

Introduction: How to Respond to the Ordination of Women?

COMPILED BY ALISA WILLIAMS AND BONNIE DWYER

Ever since the election of Ted N. C. Wilson in 2010, there has been an ongoing drama at the General Conference over how to respond to the ordination of women. A progression of committees, votes, and responses over eight years has failed to settle the issue of equality in ordination. The debate actually dates back to 1990, when changes in the Church Manual were approved that gave commissioned ministers—mainly women—the authority to perform weddings and other pastoral duties. That was the same year that a General Conference Session vote denied women actual ordination. The inequality of this two-track system has been discussed repeatedly since then, but not resolved, because the inequality remains in place. (See Kendra Haloviak Valentine’s “Recent History of Adventist Women in Ministry” on p. 5)

Wilson began his presidency by establishing the Theology of Ordination Study Committee (TOSC) in 2012. It held meetings in 2013–2014 that were supposed to help shape the conversation at the 2015 General Conference Session. Instead, a proposal was put forward to give divisions the ability to make their own decisions on women’s ordination. It was defeated. However, even before that vote was taken, two unions, pointing to Working Policy, which places ordination as a responsibility of the unions, went to their constituencies for a decision on the matter. In 2012, both the Pacific Union Conference and the Columbia Union Conference constituencies voted overwhelmingly to ordain without regard to gender, and proceeded to do so.

The discrepancy between the union constituency votes and the General Conference session votes has led President Wilson to present some measure to the General Conference Executive Committee each year for the last three years to discipline the unions that voted to ordain women. In the process, the debate has moved past women’s ordination to church authority, unity, and compliance. In 2016, in the name of unity, he proposed disbanding the non-compliant unions and putting them under General Conference control. The General Conference Executive Committee sent that proposal back and created a Unity Oversight Committee to come up with a different solution. In 2017, the Unity Oversight Committee proposed a system of sanctions to be meted out on the officers of the offending unions, requiring them to sign a loyalty oath, and taking away voice and vote if their employing entity was found to be out of compliance with General Conference actions and policy. At Annual Council (AC) 2017, the proposed “loyalty”

document, “Procedures for Reconciliation and Adherence in Church Governance,” was voted down.

Shortly following AC 2017, it was announced that Thomas Lemon had been removed from chairing the UOC. Lemon had stated during his AC report that during his meetings with division and union leadership over the past year, “there was not one person who gave any hint of being in rebellion. Rebellion is an attitude before it is an action. I didn’t hear that anywhere. Concern but not rebellion. I want to allay that fear. We are children of God and we are in this together.” Many speculated that this report led to his departure from the committee chairmanship.

In 2018, the Unity Oversight Committee surveyed division and union leaders about the next steps to be taken. Committee members also went to division offices to speak with their representatives.

Compliance Committee System Created

Then in July, the committee released its proposal, “Regard for and Practice of General Conference Session and General Conference Executive Committee Actions,” that introduced the concept of Compliance Review Committees as well as discipline actions to be taken against union officers of non-compliant entities. Reaction to the proposal was swift and loud. It continued for the next two months, with the General Conference responding primarily to the General Conference Executive Committee through the Committee’s newsletter. At the Annual Council meeting of the Executive Committee, held in Battle Creek, Michigan, the “Regard for” document was approved. The response to the Battle Creek action came in November when the North American Division voted to ask the General Conference to rescind the Battle Creek vote and to quickly bring its tithe to parity with other divisions. The General Conference responded to the NAD with a video that has evoked more videos and responses. As of early December, the Compliance Committees had not yet met. What follows are key documents and stories from the many that were posted on the *Spectrum* website. In September, Alisa Williams created a timeline with links to all the many stories leading up to Annual Council. It can be found here: www.spectrummagazine.org/news/2018/responses-church-entities-gcs-compliance-attempts-and-timeline-key-events.

