, D. M. (1999). *A case study of the organizational history of Loma Linda University: An examination of contingency and institutional explanations of development* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9947104)
- Covrig, D. M. (2005). Mountains, flatlands, and tenuous meaning: Organizational sociology in administrative sensemaking. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(1), 102-120. doi:10.1108/09578230510577326
- Cox, W. F., Jr., Hameloth, N. J., & Talbot, D. P. (2007, July-December). Biblical fidelity of Christian school textbooks. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 16(2), 181-210.

- Coy, G. (1986, February/March). Communication technology in finishing God's work. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 48(3), 24-25, 36.
- Craig, C. J., & Ross, V. (2008). Cultivating the image of teachers as curriculum makers. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), and M. F. He & J. Phillion (Assoc. Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 282-305). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Cuban, L., Kirkpatrick, H., & Peck, C. (2001). High access and low use of technology in high school classrooms: Explaining an apparent paradox. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 813-834.
- CIRCLE. (n.d.). *About CIRCLE (Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center Linking Educators)*. Retrieved from <http://circle.adventist.org/help/?topic=aboutus>
- Currier, S., et al. (2012). Rap coaching with teachers. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 20(4), 28-30.
- Curtis, D. (2013, Fall). The search for ideal viewing conditions. *Millennium Film Journal*, 58, 13-15; 17. (ProQuest Document ID 1468444696)
- Davies, M. (2011). Concept mapping, mind mapping, and argument mapping: What are the differences and do they matter? *Higher Education*, 62(3), 279-301.
- Davies, W. M. (2009). Computer-assisted argument mapping: A rationale approach. *Higher Education*, 58(6), 799-820.
- de Haan, J. H., & Rotmans, J. (2011). Patterns in transitions: Understanding complex chains of change. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 78(1), 90-102.
- De Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(3), 331-353.
- De Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. E. M.G. (2012a). Attitudes of teachers, parents and students towards inclusive education: A literature review. *Pedagogische Studien*, 89(1), 30-55.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1-38). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Dudley, R. L., & Kangas, J. L. (1990). ValueGenesis 1: How does Adventist education affect youth attitudes? *Journal of Adventist Education*, 52(4), 24-31. Retrieved from <http://circle.adventist.org/files/jae/en/jae199052042408.pdf>
- Easterly, W. (2008). Institutions: Top down or bottom up? *American Economic Review*, 36(2), 95-99.
- Education nation 2.0: (2011). *Redefining K-12 education in America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uMDTuw0__IM
- Eisner, E. W. (2003). Questionable assumptions about schooling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(9), 648-658.
- Elder, D. L., & Padover, W. (2011). Coaching as a methodology to build professional practice. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching*, 4(1), 138-144.
- Encarnation, D. J. (1983). Public finance and regulation of non-public education: Retrospect and prospect. In T. James & H. M. Levin (Eds.), *Public dollars for private schools* (pp. 175-195). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- English, F. W. (1987). It's time to abolish conventional curriculum guides. *Educational Leadership*, 44(4), 50-52.
- Epperson, J., & Osborn, R. (1995, October/November). Creating a 21st century curriculum for Adventist secondary schools. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 58(1), 10-13.
- Erickson, D. (1983). *Public schools in contemporary perspective* (Rep. No. TTC-14). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Institute of Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
- Febey, K. S., & Louis, K. S. (2008). Political cultures in education at the state and local level: Views from three states. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 52-72). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Firestone, W. A., & Martinez, C. M. (2007). Districts, teachers, and distributed leadership: Changing instructional practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1), 3-35. doi:10.1080/15700760601091234
- Fitzgerald, L., & Dopson, S. (2009). Comparative case study designs: Their utility and development in organizational research. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 465-483). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). The future of evaluation. In *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (4th ed., pp. 490-497). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Forbes, P. C. (2011). A descriptive case study of the perceptions and use of Adventist Edge: An initiative developed in response to the North American Division of Seventh-Day Adventists' document, *Journey to Excellence* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.cc.andrews.edu/pqdtft/docview/912741010/9D63972E7DC1448BPQ/1?accountid=8313>
- Fromhold-Eisebith, M., & Eisebith, G. (2005). How to institutionalize innovative clusters: Comparing explicit top-down and implicit bottom-up approaches. *Research Policy*, 34(8), 1250-1268.
- Fullan, M. (2008). Curriculum implementation and sustainability. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), and M. F. He & J. Phillion (Assoc. Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 113-122). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crevola, C. (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Futcher, W. G. A. (1976). *Descriptive statistics for introductory measurement*. Andrews University Monographs Studies in Education, Vol. 1. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.
- Gaebelein, F. E. (1968). *The pattern of God's truth: Problems of integration in Christian education*. Chicago, IL: Moody.
- General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. (2013). *Seventh-day Adventist yearbook 2013*. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald.
- Gehrke, R.S., & Cocchiarella, M. (2013, August). Preservice special and general educators' knowledge of inclusion. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 36(3), 204-216. doi:10.1177/0888406413495421
- Ghitulescu, B. E. (2013, June 1). Making change happen: The impact of work context on adaptive and proactive behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 49(2), 206-245. doi:10.1177/0021886312469254
- Gitlow, L. (2001). Occupational therapy faculty attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in their educational programs. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 21(2), 115-131.

