Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

2015

# Effective Methods of Communicating Organizational Values: A Case Study

Caralin B. McHan
*Andrews University*, caralin@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses

Part of the Communication Commons, and the Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons

ABSTRACT


EFFECTIVE METHODS OF COMMUNICATING ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES:

A CASE STUDY


by

Caralin B. McHan


Chair: Rachel Williams-Smith

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Master's Thesis

Andrews University

College of Arts and Sciences

Title: EFFECTIVE METHODS OF COMMUNICATING ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES: A CASE STUDY

Name of Researcher: Caralin B. McHan

Name and degree of faculty chair: Rachel Williams-Smith, Ph. D.

Date of completion: October 2015

Organizational values affect business success, and employee satisfaction and commitment. Value training begins during socialization. This qualitative case study of Adventist Frontier Missions explored effective methods the organization's trainers used to communicate and motivate newcomers to assimilate organizational values during the 2015 short-term missions training.  Through observation, surveys, focus groups and interviews, I found that newcomers were motivated by seeing a connection between the organization's values and its mission, and by seeing the values enacted by the trainers.  I also found that newcomers perceived nonverbal communication of organizational values to be integral to their value-assimilation process. These findings should be useful for organizations interested in values or culture-based onboarding.

Andrews University

College of Arts and Sciences

EFFECTIVE METHODS OF COMMUNICATING ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES:

A CASE STUDY

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Caralin B. McHan

2015

EFFECTIVE METHODS OF COMMUNICATING ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES:

A CASE STUDY

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Caralin B. McHan

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

_____
Rachel Williams-Smith, Chair, Ph.D.

_____
Ben Maguad, Ph.D.

_____          _____
Desrene Vernon-Brebnor, Ph.D.                    Date approved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFM              Adventist Frontier Missions

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are constantly training new employees.  According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015), 58.7 million Americans were hired for new jobs—not including job transfers within an organization, promotions, or demotions—in 2014.  On any given day, between three and four percent of America's working population is starting a new job (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015).  All of these new employees go through a period of organizational socialization. Organizational socialization is the process by which individuals become insiders, or members of an organization (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo & Tucker 2007).

During organizational socialization, new members learn what is expected of them by proactively seeking information and/or through socialization tactics (Bauer et al., 2007). Organizational socialization tactics are the methods an organization uses to help a newcomer become a full-fledged member of the organization.  The tactics can vary in terms of message content and the channel used to disseminate information.  Typically, media-rich channels are chosen to transfer know-how, while lean channels are chosen to transfer other information (Murray & Peyrefitte, 2007).  Part of the know-how and information disseminated to newcomers is regarding their roles in the organization, but one of the most important aspects of socialization is the process of instilling organizational values into new employees (Hart, 2012) so that "employees' goals, styles of work, and morals …match those of the organization" (Hess, 1993, p. 190).

Just like individuals, organizations have value systems. Sometimes these value systems are the conglomerate values of all of the members and sometimes the values systems are strategically chosen and enforced by the organization's founders and management. When individuals become new members of an organization, they learn the values and beliefs that the organization upholds and that they will be expected to exhibit in the workplace (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989).

Organizations should be concerned with making sure that their employees espouse the same values as the organization since the behavior of employees and the decision-making process are guided by an individual's culture and values (Hooper & Pye, 2002). The phenomenon of employees sharing the same values as an organization is known as value congruence. Employees with organizational value congruence are more likely to make decisions that align with organizational goals (Hooper & Pye, 2002).

Organizations train new employees with the hope that the newcomers will internalize and adopt the information given to them during training, including organizational values. Though values-focused messages can be communicated to employees throughout their tenure, organizations often start transferring information about organizational goals, values, and purpose to newcomers during the socialization process (Hart, 2012).

**Background and Statement of the Problem**

In recent years, businesses have increasingly focused on building a positive brand. Some scholars claim that an organization is granted a brand image by external stakeholders and their expectations of and experiences with the organization, while other scholars insist that the internal stakeholders of an organization create a brand identity through their promises and behavior (Burmann, Hegner, & Riley, 2009). Burmann, Hegner, and Riley (2009) proposed a model that

combines these two views, suggesting that brand is a composite of both brand image and brand identity.  Brand identity refers to "the shared values, competencies, origin, vision, communication style and behavior" of a group of people (Burmann, Hegner, & Riley, 2009, p. 115).  The shared values of a brand identity typically originate with the founders of an organization (Manohar & Pandit, 2013).  Often called core values, they define the organization's purpose and philosophy (Manohar & Pandit, 2013) and form the basis from which employees choose behavior and make decisions (Hooper & Pye, 2002).

Core values have been found to make a significant impact on the success and effectiveness of organizations.  Manohar and Pandit (2013) examined the core values of highly innovative organizations and found that in these successful organizations, core values give direction to organizational members and are practiced at all levels of the organization. Core values can only give direction to organizational members if these members are aware of them. This requires that the organization communicate organizational values to all members.

Not only are organizations faced with the task of communicating their core values to employees, they should do so in a way that persuades the members to internalize and enact their organizational values.  Research has shown that if the values of the employees match the values of the organization, the employees will have greater job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance (Fitzgerald & Desjardins, 2004).  One way organizations can increase the likelihood their employees will have value congruence is to require employees to go through training.  A study conducted by Cable and Parsons in 2001 found that newcomers shifted their values toward what they perceived to be the organization's values during socialization.

Most organizations would agree that orientation programs during employee socialization are an important component for teaching newcomers their organizational culture and values.

What is not known are the most effective methods organizations can use to communicate organizational values during orientation to persuade newcomers to internalize those values.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

My research examined the methods a specific organization used to communicate organizational values, and the reception of those values and methods of communication by organizational newcomers. I explored this topic through a case study of the 2015 short-term missions training for Adventist Frontier Missions (AFM). The purpose of my research was to discover the effective ways AFM communicated organizational values during orientation; the test of the communication's effectiveness being whether newcomers were motivated to internalize organizational values. This was determined by assessing the participants' perception of organizational communication of organizational values. The study revolved around the following five research questions, with the first two as the primary questions.

Question #1: How does AFM communicate organizational values to newcomers during orientation?

Question #2: How are trainees of the AFM training program persuaded to assimilate organizational values?

Question #3: Do the values of AFM newcomers shift to reflect the organization's values over the course of training?

Question #4: What do attendees of the AFM training perceive to be the most effective methods the organization uses to communicate core values?

Question #5: Which messages do AFM newcomers find to be effective in aiding their understanding and internalization of organizational values?

**Research Design and Theoretical Framework**

Processes and relationships within organizations are complex with many variables, so a holistic approach was best suited for my research. I chose to conduct a qualitative case study to explore effective methods whereby AFM communicates organizational values to newcomers during training and to explore the response of newcomers to those methods. The case study design enabled me to collect richer details than I could have gathered using a quantitative research study.

Multiple sources enhanced the reliability of my study. The sources included participant observation, surveys, focus groups and interviews. The goal of the focus groups and interviews was to discover the values participants learned over the course of the training as well as the effective methods AFM used to communicate core values. I used the inductive method of grounded theory to interpret the data collected.

**The Case Study Organization**

Adventist Frontier Missions (AFM) is a missionary organization. Incorporated in 1985, the organization's mission is to "establish indigenous Seventh-day Adventist church-planting movements among unreached people groups" (About Us, 2015). Unreached people groups are those that do not have access to the Christian Bible because of geographic, language, or political barriers. The organization currently has projects with 50 different people groups in places like Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Oceania. Each project is based on a model of cross-cultural church planting that includes several stages: prepare, connect, introduce, renew, cultivate, leadership development, and transfer and follow-up (AFM Church Planting Model, 2015). During the transfer and follow-up stage, the new church is transferred to the Seventh-day Adventist church and ceases to be an AFM project.

