Institute for Christian Teaching
Education Department of Seventh-day Adventists

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING:

AN IMPLEMENTATION MODEL

FOR ADVENTIST EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

by

Constance C. Nwosu

Department of Teaching and Learning
School of Education
Andrews University

INTEGRATION OF FAITH AND LEARNING:
AN IMPLEMENTATION MODEL
FOR ADVENTIST EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The first two chapters of Genesis tell us that when God finished with His work of creation, He saw that everything He made was very good and that a cordial relationship existed between Him and our first parents. Unfortunately, this cordiality did not last. Sin infected the planet, jeopardizing humankind's relationship with the Creator.

From creation, Satan has sought feverishly to destroy faith in God. He is even more furious now than he was when the world was new, using every channel to distract attention from God. Human beings have become so hedonistic and self-centered as to not feel the need of God any more. Survival of the fittest and "I can do it by myself" have become ways of life. These ideologies are representative of the humanistic worldviews that have permeated our society and that are reflected in our schools.

Schools used to be places where learning was advanced and values elevated. Unfortunately, the schools of today are plagued by the dualistic thinking that pervades them. Walsh and Middleton (1984) observe that "dualism has remained with us. . . (and has) permeated our consciousness--and therefore our worldview" (p. 100). Christian religious education is on the downward trend, and a hidden curriculum seems to have taken over. Christian schools and colleges are at risk to the rampant deterioration of the culture. They have become "secular salad with religious toppings" (Akers, 1994, class notes).

Seventh-day Adventist educational institutions are not sheltered from these different ideologies. The Valuegenesis study conducted in 1989 gave a warning signal to the church concerning the spiritual climate of the membership of its young people (Dudley with Gillespie, 1992). Even though the study was done in the Adventist educational institutions in North America, Canada, and Bermuda, some of its findings can apply to Seventh-day Adventist young people in other parts of the world as well. This suggests that Seventh-day Adventist educational institutions are at-risk of losing substantial numbers of their young people.

Moreover, it has been observed that many people who teach at Adventist institutions of higher learning do not have the opportunity of going through the Adventist educational system themselves. Therefore, there is the possibility that these well-meaning individuals could unconsciously pick up the different worldviews spreading through their different campuses and bring these along with them into the church's schools.

With such critical situations facing schools today, how can Seventh-day Adventist educational institutions fulfill their missions? How can they maintain their role as the schools of the prophets, a role assigned to them in order to keep the faith of their fathers? One significant solution is for them to integrate their faith into their teaching, learning, and practice.

Biblical Mandate for Integration of Faith and Learning

Integration of faith and learning in Adventist schools is a Divine imperative. E. G. White maintains that

> the Holy Scriptures are the perfect standard of truth, and as such should be given the highest place in education. To obtain an education worthy of the name, we must receive a knowledge of God, the Creator, and of Christ the Redeemer, as they are revealed in the sacred word. (White, 1903, p. 17)

Arthur Holmes (1993,1994) also presents seven points to show that integration is a biblical mandate.

1. There is a biblical mandate to do and make use of the arts and sciences.

2. The biblical narrative helps us to understand the possibilities and present state of our disciplines and professions.

3. Biblical ideals guide the application of our skills and our knowledge.

4. Biblical theology addresses the theoretical assumptions of our disciplines.

5. Biblical concepts intersect with particular concepts and theories in the disciplines.

6. There are biblical implications for the methodology and knowledge claims of our disciplines.

7.   Biblical virtues are requisite for disciplined scholarship and teaching. (1993, pp.1-4).

Now, as never before, faith must become integrated into the curriculum of Christian schools and colleges. To do this, we need the Bible to guide us in all our teaching. After God completed His work of creation, He turned its stewardship over to humanity. We would be unfaithful stewards if we failed to use the provisions that have been made available to us through the arts and sciences. The Bible is also filled with stories and ideals that assist us in understanding the situations in which we find ourselves in our disciplines and professions. In addition, we need the Bible to guide us in the choice of our goals, theories, and methodologies. Furthermore, the Bible teaches virtues that are essential for our learning. We need to develop these virtues and inculcate them in our students (Holmes 1993).