A Year in the Life of the Church

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 52** Introduction: How to Respond to the Ordination of Women
- 55** General Conference Re-Asks the Questions of 2017
- 57** Unity Oversight Committee Survey Results
- 60** Validity of Unity Survey Questioned
- 64** Spring Meeting Postlude
- 66** A Troubling Disconnect
- 69** Compliance Document Moves Forward after Administrative Committee Approval
- 70** Key Document: “Regard for and Practice of General Conference Session and General Conference Executive Committee Actions”
- 74** Adventism’s Shocking Fulfillment of Prophecy
- 81** Key Illustrations: General Conference Governance Committees and Process Overview
- 82** Official Responses to Proposal for Compliance Committees
- 84** The Unity I Would Like to See: An Open Letter to the General Conference
- 89** Approval of the “Regard for” Document: Observations on the Compliance Discussion
- 91** Statements after Annual Council Compliance Vote
- 96** Confounding Conundrums: A Response to Mark Finley’s “Mystical Myths” Article
- 103** North American Division Votes Request for Tithe Parity
- 107** NAD Calls for GC Compliance Document to be Rescinded
- 109** Hooey and Credulity
- 113** South Pacific Division Asks GC to Reconsider Women’s Ordination at GC Session in 2020
- 114** Church Members and Official Entities Respond to the General Conference Unity Video



A SURVEY TO START THE YEAR

The General Conference sent out a survey to division and union presidents asking for their views on what membership in their territories felt on several issues, essentially asking the same questions that were sent back to committee at AC 2017. The six-question survey was followed by an official announcement from the Unity Oversight Committee (UOC) concerning the appointment of a new chair, Mike Ryan, and the UOC’s plans for an “open and transparent” process.

General Conference Re-Asks the Questions of 2017

BY BONNIE DWYER | AUGUST 24, 2018

General Conference officials are seeking the opinions of church leaders about the views of their membership by doing a simple poll of division and union conference presidents. They are asking the presidents essentially the same questions that were sent back to committee for further review at Annual Council 2017, but this time they are asking that the presidents base their answers on their view of the opinions of their membership rather than on their own personal opinion.

The consultation being sought from the divisions and unions came to them in the form of a questionnaire from the Unity Oversight Committee (UOC) that asked the following questions:

- 1) Should the General Conference Unity Oversight Committee appoint a team to listen sensitively, counsel, and pray with the presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?
- 2) Should there be further organizational consequences for unions that do not comply with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?
- 3) Should church leaders be asked to sign a document saying that they will follow voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?
- 4) Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to speak (i.e. have voice) at meetings of the GC Executive Committee?
- 5) Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted action of General Conference Sessions

and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to vote in meetings of the GC Executive Committee?

- 6) Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted action of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to serve on standing committees or ad hoc subcommittees of the GC Executive Committee?

The first question in the survey is a rephrasing of the action that was voted by the Annual Council in 2016. Questions 2–6 are a reshaping of the 2017 document that was sent back to the Unity Oversight Committee for further work. At that time, much was made by Executive Committee members of being asked to vote on a fourteen-page document without time to consider what was in the document. Now church leaders are being asked to project the opinions of the entire church membership, which has never been given any explanation about why the questions would be asked in the first place. Re-asking the questions could be seen as doubling down on the proposed actions. Or, is this the action of an administration that is not used to losing a vote on a major issue asking the questions again, hoping to get the answer it wanted to hear originally?

Recently, there had been some indications that advisers to General Conference President Ted Wilson were suggesting that the whole process be slowed down, that he retool his tactics and strategy and not bring an action to the upcoming April Spring Meeting, because the 2017 Annual Council vote was being read as a message that the proposed action was punitive and vengeful rather than helpful. Will this survey revive the punitive proposal? Will it give the Unity Oversight Committee any new information about how to fulfill its assignment of reshaping the proposed action? How will unions and divisions figure out the views of their membership on these questions? The survey seems to create even more questions about the proposed actions.

BONNIE DWYER is editor of *Spectrum*.

February
2018

RESPONSES AND DIALOGUE

The Unity Oversight Committee (UOC) announced that of the 150 surveys sent to division and union presidents, 144 had been returned already (with a deadline of March 15), and that “dialogue meetings with world division leaders are currently taking place.”

March
2018

SUPPORT FOR CONSEQUENCES ANNOUNCED

At the end of March, the UOC announced the results of its six-question survey. Based on the results, the UOC concluded that “there is strong support for some kind of consequences for non-compliance,” as well as “strong support” for not allowing presidents of non-compliant unions to serve on committees, and “pronounced support” for not allowing these presidents to vote in GCC meetings.