Adventist Frontier Missions has a reputation for developing a high level of organizational commitment from volunteers, who dedicate years of service to the organization. Short-term missionaries spend one to three years working for the organization, while career missionaries have been known to devote over 20 years to their mission project (Missionaries, 2015).

Before AFM volunteers begin their service they are required to undergo an intensive training to ground them in organizational values and to give them skill sets for their service. One of the main objectives of training is to develop leaders and multipliers, or the trainers of trainers necessary for a movement (Training Philosophy, 2015). Training for career missionaries is three months long, while training for short-term missionaries is four weeks. The training is split into sections that cover many topics including, survival skills, servant leadership, language and culture acquisition, and cultural issues in missions, but one of the main focuses of the trainers is to teach trainees the organization's values (L. Burn, personal communication, November 22, 2014).

The core values of AFM are reliance, integrity, humility, teamwork, and transparency (About Us, 2015). Reliance refers to dependency on God; integrity refers to enduring results; humility refers to dependent vulnerability in relationships; teamwork refers to harmonious cooperation with organizational stakeholders as well as target people groups; and transparency refers to communicating with clarity and candor (About Us, 2015).

**Significance of the Study**

Thousands of individuals are employed by or volunteer for nonprofit organizations. According to the Urban Institute, there were 1.44 million nonprofits in 2012, and more than a quarter of adults in the United States volunteered for a nonprofit organization in 2013 (McKeever & Pettijohn, 2014). Though management scholars in both the public and nonprofit

sectors recognize the importance of values in pursuing organizational goals (Peng, Pandey & Pandey, 2015), nonprofit organizations are particularly values-oriented.

The results of my research can be useful to organizations that are concerned with maintaining a particular culture of values. Knowing which organizational socialization tactics and methods of communication are most beneficial for volunteer value assimilation could give these organizations a basis from which to restructure their orientation programs. Since nonprofit organizations have limited resources and are constantly trying to reduce costs, it follows that they should seek the most efficient and effective methods for communicating core values during orientation.

In addition to saving organizations time and money, improving their training methods could impact an organization's brand. Wentzel (2009) found that when individuals interact with an employee who is considered an exemplar of the brand's workforce, the employee's behavior is attributed to the brand as a brand characteristic. In other words, the way an employee behaves—which is based on organizational values—affects the organization's brand image. The conclusion of my research offers insight on an effective way of communicating organizational values that could be useful for organizations that aim to train employees to be positive brand ambassadors.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

My study explores the methods of value transferal by AFM to new members during the 2015 short-term missions training; it does not describe the process whereby newcomers of all organizations internalize organizational values.

The study only discusses value internalization over the course of the training; it does not determine how long value congruence will last, nor how the participants will enact the

organizational values during their terms of service. I limited the study to current participants based on the assumption that trainees would be more likely to forget specific organizational socialization tactics if more time had transpired between their training and the research.

Another limitation is that I did not compare different types of socialization such as individual information seeking and peer socialization to see how they affect the value-assimilation process. I focused my study on organizational tactics and methods of persuasion, and how newcomers perceived those methods.

## Summary

Organizations often count on their employees to be brand ambassadors, acting on behalf of the organization. Employees are likely to act on behalf of an organization if they have value congruence with the organization. In order to ensure employees have value congruence, organizations communicate their core values to employees during organizational socialization. Research has been conducted on the process of organizational socialization and the role of individual information seeking during socialization, but there is a gap of knowledge around the best methods of communicating organizational values during socialization. The current qualitative case study used observations, surveys, interviews and focus groups to identify what organizational communication and persuasion methods trainees perceived as effective during the 2015 Short-Term Missions Training. The results of this study should be beneficial to AFM as well as other organizations that wish to implement an effective values-based training.

The following chapter reviews literature and theories surrounding organizational values, organizational socialization tactics, and persuasion. Subsequent chapters describe the methods and procedures followed in this study, the results obtained, and their application.

## Definition of Terms

Aspirated values: Values that members of an organization believe should be espoused by the organization's management.

Attributed values: Values that members of an organization regard as belonging to the organization.

Espoused values: Values that are used by an organization's management in formal verbal and written communication. (Synonyms: core values, organizational values)

Organizational culture: The collective values, beliefs and behavior of members of an organization.

Organizational values: values that are either embedded in or intended for an organization's culture.

Socialization: The process by which newcomers to an organization make the transition from being outsiders to insiders.

Socialization tactics: The methods by which an organization expects its newcomers to go through the socialization process.

Value congruence: When an individual's values match the values espoused by an organization.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizations have personalities in the same way individuals do, made up of their work ethic, codes of behavior, sense of humor, and value systems. Values are central to several "organizational phenomena including identity, culture, person-organization fit and socialization" (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013, p. 495). Since congruence with organizational values has been linked with increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees (Fitzgerald & Desjardins, 2004; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989), organizations have begun to emphasize core values.

One of the key moments in which organizations communicate their core values to employees is during organizational socialization. Since organizations deal with limited resources, they should strategically plan their newcomer orientations to include the most effect methods of communicating their core values so as to benefit from employee value congruence. The following literature review seeks to describe organizational socialization and discover effective methods for communicating organizational values. I will begin by exploring the topic of organizational culture and values. Then I will discuss the literature surrounding organizational socialization and socialization tactics. Lastly I will review theories of persuasion.

**Organizational Culture and Values**

The personality of an organization is known as organizational culture. Organizational culture is comprised of multiple layers including visible artifacts and

values (Schein, 1984). Visible artifacts are the aspects of organizational culture that are observable, such as office layout, uniforms, and motivational décor; and values (Schein, 1984). Schein described two levels of values: assumptions, which are unquestioned, taken-for-granted values such as *progress is inevitable* or *businesses should be profitable*; and debatable, espoused values, which are the concepts about the organization's goals and principles that guide organizational behavior, such as quality, promptness, and honesty (Schein, 1984). An organization's values often affect its visible artifacts. For example, a company might display a clock in the conference room because it values efficiency, or a company might develop a logo depicting a helping hand because it values humanitarianism.

In 1973, Rokeach defined two categories of values: terminal values, which are the preferred end-states of existence, and instrumental values, which are preferred modes of conduct (as cited in Stormer and Devine, 2008). These values can be evidenced in organizations in several ways. Bourne and Jenkins (2013) describe four different types of organizational values: espoused values, attributed values, shared values, and aspired values. Espoused values are the values that are used by an organization's management in formal verbal and written communication; attributed values are the values that members of an organization ascribe to the organization; shared values are the aggregate system of values held by an organization's members; and aspired values are the values that members of an organization believe should be espoused by an organization (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013). Bourne and Jenkins (2013) argue that these types of values can be combined into a single framework of organizational values in which values are measured on two continuums: whether they are social or individual, and whether they are

11

embedded or intended. An organization's espoused values fall on the intended and social

sides of the continuums (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013).

Organizations will often state their espoused values in a mission statement or list

of core values (Hooper & Pye, 2002). But it is not enough for organizations to simply

compile a list of their espoused values. Research suggests that organizations should be

intentional about communicating their values to employees (Fitzgerald & Desjardins,

2004). For instance, a study of organizational values in a healthcare organization found

that employees in departments that clearly and consistently communicated values were

more involved in the organization and more likely to participate in organizational

decision-making than employees in departments that did not clearly and consistently

communicate values (Fitzgerald & Desjardins, 2004).