Integration of faith and learning will be a reality on our college and university campuses when teachers realize that the work of education and that of redemption are the same (White, 1903). Holmes sums up these points by observing that

> the linkage between spirituality and learning is a part of the relationship between faith and learning. . . . Faith is not just the content of biblical teaching, but my continued responsiveness to God Himself. So the integration of faith and learning includes integration of spirituality into my work. . . . (p. 4)

It is in recognition of this spiritual mandate that in 1987 the General Conference Department of Education began sponsorship of a series of seminars on integration of faith and learning through the Institute for Christian Teaching. These seminars have been attended by more than two hundred educators from all over the world. Seminar participants witness the excellent organization and the quality of materials presented (*Brochure for the 15th International Faith and Learning Seminar*). They return to their workplaces, in all likelihood, inspired by what they witnessed and determined to raise faith integration to new levels.

Statement of the Problem

There are two basic kinds of knowledge: declarative and procedural (Marzano et al., 1992). Declarative knowledge is the cognitive understanding of whatever is being learned. This is obtained through lectures, discussions, and memorization. Procedural knowledge relates to the practice and use of what has been learned. Despite how wonderfully well human beings learn, practicing what is learned is always more problematic. To learn about something is different from learning to do something. Participants at the Faith and Learning Seminars are exposed to a great deal of quality materials that discuss the theories, backgrounds, issues, and implications for integrating faith and learning in our schools. They attain the declarative knowledge of integrating faith and learning. This is intellectual knowledge. But what happens to the procedural knowledge?

One of the objectives of the Faith and Learning Seminar is "to empower participants to become initiators or supporters of the process of integrating faith and learning among colleagues in their respective educational settings" (*Brochure for the 15th International Faith and Learning Seminar*). To what extent do the seminars accomplish this purpose? To what extent do they make a difference, when participants return to their workplaces, in the lives of their peers and their students? In other words, how can participants at the seminar move beyond declarative to procedural knowledge?

One way to do this is to establish staff-development programs on integration of faith and learning on our college and university campuses. This not only will help us to retain what we learn at the seminars, but at the same time assist in transferring the knowledge to our colleagues in the field. Moreover, it will continue to nurture us both individually and collectively. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to propose a staff-development program that will enhance implementation of faith and learning in the Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning.

Staff-development Program
on Integration of Faith and Learning

Staff-development can be defined as any planned activity within an organization that helps employees to do their work effectively and satisfactorily. It includes such activities or processes that assist in improving the skills, attitudes, understanding, and performance of staff, both presently and in the future (Little and Loucks-Horsley in Fullan, 1990). These programs are sometimes called inservice training, human-resource development, assistance, and so forth (Mazzarella, 1980; Giroux, 1990; Butler, 1992). Staff-development programs can take many forms and may last from a few hours to several months or longer. In some schools, though, such programs are on-going; they are included in the calendar of events of the school. Regardless of the duration of these programs and their forms, the instructional processes used in designing and delivering them are crucial to their effectiveness.

Components of Effective Staff-development Programs

A synthesis of the research on effective staff development programs reveals some essential components that enhance effectiveness. Joyce and Showers (1980) identified five of these that have been acknowledged widely and suggest that combining all of them has the "greatest power" (Butler, 1992, p. 7). The components include

1. Presentation of theory or description of the new skills or strategy,
2. Modeling or demonstration of skills or strategic models by an expert,
3. Practice in simulated and actual setting,
4. Structured and open-ended feedback,
5. Coaching for application.

These five steps are not linear in operation. Whether the process begins with step one or two, the important thing is the presence of all the components.