Unity Oversight Committee Survey Results

BY UNITY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

ADVENTIST NEWS NETWORK | MARCH 23, 2018

Results from a worldwide survey were presented to the members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church's General Conference (GC) Unity Oversight Committee on March 20, 2018, during a scheduled meeting held at the world headquarters in Silver Spring, Maryland.

The six-question survey was designed and administered by the church's Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research (ASTR). The survey addressed issues relating to compliance with voted actions of the General Conference Session, the church's highest decision-making body, and its Executive Committee, which meets annually between the quinquennial sessions of the General Conference.

Following the process adopted by the Unity Oversight Committee in December 2017, the survey provides quantitative data, allowing the committee "to more accurately judge where the world Church leaders and members stand on these issues," according to Mike Ryan, chair of the committee. "This information will serve as a guide to the Unity Oversight Committee in defining consequences for unions who have not complied with votes of the GC Session and of the GC Executive Committee," he added.

The report, presented to the committee by the Director of ASTR, David Trim, featured survey data gathered from the presidents of the Church's thirteen world divisions, as

well as the Middle East North Africa Union, an attached field of the GC. In addition, the survey was sent to the 137 presidents of unions around the world.

"The union presidents answer directly to a grassroots constituency," said Ryan. Additionally, union presidents are members of the GC Executive Committee with an overview of global church events and actions. Unions comprise the constituency of the GC.

Survey Results

In his report, Trim stated that union and division presidents were requested to answer the six survey questions according to "what they believe is the view of the majority of members in their territory, as opposed to their personal opinion."

Trim noted that 100 percent of the surveys, sent out on January 18, 2018, had been received by March 4. He then presented each question, along with the data received, including 1) number and percentages of "votes" received; 2) number and percentages of union president "votes"; 3) percentage of union membership living in the territories represented by each vote.

Following are the questions and responses presented to the committee:

QUESTION 1

"Should the General Conference Unity Oversight Committee appoint a team to listen sensitively, counsel and pray with the presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?"

Response:

YES: 139 total votes (92 percent); 126 union president votes (92 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 90.56 percent.

NO: 10 total votes (7 percent); 9 union president votes (7 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 6.28 percent.

NOT ANSWERED: 2 total (1 percent); 2 union presidents; percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 3.16 percent.

QUESTION 2

“Should there be further organizational consequences for unions that do not comply with voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?”

Response:

YES: 108 total votes (72 percent); 97 union president votes (71 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 83.93 percent.

NO: 34 total votes (22 percent); 31 union president votes (23 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 12.17 percent.

NOT ANSWERED: 9 total votes (6 percent); 9 union presidents (6 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 3.9 percent.

QUESTION 3

“Should church leaders be asked to sign a document saying that they will follow voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?”

Response:

YES: 72 total votes (47.7 percent); 65 union president votes (47.4 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 60.6 percent.

NO: 77 total votes (51 percent); 70 union president votes (51.1 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 36 percent.

NOT ANSWERED: 2 total (1.3 percent); 2 union presidents (1.5 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 3.4 percent.

QUESTION 4

“Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to speak (i.e. have voice) at meetings of the GC Executive Committee?”

Response:

YES: 76 total votes (50.3 percent); 67 union president votes (48.9 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 34.3 percent.

NO: 67 total votes (44.4 percent); 63 union president votes (46 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 60.9 percent.

NOT ANSWERED: 8 total (5.3 percent); 7 union presidents (5.1 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 4.9 percent.

QUESTION 5

“Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to vote in meetings of the GC Executive Committee?”

Response:

YES: 56 total votes (37.1 percent); 50 union president votes (36.5 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 26.8 percent.

NO: 86 total votes (57 percent); 79 union president votes (57.7 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 67.9 percent.

NOT ANSWERED: 9 total (6 percent); 8 union presidents (5.8 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 5.3 percent.

QUESTION 6

“Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to serve on standing committees or ad hoc subcommittees of the GC Executive Committee?”

Response:

YES: 40 total votes (26.5 percent); 36 union president votes (26.3 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 15.5 percent.

NO: 100 total votes (66.2 percent); 91 union president (66.4 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 79.1 percent.

NOT ANSWERED: 11 total (7.3 percent); 10 union presidents (7.3 percent); percentage of world membership residing in those unions: 5.4 percent.

Conclusions Drawn

The following conclusions were drawn from the collected data:

There is overwhelming support for a GC team to meet with presidents of unions not in compliance, “to listen sensitively, counsel and pray.”