- Glazzard, J. (2011). Perceptions of the barriers to effective inclusion in one primary school: Voices of teachers and teaching assistants. *Support for Learning*, 26(2), 56-63. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9604.2011.01478.x
- Goodlad, J. (1979). An ecological version of accountability. *Theory Into Practice*, 18(5), 316-322.
- Goodlad, J., Klein, F. M., & Associates. (1970). *Behind the classroom door*. Worthington, OH: C. A. Jones.
- Grunwald Associates LLC. (2011). *Deepening connections: Teachers increasingly rely on media and technology*. Eighth Annual PBS Teacher Survey. Retrieved from http://www.grunwald.com/pdfs/PBS-GRUNWALD_2011_ANNUAL_ED_TECH_STUDY.pdf
- Guskey, T. R. (2009, Summer). Closing the knowledge gap on effective professional development. *Educational Horizons*, 87(4), 224-233.
- Harrell, M. (2007). *Using argument diagramming software to teach critical thinking skills*. Pittsburgh, PA: Department of Philosophy, Carnegie Mellon University. Retrieved from <http://repository.cmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1348&context=philosophy>
- Harrell, M. (2008, December). No computer program required: Even pencil-and-paper-argument mapping improves critical thinking skills. *Teaching Philosophy*, 31(4), 351-374.
- Harvey, M. W. (2010, January/February). Preservice teacher preparation for inclusion: An exploration of higher education teacher-training institutions. *Remedial and Special Education*, 31(1), 24-33. doi:10.1177/0741932508324397
- Hastings, R.P., & Bham, M. S. (2003). The relationship between student behavior patterns and teacher burnout. *School Psychology International*, 24(1), 115-127.
- Ho, Y-M., et al. (2010, May 3). *Vision and teacher burnout in a parochial school system*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO.
- Hofferth, S. L., & Sandberg, J. F. (2001). How American children spend their time. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(2), 295-308. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00295.x
- Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *Remedial & Special Education*, 27(2), 77-94.

- Inan, F. A., & Lowther, D. L. (2010). Factors affecting technology integration in K-12 classrooms: A path model. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 58(2), 137-154.
- Jacob, B. A., & Levitt, S. D. (2003). Rotten Apples: An investigation of the prevalence and predictors of teacher cheating. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(3), 843-877.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2008). The effects of Catholic and Protestant schools: A meta-analysis. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 12(2), 255-275. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1462&context=ce>
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Jonsson, P. (2011, July 5). America's biggest teacher and principal cheating scandal unfolds in Atlanta. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Education/2011/0705/America-s-biggest-teacher-and-principal-cheating-scandal-unfolds-in-Atlanta>
- Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E. (2010). *Models of professional development: A celebration of educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin (A Sage Company).
- Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Knight, G. R. (1980). *Philosophy and education: An introduction in Christian perspective*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.
- Knight, G. R. (2010, October/November). Redemptive education Part III: Implications of philosophy for Adventist education (continued). *Journal of Adventist Education*, 73(1), 38-60.
- Knight, J. (2011). What effective coaches do. *Educational Leadership*, 69(2), 18-22.
- Kuhn, D. (1993). Connecting scientific and informal reasoning. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 39(1), 74-103.
- Khochen, M. & Radford, J. (2012). Attitudes of teachers and headteachers towards inclusion in Lebanon. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(2), 139-153. doi:10.1080/13603111003671665