## Value Congruence

In addition to communicating core values, it is beneficial for organizations to

motivate their employees to adopt organizational values. When an employee adopts

organizational values, the organization has the potential to benefit both internally and

externally. An internal benefit is that employees who possess value congruence with an

organization—meaning that they share the same set of values—have higher job

satisfaction and organizational commitment (Fitzgerald & Desjardins, 2004). An external

benefit, identified through a series of four studies conducted by Sirianni, Bitner, Brown,

and Mandel (2013), is that when employee behaviors are aligned with brand

positioning—or espoused values—customers respond positively to an organization's

brand.

Employees are representatives of an organization. Just like a country expects its ambassadors to clearly represent the country's culture and interests, organizations desire that their employees be brand champions by clearly representing the organization's service and values (Lohndorf & Diamantopoulos, 2014). It is important to note that enacting an organization's values does not mean that an employee holds the same values system as the organization. Research on facades of conformity show that individuals can hold both personal and organizational values, and choose whether to express or suppress their personal values (Stormer & Devine, 2008). It is not beneficial either to organizations or individuals when they suppress their personal values because it causes the individuals to feel psychological discomfort and could lead them to participate in behavior that sabotages the organization (Stormer & Devine, 2008).

As the previous studies indicate, it is in the best interest of organizations to employ individuals whose values match those espoused by the organization. This compatibility between individuals and the organizations for which they work is known as person-organization fit (Cable & Parsons, 2001) and is measured by calculating employee-organization value congruence (Chatman, 1989). McDonald and Gandz (1992) observed that organizations can achieve person-organization fit either by hiring employees with value congruence, or by teaching employees organizational values. But regardless of how closely an individual's values match those of an organization when they are hired, all newcomers should be made aware of organizational values during organizational socialization.

## Organizational Socialization Tactics

Organizational socialization is "the process by which newcomers make the transition from being organizational outsiders to being insiders" (Bauer et al., 2007, p. 707). Many organizational socialization theories are based on uncertainty reduction theory (Mignerey, Rubin & Gorden, 1995). The idea is that new employees seek to reduce their uncertainty in order to fit in to their new job environment and reduce their levels of anxiety and stress, and organizations seek to reduce newcomer's uncertainty so that they become fully functioning and productive members of the organization.

There are different strategies that organizations can use to help newcomers reduce their uncertainty. Van Maanen and Schein (as cited in Bauer et al., 2007) were among the first theorists to describe these strategies in their 1979 model of organizational socialization tactics. In their meta-analytic review of organizational socialization research, Bauer et al. (2007) describe Van Maanen and Schein's six dimensions of socialization: collective—socialization with other newcomers vs. individual— socialization separate from other newcomers; formal—newcomers trained off the job vs. informal—newcomers trained on the job with other employees; fixed—specific timetable vs. variable—no timetable; sequential—socialization through organized phases vs. random—random organization of socialization; investiture—feedback from insiders that affirms or disaffirms identity vs. divestiture—no feedback; and serial—help from insiders vs. disjunctive—without help from insiders (Bauer et al., 2007).

In 1986, Jones (as cited in Saks & Ashforth, 1997) split the dimensions into two categories: institutionalized socialization tactics—collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture—"encourage newcomers to passively accept preset roles, thus

reproducing the status quo," whereas individualized socialization tactics—individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive and divestiture—"encourage newcomers to challenge the status quo and develop their own approaches to their roles" (p. 236). Jones further suggested that the institutionalized socialization tactics could be simplified into three categories: context—including both collective and formal, content—including both sequential and fixed, and social—including both serial and investiture (as cited in Bauer et al., 2007; and Saks, Uggerslev & Fassina, 2007).

Institutionalized socialization tactics have been shown to increase employees' organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Bauer et al., 2007; Saks, Uggerslev & Fassina, 2007), while individualized socialization tactics have been shown to increase employee's innovative role orientation (Allen & Meyer, 1990). A concept closely linked to individualized socialization tactics is employee information-seeking or sense-making. Research has shown that individuals who participate in proactive socialization behaviors will more quickly and effectively become socialized into an organization (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). But as organizations do not have control over the extent of their employees' information seeking, institutionalized socialization tactics are of more interest to the field of organizational communication.

Message Content During New Employee Orientation

Though both individualized and institutionalized socialization tactics can help an individual reduce uncertainty and adjust to a new organization, a study by Klein and Weaver (2000) showed that individuals who attended an organization's optional orientation had higher levels of organizational knowledge and commitment than those individuals who opted out of the orientation. Organizational knowledge includes

information about performance proficiency, people, politics, language, organizational goals and values, and history (Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994). But the main two categories of information transferred to newcomers during orientation are organizational roles and organizational goals/values.

Katz and Kahn, in their 1978 study, state that the most important information a newcomer receives during socialization is regarding his or her organizational roles (as cited in Chao et al., 1994), while Kim, Cable and Kim (2005) assert that the most important information a newcomer receives during socialization is regarding organizational values. Regardless of which content area is most important for employee adjustment, a study by Hart in 2012 found that the organizational messages most emphasized by organizational management during orientation deal with organizational goals and values.

I agree with Kim, Cable and Kim (2005) that the most important messages transferred to newcomers during orientation involve organizational values because an individuals' behavior within an organization is grounded in the organization's culture and values (Fitzgerald & Desjardins, 2004). Though an organization can train an individual how to respond in predictable situations, the true test of an individual's alignment with an organization is whether, in unpredictable situations, the individual responds in ways the organization would endorse.

## Value-Transfer During Socialization

I have described organizational values and the main theories of organizational socialization. But how do individuals learn organizational values during socialization and what effective methods can organizations use to communicate their core values?

Cable and Parsons (2001) found that newcomers were more likely to report positive person-organization fit—which is based on value congruence—if they were socialized using the sequential and fixed (content tactics), and serial and investiture (social tactics) socialization tactics. Context socialization tactics did not affect person-organization fit (Cable & Parsons, 2001). The study also found that newcomers' values shifted towards their perceptions of their organizations' values when they experienced institutional socialization tactics (Cable & Parsons, 2001).

Though some research has been done concerning institutionalized organizational socialization tactics, more research should be done regarding the specific socialization strategies that facilitate learning (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Encouraging value adoption during socialization is more than simply transferring knowledge of an organization's core values; it involves persuading the newcomers to internalize and enact organizational values. I will next explore methods of persuasion and suggest some possible methods that might be effective ways to communicate organizational values during newcomer socialization.

Motivation to Learn

Since organizations communicate their core values to employees with the expectation that the employees internalize and enact them, it seems logical that a strategic plan for communicating organizational values should be based on the theory of planned behavior. Developed by Fishbein and Ajzen in 1975, the theory predicts that "the more one intends to engage in a particular behavior, the more likely should be its performance" (Armitage & Conner, 1999, p. 35). Intentions are affected by an individual's positive or negative evaluations of the behavior, whether they believe the behavior is desired by

17

another individual and their relationship to that individual, and how difficult they perceive participation in the behavior to be (as cited in Armitage & Conner, 1999). Applying the theory of planned behavior to the training of organizational values, a newcomer's intentions to adopt organizational values would be influenced by how positively they viewed the organization's espoused values, whether they felt pressure to assimilate into the organization's culture, whether the pressure was coming from their superior or someone they wanted to please, and the ease with which they could enact the organization's values.

Similar to the theory of planned behavior, Noe and Schmitt's definition of the motivation to learn as "specific desire on the part of the trainee to learn the content of a training program" (as cited in Wiethoff, 2004, p. 266) refers to newcomer attitudes towards organizational training efforts. Motivation to learn has been shown to positively affect learning and the behavior outcomes of training (Quinones, 1995). Organizations can manipulate newcomers' motivation to learn by appealing to their belief in the newcomers' ability to reach goals (Eden & Kinnar, 1991). Applying motivation to learn to the training of organizational values, newcomers might be motivated to learn organizational values if their trainer were to communicate absolute confidence in their ability to internalize organizational values and succeed in the organization.