There is strong support for some kind of consequences for non-compliance.

There is also strong support for not allowing presidents of non-compliant unions to serve on standing or ad hoc committees of the GC Executive Committee.

There is pronounced support for not allowing presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of GC Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee to vote in meetings of the GC Executive Committee.

A majority of Church leaders oppose removing “voice” as well as vote from non-compliant union presidents.

Most Church leaders also oppose requiring union presidents to sign a document promising to abide by GC Session and Executive Committee actions.

Qualitative Data Gathering Continues

A preliminary report on qualitative data gathering was given by Hensley Mooroooven, secretary of the Unity Oversight Committee. Mooroooven reported that qualitative data is continuing to be gathered through personal visits and dialogues with division and union leaders worldwide. Qualitative data is also being gathered from GC institutions and the GC Leadership Council, composed of GC officers and departmental leaders.

So far, eleven such dialogues have taken place, according to Mooroooven, with many more scheduled for the near future.

“Of the dialogues that have taken place,” added Ryan, “there appears to be a positive correlation between the quantitative and qualitative data.”

Ryan pointed out, however, that in the end, “data is a guide. It can be empirical, but not necessarily infallible, information. It’s a guide, not an absolute. But we will be informed by the data in crafting what is brought to the Executive Committee during Annual Council 2018.”

This article originally appeared on the Adventist News Network.

April
2018

SPRING MEETING SURPRISE

Spectrum asked Adventist researchers to analyze the methodology and findings of the Unity Oversight Committee's (UOC) survey, and one provided a detailed analysis that was published on the *Spectrum* website.

At the April Spring Meeting of the Executive Committee, there was no discussion of the unity controversy. But then, just as the meeting closed, there was news of a document that had not been discussed, titled "Uplifting Jesus," giving criteria for evaluating independent ministries.

Validity of Unity Survey Questioned

BY WILLIAM W. ELLIS | APRIL 20, 2018

As the conflict has continued around the ordination of women pastors and issues of compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the General Conference Executive Committee, the Unity Oversight Committee (UOC) requested that the Office of Archives, Statistics and Research (ASTR) conduct a global survey. The results of the survey, titled a "Questionnaire on Compliance," have been published in the Adventist News Network post dated March 23, 2018 and on *Spectrum*. The General Conference said that the findings represent the profile of global Seventh-day Adventist opinion on the issue of unity and compliance in the SDA Church. Because it is in the interest of us all to understand the profile of opinion among us on this and other issues, I offer these comments on the methodology and findings of this undertaking in the hope that they will help to clarify the relationship between the stated purpose of this study and its findings.

Study Purpose

Because this study is so important in the development of Church policy on a looming, divisive issue, it is essential to consider the authenticity of its findings. The key to this is the way the findings were generated by the data said to support them. And the very foundation of data generation is the methodology by which they were produced.

However, these issues cannot be engaged without first considering the study's purpose. What was it after? What did it seek to discover or elucidate? The prelude to the survey's questions states this:

The General Conference Unity Oversight Committee would like to explore the opinion of the world field, represented by division and union presidents, on the issue of compliance with voted actions of General

Conference Sessions and of the General Conference Executive Committee.

We request that you, as a division/union president, record what you believe is *the view of the majority of members in your territory* (as opposed to your personal view) on the following questions. [Underlining added by author.]¹

Another indication of the survey's purpose can be surmised from a statement about how the data will be used by the Committee.

... the survey provides quantitative data, allowing the committee 'to more accurately judge where the world Church leaders and members stand on these issues,' according to Mike Ryan, chair of the committee. 'This information will serve as a guide to the Unity Oversight Committee in defining consequences for unions who have not complied with votes of the GC Session and of the GC Executive Committee,' he added.²

This statement presupposes that there is a shared understanding among the leadership and general membership on the meaning of "compliance" and that division and union presidents can accurately know and represent the view of the majority of members in their territory.

Two Parts of the Study

The methodology of the study—the way its data were generated—has two main parts: a survey of 150 top Seventh-day Adventist leaders, and a "qualitative" part involving conversations with a number of these leaders. There are five aspects of the study addressed here. Two are aspects of the survey, its sample and instrument. Two are aspects of the qualitative component, the extent to which it was systematic and its documentation. Finally, the findings of the two study components are addressed as they are related to the study's stated purpose.