The first component takes care of the declarative knowledge. Here, the staff developer gives the background of the innovation by taking time to explain to participants the rationale and theory that surround the innovation, discuss its advantages, and give necessary information about the innovation, including the goals, its objectives, and its key ideas. This step helps the audience to understand what they are doing, and why. It also increases their

interest in the innovation.

The innovation we are considering at this Faith and Learning Seminar is the integration of faith and learning. We would need to understand what it means, what it looks like and sounds like in actual practice and be shown how teachers use it in the classrooms. Korniejczuk (1994) developed an empirically based model that could be used to identify levels of teacher implementation of faith and learning in the classroom. The model could also serve as a diagnostic guide in the broad sense, because it reveals what teachers do in the classroom at each level of integration (see appendix one).

Korniejczuk also discovered during her research that one of the participants who attended a local faith and learning seminar a few years ago did not agree with the idea of integrating faith and learning presented to her at the seminar. To this participant, the idea was "too superficial, too artificial" (p. 91).

In order for us participants at the Faith and Learning Seminar to give adequate and convincing information on the concept of integration of faith and learning to our colleagues back at home we need to master the concepts presented at the seminar. But beyond that, we need to continue to read materials on the subject and put into practice what we learn. It is only when we have acquired and stored enough information on this subject that we will be able to pass the knowledge on to them successfully.

Obtaining procedural knowledge begins with the **second component**. Here, the trainer dwells on the methodology of the innovation. The trainer **shows** the audience how to do what is being introduced and how it works. For instance, if the focus of the training is on the integration of faith and learning in mathematics, the expert could **demonstrate** this by presenting a lesson on mathematics or by presenting some curricula and any other materials that learners could adapt. The focus here is on **showing**, not telling. This step is very crucial because some people are visual learners and need to see things happen before they can understand it.

The next component after modeling is **practice**. Learners of a new skill should be given the opportunity to practice what they are being taught to see how much they have understood the process. Each trainee should select a topic in one area of interest and, following the model presented by the expert, plan and teach it to a group of colleagues. This

aspect of training helps learners to grasp the model comfortably before they present it to students. It also expedites the transfer of knowledge and skill.

For transfer to occur in any innovation, practice should be done a number of times, both at simulated and actual settings. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) observe that teachers need between 20 and 30 practices in order to sufficiently master any new skill and to incorporate it into their teaching repertoire. This means that at this seminar we need to begin to practice how to integrate faith and learning in our different disciplines *and continue to do so when we get back to our various fields*. The more practice, the better. This will help us to retain the knowledge and experience we have acquired. And as we involve our colleagues in the field and train them, we not only kindle their interests, but we also continue to nourish ours. The best way to do this is to have participants work together in groups of six or fewer (Murphy, 1992).

Akers and Moon (1980) have suggested how to integrate faith and learning in the following courses in the elementary and secondary-level classes: mathematics; practical arts; language arts; health and physical education; art, music, and crafts; history and social sciences; and Bible. But little has been written about the integration of faith and learning in higher education. We could have experts in these fields in higher education work together in groups, adapting the suggested outlines to the college level and presenting lessons in these different disciplines so that we can see how faith implementation actually works in the formal curriculum.

The **fourth component** deals with giving feedback. And this is why it is encouraged that practice be done in groups. Feedback could be either structured or open-ended. A structured feedback could be a form made up of questions asking participants to describe what they did at different steps of the innovation. Open-ended feedback consists of oral questions. One of the reasons for feedback, whichever type is used, is to provide information about performance in the practice without making the learner feel uncomfortable. For instance, instead of telling the learner that an aspect was not done well, ask that person to describe what was done at each step and ask for suggestions about how the process could be improved. Feedback also encourages collegiality among learners and makes practice "safe" and more likely to continue.

The **fifth and final component** is coaching for application. Coaching brings teachers together as a community of learners and helps them to develop the language and understanding they need for the new skill they are learning. At the same time, it provides for follow-up to training (Showers, 1985) to help with the at-home implementation of the new skill and knowledge. Coaching provides a human support system. It is important that the learner continue to strengthen the new skill. What this means in practice is that training should be done at least in pairs. Larger teams of six or less are even more effective (Murphy, 1992). Odd numbers leave out an individual in any pairing activity. This component indicates that rather than having only one participant from a school attend the Faith and Learning Seminar, there should be two or more at one time from the same school for training and accountability purposes on the part of the participants.