According to the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion, individuals are more likely to put energy into thinking about and processing information when they perceive an issue to be important or affecting them in some way (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). Applying the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion to values training, an organization might stress the importance of reflecting organizational values and how it

will affect newcomers on an individual, social, or organizational level.  Similarly, social learning theory suggests that individuals want to act in ways that will result in a reward (as cited in Gruys et al., 2008), so organizations might institute a reward system and emphasize it during orientation.

## Summary

Organizational culture and values can be linked to the success of organizations (Hooper & Pye, 2012; Manohar & Pandit, 2013).  In order to transfer their culture to new generations of employees, organizations must communicate their values (Fitzgerald & Desjardins, 2004). This is often done during newcomer orientation.  Research has shown that individuals who attend orientation have a greater understanding of organizational knowledge than individuals who do not attend orientation (Klein & Weaver, 2000).  As such, it is valuable for organizations to use orientations to persuade newcomers to internalize and enact organizational values. More research is needed to determine the effective methods organizations can use to persuade newcomers to internalize organizational values.  This information would be useful for the strategic planning of newcomer orientations, allowing organizations to make the most effective use of their limited resources.

The following chapter provides an in-depth description of the methods and procedures followed in this study.  Then, the results of the study will be described and discussed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

As mentioned in chapter one, I conducted a qualitative case study of AFM.

Qualitative research is the "nonmathematical process of interpretation, carried out for the

purpose of discovering concepts and relationships in raw data and then organizing these

into a theoretical explanatory scheme" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 11).  I chose a

qualitative method for this research because my topic involves organizations, which are

complex processes involving multiple interactions between members at the individual,

group, and organizational levels, and in both the objective and subjective dimensions

(Owen & Dietz, 2012). In order to get a holistic view of the effective methods of

communicating and persuading newcomers to internalize organizational values during

onboarding, I needed to tap into the experiences of both the senders and receivers without

isolating a set of predetermined variables. I needed an emic rather than an etic focus.  I

decided that the qualitative approach was my best option.

The qualitative design I chose was a case study.  Case studies are an appropriate

method to use when a researcher searches to answer questions about how and why

(Baxter & Jack, 2008). To do so, the researcher explores a real-life, contemporary context

or setting "over time, through detailed, in-depth, data collection involving multiple

sources of information" (Creswell, 2013, p. 97). Case studies focus on a specific context

or setting because they are based on the belief that contextual conditions are relevant to

the phenomenon under study (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The context in which organizational communication occurs is essential to my research questions because organizations are complex systems with many variables.

"Cases are units of analysis" (Patton, 2002, p. 447). The unit of analysis I chose for this study was the onboarding program of a specific organization. Compiling an in-depth description and analysis of a single bounded case to understand and illustrate a specific issue is known as an instrumental case study (Creswell, 2013). The instrumental case study afforded me the ability to gather richer information than I would have been able to gather if I were comparing multiple cases.

## Research Questions

The issue my instrumental case study dealt with was the persuasive communication of organization values, and the bounded case in which I explored it was the 2015 AFM training program. The purpose of my study was to examine the methods whereby organizational values were communicated to AFM newcomers during socialization, and to discover which methods were perceived by newcomers to be effective. I based my research on the following questions:

Question #1: How does AFM communicate organizational values to newcomers during orientation?

Question #2: How are trainees of the AFM training program persuaded to assimilate organizational values?

In addition, I asked the following secondary questions:

Question #3: Do the values of AFM newcomers shift to reflect the organization's values over the course of training?

Question #4: What do attendees of the AFM training perceive to be the most effective methods the organization uses to communicate core values?

Question #5: Which messages do AFM newcomers find to be effective in aiding their understanding and internalization of organizational values?

## Setting and Participants

I used purposeful sampling to select AFM as the case study organization. Purposeful sampling is choosing a case for study because it is "information rich and illuminative" offering useful manifestations of the phenomenon of interest (Patton, 2002, p. 40). Purposeful sampling was a logical method for me to use because the focus of qualitative research is on in-depth understanding. Adventist Frontier Missions was an excellent choice for my case study because its length of training allowed for an information-rich longitudinal study of newcomer value-assimilation during socialization. Another reason AFM made a good case was that I had been told that the organization's training was grounded in values, making the information I would gather illuminative to the topic.

Adventist Frontier Missions holds two trainings each summer. The career missions training, for missionaries dedicating their life to service, lasts three months. The short-term missions training, for missionaries dedicating 1-2 years of service, lasts one month. During the summer of 2015, only three couples/families—six adults—registered for the career missions training. In contrast, 16 individuals registered for the short-term missions training. I used purposive sampling to select the short-term training as the sample for my case study because it offered a larger sample.

As Marshall (1996) wrote, "an appropriate sample size for a qualitative study is one that adequately answers the research question" (p. 523). I believed that the trainees who were interested in participating in my research would put effort into understanding and interpreting their own behavior, and therefore be ideal participants in my research. Therefore I opened up my research to all of the trainees, asking that only those who were interested participate. This process of using the most accessible subjects is known as convenience sampling (Marshall, 1996).

Fifteen trainees consented to participate in my study. Eight of them had previously served as a short-term missionary; seven of them were new to mission work. The majority of them were young adults; ten were in the 18-24 age range, three were in the 25-29 age range, one was in the 30-34 age range, and one participant was in the 40-44 age range. Eight of the participants were students, and seven had already graduated into the work force. Nine of the participants were female; six were male. Eleven of the participants were from the United States, three from Europe, and one from Canada.

## Instrumentation

Qualitative case studies rely on multiple sources of data (Creswell, 2013). The sources of data I relied on were surveys, participant observations, focus groups and one-on-one interviews with participants. The triangulation, or process of corroborating evidence from different sources, strengthens the reliability of my research (Patton, 2002).

Before the start of the short-term missions training I used the responsive interviewing model to interview the AFM Training Director. The purpose of the interview was to get a more comprehensive understanding of AFM's values and to discover the methods that trainers use to communicate organizational values during

training. "Responsive interviewing emphasizes the importance of working with interviewees as partners rather than treating them as objects of research" (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. xv). Using the responsive interviewing model allowed me to be flexible (Creswell, 2013).  I started the interview with a pre-determined set of questions (see Appendix A), but asked further questions based on the Training Director's responses. For example, the Training Director described the process AFM went through in choosing their five core values.  This led me to query whether the values were attributed or aspirated.

<div align="center">Surveys</div>

On the first day of training I administered a demographic and values survey (see Appendix B) to study participants. The values portion of the survey instructed participants to circle their top 7 values from a list of 20 instrumental values. I chose to include instrumental values in this survey because the five core values espoused by AFM are instrumental values, defined as preferred modes of conduct. The instrumental values I listed on the demographic and values survey included the five core values of AFM— reliance, integrity, humility, teamwork, and transparency—and a modified version of the 18 instrumental values identified by Rockeach in 1973 (as cited in Karacaer, Gohar, Aygun & Sayin, 2009) and used by Karacaer et al (2009) in their study on auditor values. I included ambition, broad-mindedness, capability, cheerfulness, cleanliness, courage, helpfulness, imagination, independence, intellectuality, logic, obedience, politeness, responsibility, and self-control in my instrument.  The values from Rockeach's list that I did not include were honesty, forgiveness, and love.  These instrumental values were excluded because of their strong religious connotations.