The Survey Questionnaire/Instrument

A basic issue in any sample survey is the extent to which it represents the population from which it is drawn. The best sample in any case is a strict probability sample in which every element of that population has a known and equal probability of being selected into the sample. This is

rarely achieved because the response rates of respondents in a strict probability sample are seldom 100 percent. The question then becomes the extent to which the almost inevitable compromise with this standard corrodes the representativeness of the sample.

The sample in this study is not at all a probability sample, but one apparently based on the convenience of the investigators as it was easy for them to poll 150 of the most senior Church leaders who were supposed to be able to accurately know and report the opinions of congregants in their massive units. It is a problematic leap to get from leadership beliefs about the opinions of members of their groups to the opinions of the members themselves. It is misleading to assert that any leader can accurately know and report the range of opinion of hundreds of thousands of others in the group, particularly when no attempts to systematically gather information have been done within these large groups. Claiming to know the opinions of those in one's union or division does not make it so, and it is a gross misrepresentation of the data to claim that it does. It is like saying that all the Cardinals and Bishops of the Catholic Church can accurately know and report the range of Catholic opinion on things like contraception or abortion.

The questionnaire, attached as Exhibit 1, is also problematic.³ The construction of instruments, often called questionnaires or interview schedules, is an extremely important step in the sample survey process. The most credible organizations engaged in this kind of work are generally the more well-known and seasoned university survey research shops. They often work for months and sometimes years to create reliable and well-validated items—questions—for their surveys. This means simply that the well-validated items measure what we think they measure.

The questions in this survey are derived from various actions proposed in the document titled "Procedures for Reconciliation and Adherence in Church Governance Phase II" discussed at last year's Annual Council and referred back to the Committee.⁴ Likely, the committee wanted the wording of the questions to be consistent with the language in the compliance document. Yet the wording is important to the scientific nature of the survey process, findings, and conclusions. The six items in the Unity Oversight Committee survey are too long and too vague to meet this standard though some seem to be more valid than others. (See Exhibit 1.)

In question 1, the meanings of some of the major terms are not clear and subject to manifold interpretations: "listen sensitively," "counsel," "not in compliance."

In question 2, the concept of “organizational consequences” is unclear. Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 are clearer, but they could certainly be sharpened and made more valid with a substantial period of application and honing. But if this could not be done because of the urgency of launching the survey, researchers would have been well-advised to consult existing, well-validated survey items and to base their new items on these.⁵ Even assuming that the items are reliable, meaning that they would consistently generate the same results when measuring the same opinions, the validity of

the six items of the survey is questionable. We cannot know with real confidence that they measure what we think they measure. And without the assurance that the convenience sample of 150 Adventist leaders represents the range of opinion of 20 million of us and that the survey items measure what we think they measure, we cannot be at all sure of the apparent survey results.

In addition, the use of a five-item scale for responses for each question, such as strongly favor, favor, no opinion, oppose, strongly oppose, instead of the bi-modal “yes” or “no”

Questionnaire on Compliance

The General Conference *Unity Oversight Committee* would like to explore the opinions of the world field, represented by division and union presidents, on the issue of compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the General Conference Executive Committee.

We request that you, as a division/union president, record what you believe is the view of *the majority of members in your territory* (as opposed to your personal view) on the following questions. Please enter an X in the appropriate space and email this to trimd@gc.adventist.org

For each question, please answer Yes or No

<p>1. Should the General Conference Unity Oversight Committee appoint a team to listen sensitively, counsel and pray with the presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?</p>	<p>1. ___ Yes 2. ___ No</p>
<p>2. Should there be further organizational consequences for unions that do not comply with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?</p>	<p>1. ___ Yes 2. ___ No</p>
<p>3. Should church leaders be asked to sign a document saying that they will follow voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee?</p>	<p>1. ___ Yes 2. ___ No</p>
<p>4. Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to speak (i.e. have voice) at meetings of the GC Executive Committee?</p>	<p>1. ___ Yes 2. ___ No</p>
<p>5. Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to vote in meetings of the GC Executive Committee?</p>	<p>1. ___ Yes 2. ___ No</p>
<p>6. Should presidents of unions not in compliance with voted actions of General Conference Sessions and of the GC Executive Committee be allowed to serve on standing committees or ad hoc subcommittees of the GC Executive Committee?</p>	<p>1. ___ Yes 2. ___ No</p>

Comments and Suggestions:

FINAL SURVEY – Approved by UOC on June 9, 2018

Exhibit 1

responses would have produced a more varied range of positions on the studied compliance issues. Similarly, the addition of demographic data, such as age, ethnic background, length of service, and education, would have allowed for more nuanced findings on the opinion items.