If the implementation of faith and learning is desired in our schools, then schools and colleges must create the atmosphere for its implementation. The coaching of teachers by their peers has been found to be a very effective way to improve instruction (Showers, 1982, 1984, and 1985). Coaching is an important part of study groups.

Study Group

Study groups are support groups that provide opportunities for regular dialogue and interaction among teachers during the teaching year. Gaikwad (1991) observes that study groups enhance the implementation of an innovation. Dufour (1991) and Murphy (1992) postulate that creating small, supportive groups where teachers meet to ask questions and discuss their concerns and ideas about a new program significantly increases the possibility of their adopting the program. Moreover, such groups help to reduce isolation and encourage testimonies about the success of the program (Dufour, 1991).

We need study groups on our campuses in order to maintain continuity and effectiveness in the implementation of faith and learning in our classrooms. To provide time for these activities, each campus could designate one hour per week or four hours per month for faith-and-learning activities on their calendar of events; or each group could work out its own schedule according to the time available.

Study groups could be structured homogeneously or heterogeneously. But

heterogeneous groups work better. This could be done by mixing faculty and administrators, younger and older faculty, teachers in different subjects, male and female. Alternatively, members could be grouped according to their subject areas. In any case, people work best in groups they feel comfortable with. Groups of six or less seem to work best (Murphy, 1992) because they provide diversity of opinions and allow time for individual participation. Some training will be required for successful operation of these study groups.

It will be important to remember that the purpose of the study groups is to assist teachers in acquiring the knowledge and skills they need to integrate faith and learning, keeping the objectives in mind. Different activities could be engaged in during these weekly or monthly meetings. Members could share their frustrations and concerns. They could also give testimonies of their discoveries and successes as they experiment with ideas on the implementation of faith and learning in their classrooms. Teaching strategies such as cooperative learning, inquiry, simulations, inductive reasoning, and others that facilitate faith implementation in the classroom could be discussed and demonstrated at these meetings.

The training process that has been suggested in this paper is not a new model—but it is an effective one. It is a process that aids the learners of a new and complex strategy to master certain skills and feel comfortable about using them. The integration of faith and learning is a complex innovation, and as such requires an explicit method of training. The process also sustains participants as they deal with their personal concerns as they learn and apply new innovations in their work places.

The Concepts of Concerns

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), developed by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973), reveals some vital facts that we need to be aware of as we engage in the implementation of faith and learning in our schools. Change is a process that takes time to occur. It is also developmental (Hall, 1979). As learners go through the procedure suggested above, they have the opportunity to gradually get accustomed to the new learning and ways of thinking about it.

In addition, change is experienced personally and, therefore, causes concerns. These

concerns relate to the "feelings, perceptions, motivations, and attitudinal dynamics of individuals as they first become aware of an innovation" (Hall, 1979, p. 4). Hall and his colleagues have identified seven stages of concerns that apply to individuals involved in a change process and have verified their existence. These concerns begin with a focus on self and continue with concerns related to the management of the task and its impact on the students (Hall 1979) (see appendix two).

The following statements, as suggested by Dufour (1991), briefly describe the concerns at each stage:

Stage 0, **Awareness:** What is the innovation?

Stage 1, **Informational:** I need to know more about the innovation.

Stage 2, **Personal:** How will the innovation affect me?

Stage 3, **Management:** How will I find time to do this?

Stage 4, **Consequence:** How is my use of the innovation affecting
               [my students]?
Stage 5, **Collaboration:** I would like to discuss my findings and ideas
               with others.
Stage 6, **Refocusing:** I have an idea for improving upon the innovation
               (pp. 66-69).