At the conclusion of the training, participants completed a final values survey (see Appendix C). In this survey, I again instructed participants to circle their top 7 values from a list of 20 instrumental values. I also asked for whether participants felt their values had changed over the course of the training and what they perceived to be the best methods AFM used to communicate values.

All fifteen trainees filled out the survey administered at the beginning of the training. Only eleven trainees filled out the survey administered at the end of the training, so the data used to determine whether trainee values shifted over the course of the training was limited to those eleven participants.

Focus Groups & Interviews

In addition to the surveys administered at the beginning and end of training, I conducted focus groups and interviews with study participants, asking them about AFM values and how they were communicated. Whereas the surveys provided succinct information, the interviews allowed me to gain an in-depth perspective of the participant's experience. The purpose of a qualitative interview is to "explore in detail the experiences, motives, and opinions of others and to learn to see the world from perspectives other than [the researcher's] own" (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 3).

I did not have time to give individual interviews to each participant, but I did not want to exclude any participant's experience. To solve this issue, I held focus groups. There ended up being three focus groups and two one-on-one interviews. Each focus group had between 4-7 participants. I created an interview/focus group protocol (see Appendix D) to ensure consistency in the lines of inquiry I pursued with each person/group (Patton, 2002). In order to maintain participant confidentiality, I refer to all

participant responses from the focus groups and interviews by the focus group or interview number. For example, if a participant named Amanda had participated in Focus Group 2, I would replace the name Amanda in all research documents with the name Focus Group 2.

## Observation

"Observational data, especially participant observation, permit the evaluation researcher to understand a program or treatment to an extent not entirely possible using only the insights of others obtained through interviews" (Patton, 2002, p. 22-23). The instrument of choice for the qualitative researcher is the human observer, so I attended the short-term missions training as a participant as observer. A participant as observer participates in the activity on location as opposed to observing from a distance (Creswell, 2013). While observing, I took notes (see Appendix E) regarding what was communicated to trainees. Each evening I used these notes to write a journal entry synthesizing my experience during that day's training (see Appendix G).

## **Procedures**

After AFM gave me organizational consent to study the 2015 training sessions, I scheduled an interview with the Training Director. During the interview I asked the Training Director to identify the values of AFM and to describe how he communicates those values to trainees during training.

On July 14, I met with the six attendees of the AFM career missions training and pilot tested my Demographic & Values Survey, Final Values Survey, and interview/focus group questions. There was one interview/focus group question the career missionaries found confusing. Based on this feedback, I changed the question.

The short-term missions training began on July 20. Before the Training Director officially started training, I gave a presentation to the trainees, explaining my presence as participant observer.  I also offered trainees the opportunity to participate in my research, and detailed the time commitment involved; participants would complete a 10-minute survey at the start of training, and at the end of training.  They would also sign up for a one-hour focus group or interview, taking place during the last two weeks of training. Trainees were assured that there were no known risks to participation in the study, and that I would ensure their confidentiality throughout the course of the study. I requested that AFM trainers and staff step out of the room during my presentation so that the trainees would not feel pressured to participate in my research. Directly following my presentation, those trainees that agreed to participate signed informed consent forms (see Appendix F) and filled out the Demographic & Values Survey (see Appendix B).

I would have liked to participate in every aspect of training. But after interviewing the Training Director, I learned that the training includes the immersion experience of living together, and I was not able to participate in that experience. I attended the training classroom experience from July 20-August 14.  Six hours a day; Monday through Friday 9:00-12:00 and 2:00-5:00.  During this time I took notes about what the trainers said and how they communicated. Each time a new trainer arrived, I explained the purpose of my research and had the trainer sign an informed consent (see appendix F) before taking notes.  If I did not have a trainer's informed consent I still attended the training session, but did not take notes. Each evening I wrote my observations in a journal (see Appendix G), giving special attention to values that were either mentioned explicitly or implied. I

looked for examples of methods the trainers used to communicate values as well as my experience and reactions to the trainers' communication methods and messages.

After two weeks of training I requested that participants sign up for focus groups or interviews. The majority of the participants preferred focus groups. I ended up with three focus groups and two interviews. The focus groups and interviews took place during the one-hour period before lunch, but because training sessions often went late, the interview/focus group time was limited. Each focus group and interview lasted between 25-35 minutes. Though I was able to ask all of the planned questions, there was not enough time to ask follow-up questions.

The focus groups and interviews took place in private rooms in the AFM Training Center so that other trainees or AFM staff would not overhear them. Before asking the first question, I reminded the participants that their answers were confidential. Since I recorded the focus groups and interviews, I requested that trainees not mention specific names of other trainees, but assured them that if they slipped up, I would edit names out of the audio files. I also told the trainees that they were not required to answer all questions, but that they should speak up if they had an answer or opinion.

August 13 was the final day of formal training. I requested that the Training Director exit the room when I handed out the Final Values Survey (see Appendix C) to participants. At this point, I reminded trainees that participation in my research was optional. The survey took about five minutes to complete.

Part of the case study procedure includes assembling the raw data (Patton, 2002). After I collected the data, I compiled all the Demographic & Values Survey and Final Values survey results into a table (see Appendix N). I replaced the participant names

28

with their interview or focus group number in order to maintain confidentiality. Then I transcribed the focus groups and interviews (see Appendices H through M), editing out any trainee names mentioned in the conversation. Once all of the interviews/focus groups were transcribed, I scrubbed my journal, replacing all trainee names with their corresponding interview/focus group number. My data was ready for analysis.

## Data Analysis

The theoretical framework that guided my data analysis was grounded theory. Grounded theory seeks to generate or discover a model or theory to explain a process and provide a framework for further research (Creswell, 2013). But first, an individual case or cases must be constructed "without pigeon holing or categorizing" them (Patton, 2002, p. 57). "The initial focus is on full understanding of individual cases before those unique cases are combined or aggregated thematically" (Patton, 2002, p. 57). Once a case is fully understood, it can be analyzed for patterns and themes. The rationale behind case-construction before applying theoretical analysis is that phenomena are influenced by context, thus understanding the phenomena requires data to be grounded in the specific cases and contexts (Patton, 2002).

The first step in constructing the case for analysis was synthesizing the interview with the AFM Training Director to provide a picture of AFM values and the rationale and methods AFM trainers use to communicate those values to trainees. This information provided background and supplemented my observations and the results of the interview/focus groups.

Constructing a case record requires organizing and classifying the data (Patton, 2002). I read the interview/focus group transcripts, and observation journal both literally

29

and reflexively (Schutt, 2012). When reading the transcripts and journal literally, I focused on the literal content, identifying the values that were communicated and the methods that were used to communicate them.  When reading the transcripts and journal reflexively, I focused on my own interpretation of the data, looking for themes, patterns and regularities.  I classified the data—using colored pens to code the data—into four areas: a) the values that were mentioned or implied, b) why the values were important or motivation for learning them, c) The methods by which the values were communicated or learned, and d) specific phrases or metaphors that were taught in training that were repeated in interviews or my journal.

Some of my research questions dealt with the participants' reactions, which had the potential to be varied and subjective.  There were a couple deviant responses.  I included these responses in the study because all responses represented an equally valid participant reaction to organizational communication and my research would be incomplete were I to leave anything out. In order to limit researcher bias, I did not eliminate deviant responses.

After I classified the data, I listed the values mentioned in each instrument and counted the number of times each value appeared.  Similarly, I listed the communication methods mentioned in each instrument and counted the number of times each method appeared. I compared the communication methods participants mentioned in the Final Values Survey to those I observed and to those participants mentioned during the interviews/focus groups.