- Lattanzio, V. (2014, May 8). *Philadelphia teachers, principal charged in test cheating scandal*. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcphiladelphia.com/news/local/Teachers-Principal-Charged-in-Philadelphia-School-Cheating-Scandal-258455781.html>
- Lavian, R. H. (2012). The impact of organizational climate on burnout among home-room teachers and special education teachers (full classes/individual pupils) in mainstream schools. *Teachers & Teaching*, 18(2), 233-247. doi:10.1080/13540602.2012.632272
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organizations and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Loan, F. A. (2012, June 29). Impact of the Internet surfing on reading practices and choices. *Webology*, 9(1), Article 94. Retrieved from <http://www.webology.org/2012/v9n1/a94.html>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–96. Retrieved from <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
- Masuda, A. M., Ebersole, M. M., & Barrett, D. (2012). A qualitative inquiry: Teachers' attitudes and willingness to engage in professional development experiences at different career stages. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 79(2), 6-14.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1992, February). What matters most in teachers' workplace context? (Report No. CRC-P92-139). *Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Means, B. (2008). Technology's role in curriculum and instruction. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), and M. F. He & J. Phillion (Assoc. Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 123-144). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Menton, D. N. (1993). Is evolution a theory, a fact, or a law? Or—none of the above? [No. 4 in a series]. Saint Louis, MO: The Missouri Association for Creation. Retrieved from <http://www.bestbible science.org/theory.htm>

- Mehrens, W. A., & Kaminski, J. (1989). Methods of improving standardized test scores: Fruitful, fruitless, or fraudulent? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 8(1), 14-22.
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutional organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B., (1992). The structure of educational organizations. In *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 71-97), by J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (2006). Institutional analysis and the study of education. In H. D. Meyer & B. Rowan (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in education* (pp. 1-13). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mighty, I. (2007). *Our "Happy Feet" predicament*. Winnipeg, MB: Canadian teachers Network. Retrieved from <http://circle.adventist.org/browse/resource.phtml?leaf=13097>. URL: http://catnet.adventist.ca/files/articles/pdf/tech_ID302.pdf
- Mulnix, J. W. (2012). Thinking critically about critical thinking. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(5), 464-479.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1990). *Digest of education statistics, 1989*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).
- North American Division Office of Education. (2003). *Journey to excellence: A focus on Adventist education in the 21st century* [DVD and related booklet]. Silver Spring, MD: Author.
- North American Division Office of Education. (2011). Sponsor, Valuegenesis update: Research information summary. *Newsletter*, 1, 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.kahili.org/Images/VG3%20Update.pdf>
- North, D. C. (1986, March). The new institutional economics. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 142(1), 230-237.
- Oakes, J., Quartz, K., Ryan, S., & Lipton, M. (1999). *Becoming good American schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research. (2013). *149th annual statistical report—2013*. Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

- Ohler, J. (2008). *Digital storytelling in the classroom: New media pathways to literacy, learning, and creativity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Osunsami, S., & Forer, B. (2011, July 6). *Atlanta cheating: 178 teachers and administrators changed answers to increase test scores*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/US/atlanta-cheating-178-teachers-administrators-changed-answers-increase/story?id=14013113>
- Pagliaro, M. M. (2013). *Mastery teaching skills: A resource for implementing the Common Core State Standards*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 37-53.
- Popham, J. (1999, March). Why standardized tests don't measure educational quality. *Educational Leadership*, 56(6), 8-15.
- Rafferty, A.E., & Griffin, M. A. (2009). Job satisfaction in organizational research. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 196-212). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Rasi, H. M. (1987, Summer). Helping students think critically. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 49(5), 4-6, 28.
- Rasi, H. M. (Compiler). (1991-2012). *Christ in the classroom: Adventist approaches to the integration of faith and learning* (38 vols. Ritua). Silver Spring, MD: Institute for Christian Teaching, Education Department of Seventh-day Adventists.
- Ravitch, D. (1995). *National standards in American education*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Rock, M. L., Zigmond, N. P., Gregg, M., & Gable, R. A. (2011). The power of virtual coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 69(2), 42-47.
- Rosenholtz, S., & Simpson, C. (1990). Workplace conditions and the rise and fall of teachers commitment. *Sociology of Education*, 63(4), 241-257.
- Ross-Hill, R. (2009). Teacher attitude towards inclusion practices and special needs students. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 9(3), 188-198. doi:10.1111/j.1471-3802.2009.01135.x
- Rozycki, E. G. (2005). Can we trust "best practices"? *Educational Horizons*, 83(4), 226-230.
- Rudd, R. D. (2007). Defining critical thinking. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 82(7), 46-49.