Although these concerns are discussed in stages, it does not mean that one concern is completely laid to rest before another emerges. Nevertheless, being aware of them is very important, not only for the learners, but also for the staff-developer and the organization as a whole. In the first place, it will help the learners to know that their feelings are normal. And for the staff-developer and the organization, an awareness of these concerns will enable them to forecast what about the innovation will cause anxiety. Then, the staff-developer and the organization will work at lessening the anxiety and increasing effectiveness in the use of the innovation.

Administrative Support
for Staff-development Programs on Our Campuses

Irrespective of how much we talk about the importance of and the need for staff development for the integration of faith and learning on our campuses, and despite the

willingness on the part of the teachers to engage in such programs, the role of administrative support is critical in this endeavor. The reason is that there are different variables that operate in organizations that effect personal learning and implementation by individuals. Organizations provide the context within which innovations will live or die.

If the integration of faith and learning is not supported by administrators on our various campuses, it will struggle to survive. Dufour (1991) cites Miles' observation that "administrative indifference results in the inevitable death of training programs" (p. 70). A learning community is a growing community. When teachers and administrators engage in active learning, the result is improvement both in the individual and on the entire institution. We need to turn our campuses into learning organizations.

Five Disciplines of the Learning Organizations

Peter Senge (1990) identified five disciplines of a learning organization. They are **systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, and team learning** (pp. 6-10). Systems thinking refers to how an organization thinks and plans about change in a whole, not in bits. Senge calls it a "conceptual framework. . . that makes full patterns clearer, and helps to see how to change them effectively" (p. 7).

The term "mastery" often gives the impression of complete knowledge in a particular area. However, Senge and his colleagues use this phrase for "the discipline of personal growth and learning" (p. 141). He defines it as

> the discipline of *continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing reality objectively* (p. 7, italics supplied)

and observes that it is a vital "cornerstone" and "spiritual foundation" of the learning organization (p. 7).

If the integration of faith and learning must be implemented on our campuses, it must be the focus of the administrators. They must recognize that the discipline of personal mastery is essential because an organization learns through its individual members. And they must do everything to encourage such individuals and others to have that aspiration. Quoting Kyocera, a world leader in advanced ceramics technology, Senge states that

if the employees themselves are not sufficiently motivated to challenge the goals of growth and . . . development . . . there will simply be no growth . . . and no development. (pp. 139-140)

When we, as Seventh-day Adventist educators, integrate the discipline of personal mastery in our lives, it will do two things for us. First, it will help us to clarify continually how important the integration of faith and learning is to us. Secondly, present reality will become clearer to us (p. 141). Educators on our campuses need to encourage personal mastery of individual teachers because "the total development of [our teachers] is essential to achieving our goal of corporate excellence" (p. 143) in the implementation of faith and learning on our campuses.

The third discipline that Peter Senge advocates is "mental models," which he identified as "ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action (p. 8). This fits in very well when we consider the reason for the Faith and Learning Seminar. The various worldviews around us have influenced our thinking and the way in which we do things. The discipline of mental models is vital for us in our effort to integrate faith and learning in our classrooms. Senge comments that it starts with

> turning the mirror inward; learning to unearth our internal pictures of the world, to bring them to the surface and hold them rigorously to scrutiny. It also includes the ability to carry on "learningful" conversations that balance inquiry and advocacy, where people expose their own thinking effectively and make that thinking open to the influence of others. (p. 9)

Building shared vision is the next discipline of the learning community. The Bible says that "where there is no vision the people perish" (Proverbs 29:18). Organizations without visionary leadership do not last long. Having a vision leads to aspirations for excellence. And shared vision comes from visions from individual members within an organization.

Adventist administrators need to tap the visions of their individual teachers in faith implementation and transform those visions into a shared vision in order to provide the focus and energy for learning. Without working together on this, the task can be overwhelming. But with shared vision, we can together reach an all-surpassing goal (Senge, 1990).