Finally, I compared the results of Demographic and Values Survey with the results of the Final Values Survey to see whether participant values shifted to reflect

organizational values over the course of the training.  I compared the values participants

claimed to hold at the beginning of training with the values those same participants

claimed to hold at the end of training. I also compared the values participants claimed to

hold—both at the beginning and at the end of training—with AFM's core values. Lastly,

I compared AFM's core values with the values participants attributed to AFM. All of

these comparisons gave me a picture of the shift in trainees' understanding and adoption

of AFM values over the course of the training.

## Summary

I used a case study of AFM to examine effective methods whereby organizational

values can be communicated to newcomers during socialization.  The data for my

research was collected through participant observation, surveys, and interviews/focus

groups. The next chapter describes the results of the research, followed by a discussion of

the findings.

CHAPTER 4


RESULTS

Training or orientation programs during employee socialization are one of the

first introductions newcomers have to organizational culture and values.  During training,

organizations are faced with persuading newcomers to internalize and enact

organizational values. But the best methods organizations can use to communicate

organizational values during orientation have not yet been identified.  I conducted a case

study of the 2015 AFM short-term training to see what methods trainees found most

effective.


**AFM Values**

When I asked the Training Director how AFM trainers communicate values

during training, he described how the organization demonstrates core values on a day-to-

day basis. For example, requiring that career missionaries spend 12 years in the mission

field demonstrates integrity, and emphasizing the importance of student missionaries to

spend three months learning culture and language at the beginning of their mission

highlights the importance of humility. The Training Director believes that core values

define the culture of an organization.  "Core values describe who you are.  And the

greater effectiveness with which they do, the more powerful they are" (Appendix H).

The values exist independently of whether they are identified or how they are labeled.

Adventist Frontier Missions has labeled five core values, known as behavioral values: reliance, integrity, humility, teamwork, and transparency (About Us, 2015). Reliance describes an attitude of depending on God for resources, strategy, and success; integrity refers to a code of honesty and truth in order to achieve enduring results; humility refers to an attitude of teachability and dependent vulnerability in relationships; teamwork refers to building cohesive teams with healthy relationships that work well together and with others; and transparency refers to communicating with clarity and candor (About Us, 2015).  The Training Director views these values as essential to the success of the organization; reliance is the basis on which the other values are built, and integrity is the end goal of the organization. How one gets from reliance to integrity is through a culture of humility, teamwork, and transparency.

In addition to the core values, there are values implicit in AFM's mission statement. The mission of AFM is to "establish indigenous Seventh-day Adventist church-planting movements among unreached people groups."  The implied values— identified by the Training Director—are: a pioneering spirit, cultural sensitivity, support of Seventh-day Adventist theology and values, movements/multiplication, and connecting with people groups outside of the reach of the gospel.

**AFM Training Learning Environments**

AFM's mission statement is pivotal to their training. The Training Director explained, "If you were to take our mission statement and eliminate all the adjectives it says: to establish movements among people groups.  At the very core is movements.  So all of our teaching, then, focuses around how do we shape people or how do we equip people to do that?" The trainers try to equip the trainees to establish movements by using

two different didactic environments: dialogical learning takes place in the classroom, and immersion learning takes place outside of the classroom in the way the trainees form a team, work and live together.

<div align="center">The Classroom</div>

The classroom is a large room in Morgan Hall at the AFM Training Center in Berrien Springs, Michigan.  Classes run a minimum of six hours each day for four weeks. Rather than focus on information, the classes focus on transformation. The three main trainers each specialized in a training area: one on languaculture acquisition, one on worldview and cultural issues, and one on discipleship. Though they followed a master schedule and covered specific points, in general the trainers led discussion-based classes. The trainers used different techniques to spark conversation; sometimes a trainer would lead the class in a game or activity, tell a story, or show a short video.  But the trainer would then invite the trainees to reflect on the experience and share what they had learned.  Often, the trainer told a story without giving the moral or message, instead asking trainees to tell him what the story meant and what they might have done differently in the situation.  Another role storytelling played was highlighting previous mistakes the trainers had learned from.  A trainer would tell a story about a mistake or bad judgment he made in the past and describe the consequences of his actions.  Trainees were expected to learn from the trainers' mistakes and draw conclusions about appropriate behavior from these stories.

The classes were educational and interesting.  AFM trainers believe in "presenting truth in a fashion most likely to be understood, practiced, remembered by our audience, and easily shared by them with their friends" (Training Philosophy, 2015).  This

<div align="center">34</div>

philosophy shaped the entertaining and interactive teaching style of the trainers.  They were good storytellers, using vocalics and gestures to accentuate their messages, and often augmented their lessons with diagrams, illustrations, songs, or other attention-getters. For example, one trainer used three buckets to illustrate different classifications of behavior.

To ensure that trainees paid attention and understood concepts, trainers asked for feedback.  Different trainers went about this differently.  One trainer handed composition booklets to the trainees and requested that they journal each day to summarize, reflect, and apply the most important things they learned.  The trainer read the journals and wrote feedback for the trainees.  Another trainer distributed blank t-shirts to the trainees, requesting that they decorate the t-shirt with concepts learned in class.  The classroom was a relaxed learning environment.  As one participant put it, "They're very interactive with us.  It's not a classroom; we go to classes, but it doesn't feel like a classroom.  It feels like a community" (Focus Group 2).

The Simulator

Learning does not end when trainees exit the classroom.  Rather, trainees view the way trainees live and work with each other as an essential aspect of training called the Simulator. They "see training as an immersion experience. Once you arrive—whether it's at morning, night or noon—everything you experience is designed to embed these values" (Training Director Interview).

Right across the parking lot from Morgan Hall is Mission Inn, the dormitory where trainees eat, sleep and spend much of their time when they are not in the classroom.  Much of their Simulator experience takes place in Mission Inn.  At the

beginning of training, the trainers set up leadership roles for trainees, such as being in charge of multimedia, cooking, cleanup, a social gathering, etc. In addition, the trainers requested that trainees practice what they learned in the classroom with each other.  For example, trainees were taught a specific format for resolving issues and group decision-making.  They were then asked to schedule this type of team discussion outside of the classroom.

When trainers asked for trainees to do something outside of classroom, they held trainees responsible to follow through.  For example, the trainers instituted a penalty of 10 push-ups per minute that a trainee arrived late to the classroom.  Instead of acting as drill sergeant and watching over the penalty, the trainers told trainees to keep track of their time and do the pushups on their own time.  Several times I saw trainees doing pushups during free time because they had arrived late to class.  Once, a trainer was with me, and he thanked the trainees for being accountable for their penalty.

One of the simulator training experiences was a one-hour coaching conversation with the Training Director, scheduled during the free hour right before lunch or dinner. During this conversation, the Training Director asked three questions: a) what do you want to talk about? b) what are some of your strengths and c) what are some areas in which you would like to grow? The coaching conversation had three goals:  a) to prepare the trainees to invest in others; b) to model the core values c) And to make the trainees aware that they are responsible for managing the backside of their strengths, or their weaknesses.

The Crucible

"The end of the first week of training culminates in an outdoor adventure survival weekend designed to push the trainees to their mental, physical, spiritual and social limits" (Student & Short Term Missions Training, 2015). The survival weekend is called the Crucible, and is a combination of dialogic learning and immersion learning. According to the Training Director, between 50-70% of the values learning occurs over the course of these 72 hours.

The Crucible has earned a reputation, and quite a bit of anticipation surrounds the event. Part of the anticipation centers around the secret nature of the Crucible. People who have gone through the Crucible experience are not supposed to talk about it. What happens at Crucible stays at Crucible. The reason for this secrecy is that in order to achieve the environment of dependency and vulnerability that the trainers attempt to foster through the Crucible, there needs to be an element of surprise. In order to respect AFM's training efforts, I will only give a general description of the Crucible.