Qualitative Data Collection

There are a number of well-accepted qualitative data collection methods in social analysis. One of them is nominally-scaled items in sample surveys, and some would argue that the six items in this survey are of this type. Other accepted qualitative methods include focus groups, in-depth interviews, simulations, and anthropological field studies and its cousin, participant observation studies. What the standards all of these methods have in common is that they must be systematic, and their procedures and results must be documented. Since there is no readily available documentation of the “personal visits and dialogues” with church leaders said to comprise the qualitative component of the unity project, it is impossible to know whether these conversations were appropriately systematic and documented. Therefore, it is difficult to be confident in the data generated and to draw conclusions about the consistency of the information from the “listening sessions” and the findings from the questionnaire. This is especially true given the lack of anonymity in both the “quantitative” and “qualitative” responses.

The Findings

The findings of systematic social research are typically reported in such a way that there is a clear and logical link between the research operations and the conclusions drawn. As in all such studies the very foundation of data generation is the methodology by which they were generated. In this study, the sample is not representative of the global body of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, as no person in the general membership was in the sample, only a small number of its higher leaders. And the validity of the survey instrument is questionable. In the qualitative component of the study, we have no assurance that the data collection was systematic or well-documented. For these reasons, we can have little confidence in the study findings as a whole.

The Presentation of the Findings

The appropriateness of the presentation of the study findings are open to challenge by those who bear the standards for the conduct of systematic social research.⁶ In the first place, in the reportage of the findings, the proportion of the global Seventh-day Adventist population represented by Church

leaders responding “Yes” or “No” to survey questions is indicated, strongly suggesting that the responses represent the indicated proportion of the entire population under study. This is potentially misleading. Second, the identity of study respondents may be made known to some of the researchers apparently in such a way that individuals’ responses may be known. Any sample survey with such sensitive questions, ones that could lead to punishment of those who answer in ways that do not support leadership, should be absolutely anonymous in the sense that the responses of individuals could be known to researchers or anyone else. Otherwise, the survey can only be construed as an open plebiscite of followers by their leaders. How could that be presented as an adequate measure of opinion on sensitive issues?

It is this researcher’s hope that these observations will enhance our purpose in promoting the work of our Church in advancing the gospel.

Notes & References:

1. The instructions for the “Questionnaire on Compliance,” the questionnaire for this survey, are included below as Exhibit 1.
2. Adventist News Network. Survey results presented to Unity Oversight Committee: Qualitative Research Continues. <https://news.adventist.org/en/all-news/news/go/2018-03-23/survey-results-presented-to-unity-oversight-committee-qualitative-research-continues/> [accessed April 5, 2018].
3. See Exhibit 1.
4. Adventist News Network. Procedures for Reconciliation and Adherence in Church Governance Phase II. <https://news.adventist.org/fileadmin/news.adventist.org/files/content/procedures-for-reconciliation-and-adherence-in-church-governance-phase-ii.pdf> [accessed April 11, 2018].
5. Among the many sources of well-validated survey items are the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan and the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.
6. Note the findings have been reported in the Adventist News Network post of March 23, 2018 and in the *Spectrum* post also of that date. Adventist News Network. Survey results presented to Unity Oversight Committee: Qualitative Research Continues. news.adventist.org/en/all-news/news/go/2018-03-23/survey-results-presented-to-unity-oversight-committee-qualitative-research-continues/ [Accessed April 11, 2018]. *Spectrum Magazine*. Unity Oversight Committee Survey Results. <https://spectrum-magazine.org/print/8646> [Accessed April 11, 2018].

WILLIAM W. ELLIS is Professor of Political Studies at Washington Adventist University. Earlier in his career, he held tenured faculty positions in political science at Northwestern University, the University of Michigan, and Howard University, as well as senior research and management positions industry and the federal government. At Northwestern University, then a leader in quantitative political research, he taught some the basic graduate courses in research methodology, including an advanced graduate course in multivariate analysis.