The final discipline of the learning organization that Senge identified is team learning. This starts with dialogue: "the capacity of members of a team to suspend assumptions and enter into a genuine 'thinking together'" (p. 10). Dialoging allows a group to have insights that an individual cannot attain (Senge, 1990). Team learning is very important because the fundamental learning unit in modern organizations are teams, not individuals (Senge, 1990). And it requires dialoging and discussion skills to be successful. This discipline reiterates the need for study groups on our campuses.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Integrating faith and learning means practicing nurturing faith. It is whatever exits in the school that serves to build the faith of the students to a high level. To maintain this nurturance in the Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning, the atmosphere on our campuses should encourage on-going dialogue. Our campuses should be turned into active learning communities. One way to do this is to establish staff-development programs on our college and university campuses. These programs will facilitate transference of training among colleagues as well as continue to nurture faculty members both on individual and collective basis. The following recommendations will assist in encapsulating the ideas discussed in this paper.

1. An explicit method of training should be introduced both in the initial training (Faith and Learning Seminars) and on our respective campuses back home.

2. Institutions should send at least two participants at the same time to the Faith and Learning Seminar for training and accountability purposes.

3. Each college and university campus should set up study groups that meet regularly (weekly or monthly) on the implementation of faith and learning.

4. Our college campuses and universities should implement the five disciplines of the learning organization to prepare the context for the application of faith and learning to happen.

APPENDIX 1

IFL Empirical Model

Level of Implementation	Characteristics	Examples
No deliberate implementation		
Level 0: No knowledge No interest	Teacher has little or no knowledge of IFL. Teacher is doing nothing to be involved in IFL. Teacher is not convinced that IFL can be carried out in the subject. Teacher thinks that the subject he/she teaches is not related to faith.	"IFL is only extracurricular; cannot be implemented in the curriculum." "I do not know how to implement IFL." "I have other priorities in mind." "I cannot do it in my subject." "I know how to do it, but I do not have institutional support."
Level 1: Interest	Teacher has acquired or is acquiring information on IFL. Teacher is aware that IFL should be incorporated in his/her classes. Teacher is looking for ways to deliberately implement IFL. Teacher thinks that it may be worthwhile to include IFL in future planning.	"I know very little about IFL." "I do not like superficial integration, thus I am looking for appropriate ways." "I am looking for information on how to implement IFL."
Level 2: Readiness	Teacher knows how to implement IFL in at least some themes. Teacher is preparing to deliberately implement IFL at a definite future time.	"I am going to incorporate some integration I have tried in my course plan." "I have decided to systematically introduce some things I know."

R. Korniejczuk, 1994.

Level of Implementation	Characteristics	Examples
Deliberate Implementation		
Level 3: Irregular or superficial use	Deliberately integrated, but generally unplanned. There is no coherent Christian worldview. Irregular use. Only some themes are integrated throughout the general context of the subject. Superficial use. Use of spiritual content for secular purposes without meaning. Management concerns disturb IFL.	"I know that what I am doing is not the best, but this is a Christian school and I have to do something." "I do not know how to plan IFL." "I only feel confident with two themes: Creation and Evolution." "I do not like planning IFL. I do it consciously but spontaneously."
Level 4: Conventional	There is a stabilized use of IFL, but no changes are made in ongoing use. Syllabus and objectives show IFL in at least some themes. IFL is based on teacher's talking rather than student response. Teacher knows how to implement IFL. IFL shows coherent implementation.	"I include IFL in my unit planning so I can remember to do it." "It is not often that I change what I have planned."
Level 5: Dynamic	Teacher varies the implementation of IFL to increase impact on students. Teacher can describe changes that he/she had made in the last months and what is planned in a short term. Change of strategies and themes according to student needs or interests. Students draw conclusions of IFL.	"I just look at their [students'] faces and know what they are thinking. I encourage them to draw conclusions." "I vary my IFL strategies according to the needs of my students."
Level 6: Comprehensive	Teacher cooperated with colleagues on ways to improve IFL. Regular collaboration between two or more teachers increased impact on students. The whole school (or at least a group of teachers) provided a coherent Christian worldview and emphasized student response.	