The Crucible is designed to be an immersion experience that simulates the frontier mission experience (Training FAQs, 2015). Trainers acted in specific ways in order to simulate aspects of the mission field and to elicit an emotional response from the trainees. Through various exercises, trainees were forced out of their comfort zones until they hit a wall physically, emotionally, or mentally. Sometimes the crash was public; sometimes it was private. Public crashes were dealt with as a group. "We're watching the human interaction, we're watching how people hold up, we're watching emotional responses, how we communicate, and then we're coaching them through that. There's a lot of impromptu training that's taking place in the Crucible," the Training Director explained.

That training took the form of coaching. Conversation was a big part of the Crucible. Each activity was followed by a debriefing session. "We have space that we create, but it's not the space, it's really the conversation around it that's the classroom," the Training Director emphasized, "It's in the spaces between when the real learning is taking place."

The trainers believe that "mistakes are some of our best teachers. We encourage our teams to fail safely and not to waste their mistakes" (Training Philosophy, 2015). The Crucible was full of mistakes, but the trainers coached the trainees to think and talk through their mistakes to glean lessons that would help them become better leaders and followers; better team members. Before the Crucible began the Training Director explicitly told the trainees that the purpose of the Crucible was to turn them into a high-functioning team. Many of the activities fostered leadership and followership skills.

But though teamwork and leadership was explicitly defined as the goals of the weekend, an unmentioned goal was that trainees come to terms with themselves and their community (Student & Short Term Missions Training, 2015). Over the weekend, each trainee hit some sort of melting point. The day following the Crucible was spent debriefing; each trainee mentioned his/her melting point and what he/she learned from the experience. This debriefing was only possible because the trainees had accepted a culture of transparency and vulnerability over the Crucible weekend.

### Values Communicated During Training

During my interview with the Training Director, he explicitly explained AFM's five core values—reliance, integrity, humility, teamwork, and transparency—as well as the values implicit in AFM's mission statement—a pioneering spirit, cultural sensitivity, support of Seventh-day Adventist theology and values, movements/multiplication, and

connecting with people groups outside of the reach of gospel. Some other values that he mentioned at least twice were: community, communication, cultural sensitivity, practice, healing, leadership, transformation, trust and vulnerability.

Though the Training Director was explicit in speaking about AFM's core values during our interview, the communication of values during training was subtler. I only noticed two of the core values mentioned by name in the classroom: teamwork and transparency. And only transparency was identified as one of AFM's values. Not once during training were the five core values listed. In contrast, AFM's mission statement was explicitly discussed in the classroom. The values that were mentioned by name most often during training were: leadership, teamwork, transparency, community, cultural sensitivity, healing, multiplication, and vulnerability.

Though AFM's core values were not mentioned by name, if a trainee said something that related to one of the values, the trainers would expound upon it, stressing the value's importance without identifying or labeling it. Often core values were alluded to instead of identified. For example, on Day 2, a trainer said, "For you to think that you can help them when you arrive is an illusion. Your first work is going to be a learner or a listener rather than a teacher." I understood the trainer to be highlighting the necessity of humility. Another example is that one of the trainees became overwhelmed on Day 3. When he vocalized his feelings, the trainer stopped almost mid-sentence and prayed for the trainees. This demonstrated the value of reliance and validated the trainee's transparency.

Most of the core values were communicated implicitly through modeling and coaching during the Crucible and through daily interactions between the trainers and

trainees.  For example, the trainers' teaching style was transparent and vulnerable.  In describing their training style, the Training Director said, "We tell a lot of stories about ourselves and our own journey and our own experiences."  He also identified the way trainers use prayer in training as nurturing a spirit of reliance.

## Trainee Values

Over the course of the 2015 Short-Term Missions Training, the trainees did learn organizational values.  They also demonstrated a shift in their values toward prioritizing the core values of AFM.

### Trainee Values before Training

On the first day of training I asked participants to list the values of AFM.  I was looking to see whether trainees could identify the five core values of AFM: reliance, integrity, humility, teamwork, and transparency.  None of the participants successfully listed all of AFM's core values, although several of them identified at least one.  Four participants mentioned teamwork; one mentioned humility. Nine mentioned concepts present in AFM's mission. One participant stated that he/she did not know AFM values.

I also asked participants to circle their top seven values out of a list of twenty values. The values most circled were (in order of agreement): Transparency, Integrity, Helpfulness, Cheerfulness / Humility / Teamwork.  Four of those are core values of AFM. Table 4.1 shows the number of participants that circled each AFM core value as a personal value at the beginning of training.

Table 4.1

*First Comparison of Participant and AFM Core Values*

| | Reliance | Integrity | Humility | Teamwork | Transparency | Total Values |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant 1 | | X | | | | 1 |
| Participant 2 | | X | X | | | 2 |
| Participant 3 | X | X | X | X | | 4 |
| Participant 4 | | X | X | X | X | 4 |
| Participant 5 | X | | X | | | 2 |
| Participant 6 | | | | | X | 1 |
| Participant 7 | | X | | X | X | 3 |
| Participant 8 | | X | X | | X | 3 |
| Participant 9 | | X | X | X | X | 4 |
| Participant 10 | | X | X | | | 2 |
| Participant 11 | X | | | X | X | 3 |
| Participant 12 | | X | X | X | | 3 |
| Participant 13 | | X | X | | | 2 |
| Participant 14 | | X | X | | X | 3 |
| Participant 15 | X | X | X | | X | 4 |
| Total Participants | 4 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 8 | |

Trainee Values after Training

On the last day of training I again asked participants to list AFM values to see whether they could identify all five core values.  None of the participants successfully listed all five core values. Nine participants attributed concepts present in AFM's mission as AFM values. The values mentioned most were transparency, teamwork, humility and vulnerability.  Other values include cultural sensitivity, discipleship, obedience and relationships or relational healing.  Table 4.2 shows the number of participants that mentioned or alluded to each of AFM's core values. Some participants listed similar concepts or synonyms to AFM's core values; these are indicated in Table 4.2 with parentheses. Participant 6 listed all 20 of the values mentioned later in the survey as AFM's values, so his/her responses are not included in Table 4.2 totals.

The responses in the focus groups and interviews were similar to participant responses on the surveys in terms of identifying AFM core values. As a group the trainees identified all of AFM's core values, but individuals and small groups did not consistently know them. One trainee said, "I honestly don't know what they claim as their values" (Interview 1).  But though that participant did not claim to know AFM values, all interviewees and focus groups mentioned teamwork and transparency; most of them also mentioned integrity. Non-core values frequently mentioned or alluded to by participants include adaptability, community, communication, involvement, investment, multiplication, and relationships.  The AFM core values of humility and reliance were not really mentioned or alluded to by trainees in the interviews or focus groups.

Table 4.2

*AFM Core Values Identified by Trainees on Final Values Survey*

| | Reliance | Integrity | Humility | Teamwork | Transparency | Total Values |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant 1 | (x) | | X | X | X | 3-4 |
| Participant 2 | X | X | | X | X | 4 |
| Participant 3 | | | X | X | X | 3 |
| Participant 4 | | | | | | 0 |
| Participant 5 | | X | | X | (x) | 3 |
| Participant 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Participant 7 | | X | | X | X | 3 |
| Participant 8 | X | | X | X | X | 4 |
| Participant 9 | | | | | | 0 |
| Participant 10 | | | X | | X | 2 |
| Participant 11 | (x) | X | X | X | X | 4-5 |
| Total Participants | 2-4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 7-8 | |

In the Final Values Survey I again asked participants to list their top seven values to see whether the values participants circled would shift to reflect organizational values. The values most circled were (in order of agreement): Integrity / Teamwork / Transparency, Humility, Cheerfulness / Obedience. Four of these are core values of AFM; and were all among the top values circled by trainees in the Demographic & Values Survey administered at the beginning of training. Table 4.3 compares the AFM

core values that participants identified as personal values at the beginning of training and the end of training. The table includes two columns for each AFM core value, representing the before—administered on July 20—and after—administered on August 13—surveys.