- Sarason, S. B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schultz, G. (1998). *Kingdom education: God's plan for educating future generations*. Nashville, TN: Life Way Press.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (In collaboration with J. F. Galaz-Fontes & M. Liu). (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Scott, P. (2012). *Upon a solid foundation: The ACSI response to and expansion on the "Cardus Education Survey."* Colorado Springs, CO: Association of Christian Schools International. Retrieved from http://www.acsiglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/ACSI-Cardus-Report_Final.pdf
- Scott, W. R. (1994). Institutions and organizations: Toward a theoretical synthesis. In W. R. Scott, J. W. Meyer, & Associates (Eds.), *Institutional environments and organizations: Structural complexity and individualism* (pp. 55-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W.R. (1995a). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R. (1995b). Introduction: Institutional theory and organizations. In W. R. Scott & S. Christensen (Eds.), *The institutional construction of organizations: International and longitudinal studies* (pp. xi-xxiii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society*, 37(5), 427-442.
- Scott, W. R., & Meyer, J. W. (1994a). Environmental linkages and organizational complexity: Public and private schools. In W. R. Scott, J. W. Meyer, & Associates (Eds.), *Institutional environments and organizations: Structural complexity and individualism* (pp. 137-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R., Meyer, J. W., & Associates (1994). *Institutional environments and organizations: Structural complexity and individualism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Selesho, J. M. (2012). Inclusion of high school learners in the mainstream: Ecological niche. *Anthropologist*, 14(6), 539-543.
- Sellers, R. (2007). Technology and ministry current trends. *Clergy Journal*, 83(3), 10-12.
- Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of the theory of organization. *American Sociological Review*, 13(1), 25-35. doi:10.2307/2086752
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Company.

- Selznick, P. (1966). *TVA and the grass roots: A study in the sociology of formal organization*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Selznick, P. (1996). Institutionalism “old” and “new.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 270-277.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2001). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Simonds, L. (2013). *How to stop wasting time*. Retrieved from <http://business.time.com/2013/09/15/how-to-stop-wasting-time/>
- Singer, N. (2014). *Listen to Pandora, and it listens back*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/05/technology/pandora-mines-users-data-to-better-target-ads.html?_r=0
- Singh, J. V., Tucker, D. J., & Meinhard, A. G. (1991). Institutional change and ecological dynamics. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 390-424). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, C. M. (2011). *The fact of evolution*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Smithwick, D. (2005). *Soul searching*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Spillane, J. (2004). *Standards deviation: How schools misunderstand education policy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stevenson, H. W. (1992, December). Learning from Asian schools: American schools could benefit from the teaching styles and institutional structures used in Asia—many of which were pioneered here. *Scientific American*, 267(6), 70-76.
- Stigler, J., & Heibert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organization. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 142-193). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally & Company.
- Stover, K., Kissel, B., Haag, K., & Shoniker, R. (2011). Differentiated coaching: Fostering reflection with teachers. *Reading Teacher*, 64(7), 498-509.
- Sullivan, D. J. (1974). *Public aid to non-public schools*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Taylor, J. W. (1989). God, nature, and learning: An integrational approach. In H. M. Rasi (Ed.), *Christ in the classroom* (Vol. 2, pp. 259-278). Washington, DC: Institute for Christian Teaching.
- Taylor, J. W. (2001a). A biblical foundation for the integration of faith and learning. *Asia Adventist Seminary Studies*, 4, 19-34.
- Taylor, J. W. (2001b). Instructional strategies for integrating faith with learning. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 63(5), 5-8; 12-14.
- Taylor, J. W. (2005). Instructional strategies for integrating faith with learning. In *Christ in the classroom* (Vol. 33, pp. 585-592). Washington, DC: Institute for Christian Teaching.
- Taylor, J. W., Lapat, L., & Oberholster, F. R. (2001). Strategies for integrating faith in mathematics. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 63(5), 9-11.
- Thayer, J., & Kido, E. (2012). CognitiveGenesis (CG): Assessing academic achievement and cognitive ability in Adventist schools. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 21(2), 99-115. doi:10.1080/10656219.2012.698826
- The Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (2004, September). *The mad, mad world of textbook adoption*. Foreword by Chester E. Finn, Jr.; Introduction by Diane Ravitch. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/Mad%20World_Test2_8.pdf
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Tom, A. (1997). *Redesigning teacher education*. Albany, NY: University of New York.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207-22.
- Twardy, C. (2004, June). Argument maps improve critical thinking. *Teaching Philosophy*, 27(2), 95-116.
- Uecker, J. E. (2009). Catholic schooling, Protestant schooling, and religious commitment in young adulthood. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(2), 353-367. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5906.2009.01451.x
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009, November). *Race to the top program: Executive summary*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf>