R. Korniejczuk, 1994.

APPENDIX 2

STAGES OF CONCERN ABOUT THE INNOVATION

AWARENESS:
Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated.

INFORMATIONAL:
A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems to be unworried about herself/himself in relation to the innovation. She/he is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.

PERSONAL:
Individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, her/his inadequacy to meet those demands, and her/his role with the innovation. This includes analysis of her/his role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision making, and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the program for self and colleagues may also be reflected.

MANAGEMENT:
Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling, and time demands are utmost.

CONSEQUENCE:
Attention focuses on impact of the innovation on students in her/his immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the innovation for students, evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcomes.

COLLABORATION:
The focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation.

REFOCUSING:
The focus is on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative. Individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of the innovation.

—Hall, George, and Rutherford

References

Akers, G. H., & Moon, R. D. (1980). Integrating learning, faith and practice in Christian education, Part 2. *Journal of Adventist Education*, 42, (5), 23-30.

Akers, G. H. (1994). Class notes on integration of faith and learning.

Butler, J. A. (1992). Staff development. *School Improvement Research Series*. U. S. Department of Education.

Dudley, R. L. with Gillespie, V. B. (1992). *Valuegenesis: Faith in the balance*. Riverside, CA: La Sierra University Press.

Dufour, R. P. (1991). *The principal as staff developer*. Bloomington, Indiana: National Educational Service.

Fullan, M. G. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In Bruce Joyce (ed) *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gaikwad, S. M. (1991). *A descriptive study of teacher, school, and training characteristics in the implementation of the cooperative and inductive teaching models*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, U. S. A.

Giroux, H. A. (1990). Border pedagogy in the age of post modernism. *Educational Leadership*, 170 (3) 162-181.

Hall, G. E. (1979). Using the individual and the innovation as the frame of reference for research on change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australia Association for Research in Education.

Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C., Jr., & Dossett, W. A. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Holmes, A. (1993). Reintegrating faith and learning--The biblical mandate. *Perspectives*. Christian College Coalition. Washington D. C.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The message of research. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 379-382.

Korniejczuk, R. B. (1994). *Stages of deliberate teacher integration of faith and learning: the development and empirical validation of a model for Christian education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Marzano, R. J. et al (1992). *Dimensions of learning* (Teacher's manual). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mazzarella, J. A. (1980). Synthesis of Research on Staff Development. *Educational Leadership,* 38 (2), 182-185.

Murphy, C. (1992). Study groups foster schoolwide learning. *Educational Leadership,* 50, 71-74.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization.* New York: Double-day Currency.

Showers, B. (1982). Coaching: A training contribution of coaching. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Showers, B. (1984). Peer coaching: A strategy for facilitating transfer of training. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. *Educational Leadership,* 42, 43-48.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the art analysis. *Educational Leadership* 45 (3) 77-87.

The Department of Education of Seventh-day Adventists. (1994). *Brochure for the 15th International Faith and Learning Seminar, June 19-July 1.*

Walsh, B. J. & Middleton, J. R. (1984). *The transforming vision.* Downers Grove: Illinois, Intervarsity Press.

White, E. G. (1903). *Education.* Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.

Additional bibliography

Fogarty, R., Perkins, D., & Barell, J. (1992). *Teach for transfer.* Illinois: Skilight Publishing Inc.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1988). *Student achievement through staff development.* New York: Longman Inc.

Murphy, C. (1991). Changing organizational culture through administrative study groups. *The developer*. Oxford, Ohio: The National Staff Development Council.

Murphy, C. (1991). Lessons from a journey into change. *Educational Leadership*, 48 (8) 63-67.

Showers, B. (1983). Transfer of training: The contribution of coaching. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Showers, B. (1987). The role of coaching in the implementation of innovation. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 14, 3, 59-70.