- Van der Linden, W. J., & Jeon, M. (2012). Modeling answer changes on test items. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 37(1), 180-199.
- Van Gelder, T. (2005). Teaching critical thinking: Some lessons from cognitive science. *College Teaching*, 53(1), 41-46.
- van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2012). Coaching in education: An overview. In C. van Nieuwerburgh (Ed.), *Coaching in education: Getting better results for students, educators, and parents* (pp. 3-23). London, England: Karnac Books.
- Varcoe, L., & Boyle, C. (2014). Preservice primary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *Educational Psychology*, 34(3), 323-337.
doi:10. 1080/01443410.2013.785061
- Verboord, M., & van Rees, K. (2009). Literary education curriculum and institutional contexts: Textbook content and teachers' textbook usage in Dutch literary education, 1968-2000. *Poetics*, 37(1), 74-97.
- Vlăduț, C. I, & Kállay, É. (2010, September). Work stress, personal life, and burnout: Causes, consequences, possible remedies (Brief Report). *Cognition, Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 14(3), 261-280.
- Volante, L. (2004, September 25). Teaching to the test: What every educator and policy-maker should know. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 35, 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/volante.html>
- Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). London, England: Allen & Unwin.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wherry, J. H. (2004, September/October). *The influence of home on school success*. Retrieved from <http://www.naesp.org/resources/2/Principal/2004/S-Op6.pdf>
- White, E. G. (1890). *Patriarchs and prophets*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- White, E. G. (1900). *Christ's object lessons*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald.
- White, E. G. (1903). *Education*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press.
- White, E. G. (1913). *Counsels to parents, teachers, and students regarding Christian education*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press.
- White, E. G. (1923). *Fundamentals of Christian education*. Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing.

- White, E.G. (1930). *Messages to young people*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald.
- White, E. G. (1940). *Counsels on stewardship*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald.
- White, E. G. (1948a). *Testimonies for the church* (Vol. 2). Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- White, E. G. (1948b). *Testimonies for the church* (Vol. 4). Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- White, E. G. (1948c). *Testimonies for the church* (Vol. 6). Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- White, E.G. (1958). *Selected messages from the writings of Ellen G. White: Book 2*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald.
- White, E. G. (1968). *Counsels on education: As presented in the nine volumes of testimonies for the church*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- White, E. G. (1988). *Counsels on speech and song*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press.
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report REL 2007-NO. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf
- Zanna, M. P., & Rempel, J. K. (1988). Attitudes: A new look at an old concept. In D. Bartal & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge* (pp. 315-334). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

VITA

VITA

NAME: Monica Desir

EDUCATION:

2015 Doctor of Philosophy (Curriculum and Instruction)
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI

1993 Master of Arts, English (rhetoric & composition emphasis)
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

1989 Bachelor of Science (Elementary Education)
Caribbean Union College, Trinidad, West Indies

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2005-Present Writing Instructor, University of Phoenix (online)
Advanced Facilitator training and certification, University of
Phoenix (October to November, 2011)

2001-2004 Principal/English Teacher (Grades 5-10), Sharon Junior Academy
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

1993-2001 Kindergarten Teacher/Grades 5-10 English Instructor
Sharon Junior Academy, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

1992-1993 Writing Center Tutor, Andrews University,
Berrien Springs, Michigan

1991-1992 Freshman Composition Instructor, Andrews University
(as graduate assistant for two semesters)

1997-2002 Instructor, GED classes (part-time)—College Transition Program,
Milwaukee Area Technical College, Wisconsin