As seen in Table 4.3, the value congruence of six participants increased over the course of training; the value congruence of four participants stayed the same; and the value congruence of one participant decreased. Every AFM core value had more participants identify it as a personal value at the end of training than at the beginning of training. The average value congruence of participants with organizational values at the beginning of training was 2.8 values, while at the end of training it was 3.7 values. This indicates a shift in participant values towards organizational values over the course of training. Some non-core values that shifted to being identified as personal values by participants by end of training include obedience, cheerfulness, responsibility and broad-mindedness.

On the Final Values Survey I asked participants whether they felt any of their values had changed over the course of the training. Most of the participants affirmed that their values had changed. "I believe so. When presented, several of their values impressed upon me as important, especially in missions," wrote one participant. Another participant confirmed this statement: "Yes. There were some values (new and old to me) discussed and brought out which I now see to be extremely more important than before." One of the values participants mentioned as having changed during training was teamwork.

Table 4.3

*Second Comparison of Participant and AFM Core Values*

| | Reliance 7/20 | Reliance 8/13 | Integrity 7/20 | Integrity 8/13 | Humility 7/20 | Humility 8/13 | Teamwork 7/20 | Teamwork 8/13 | Transparency 7/20 | Transparency 8/13 | Total Values 7/20 | Total Values 8/13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant 1 | | | X | X | | X | | X | | X | 1 | 4 |
| Participant 2 | | | X | X | X | | | X | | X | 2 | 3 |
| Participant 3 | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | 4 | 4 |
| Participant 4 | | | | X | | X | X | X | | | 1 | 3 |
| Participant 5 | | | X | X | | | X | | X | X | 3 | 2 |
| Participant 6 | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | 3 | 5 |
| Participant 7 | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | 4 | 4 |
| Participant 8 | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | 3 | 4 |
| Participant 9 | | | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | 3 | 3 |
| Participant 10 | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | 3 | 5 |
| Participant 11 | X | | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | 4 | 4 |
| Total Participants | 2 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 10 | | |

One participant elaborated, "I saw the value in teamwork much more [after training] than before.  I said I valued teamwork [before training], but actually I valued independence more before the training."

Not all participants agreed that their values changed during training.  One participant clarified, "They haven't changed, but they have all gone to a much deeper

45

level." This could be taken to mean that his/her understanding of the value or the value's importance was strengthened during training. Along similar lines, another participant stated, "I wouldn't say my values have changed. They've just been shuffled. The way I prioritize values has changed." Interestingly, the participant who stated that his/her values hadn't changed went from listing 3 of AFMs values in his/her top seven values at the beginning of training to listing all 5 of AFM's values in his/her top seven values by the end of training.

**How Trainees Learned AFM Values**

On the first day of training the Training Director told trainees that self-discovery was an important aspect of the training; that they were responsible for what they learned. This put responsibility on the trainees, and meant that the values trainees assimilated would be the values they chose to assimilate. As I mentioned earlier, the trainers did not explicitly talk about AFM values. The participant from Interview 1 commented on this:

> Rather than just listing them off as "here are our values," they give us scenarios that
> we enact and that, after the scenarios, they have us think about, "okay, what did you
> do? Why did you do that? Would something else have been better?" And it helps
> us run through the thought process in our minds so that when we get to the ending
> point of "this is the proper action," we got there. And we know our thought process
> of getting to that answer, rather than just being told "a value for AFM is love." It's
> just a word. It doesn't really have a meaning at that point. But if we have an
> experience to tie to that value, then it makes it more real. (Interview 1)

One of the participants form Focus Group 1 reflected on the same idea, saying, "They set up the principle…and maybe don't even tell you what the values is, but the

principle and everything is so clear that you form that value almost subconsciously." Both the participants from Interview 1 and Focus Group 1 seemed to have a positive reaction to AFM's choice to refrain from listing core values in some form of explicit verbal communication.

Even though the trainers did not explicitly talk about core values, they still communicated those values. On the Final Values Survey I asked participants to select the type of communication of values that most influenced them during training: orally, visually, interactive activities or other. Participants selected Interactive Activities most, followed by oral communication.

Delving deeper, I asked participants to list the most effective method AFM used to communicate their core values. One of the participants mentioned the simulator experience: "The lectures were stellar, but it was the interactive activities/assignments (communal living and cooking, "Crucible," "Penguin Circles," games, journals, etc.) that brought it home." Another participant repeated some of the same items, and added storytelling to the list: "Interactive activities, role-playing, and personal stories and experiences." Another participant who affirmed the importance of storytelling wrote, "The stories of their experiences that portrayed the values they were trying to instill."

Though some participants listed interactive activities and storytelling as effective methods of communication, most participants focused on how the trainers modeled values. One participant stated that AFM best communicated values "by living the examples they teach." This was confirmed by another participant who wrote, "AFM lives values – shows them and shows and teaches how to apply them." Another participant further explained, "The vulnerability and transparency of the trainers. Their

47

willingness to be open and honest, and the way in which their lives reflected the material they were teaching." The participants positively responded to seeing the values modeled by the trainers.

One participant wrote that the best method of learning was "learning through experience and by example." Half of that statement focuses on the trainers modeling the values, the other half focuses on a personal experience with the values. Several other participants affirmed the importance of having some sort of personal experience with a value. "The trainers showed how the values worked and/or made us have to fight back against them with the values they wanted to instill," wrote one participant. "Showing the core values and making us demonstrate them in our daily lives to know what they feel like to uphold," wrote another. And a third added, "leading by example, practical activities."

The responses to the Final Values Survey reflected what I heard participants say in the focus groups and interviews. In the focus groups and interviews, one participant mentioned metaphors as being important to their values-assimilation process, a couple participants mentioned storytelling and the personal experiences trainers shared with trainees. A participant of Focus Group 2 mentioned the trainers' dynamic presentation style:

> There have been a couple [times] in class where I'm following but not getting it, and then, the teachers seem in tune to that. I can see them just scanning our faces. And they keep trying new ways. They'll sometimes even stand up and start talking in different voices and illustrating it with a story or a quote. 'Imagine'—

grabs somebody and like—"okay, stand here with me and we're gonna pretend

that we're wheat. What are our roots doing right now?" (Focus Group 2)

In addition to the classroom experience, a couple participants mentioned

debriefing sessions as integral to their learning. During debriefing sessions, trainees

described and analyzed what they were learning. Though several participants mentioned

the debriefing sessions, one in particular credited the debriefing sessions for contributing

significantly to his/her learning experience:

I probably wouldn't have gotten probably 75% of the gain from Crucible if we

hadn't had constant constant constant debriefing and talking and digging into the

hard stuff like 'how'd that make you feel?' 'What was going on here?' 'Who was

the leader?' 'How did you react to that?' 'What if you were the leader?' 'How

would you have reacted? (Focus Group 2)

The experiences outside the classroom were just as important as the experiences

inside the classroom. Several participants emphasized the importance of interactive

activities, the simulator experience of living together and working as a team, and the how

the trainers encouraged trainees to practice what they learned outside of the classroom.

"They're very action-oriented. So, in fact, they almost feel as if it's a failure when

they've only told us a principle and not given us a practical moment to see if we know

what to do with it," stated a participant in Focus Group 2. As this participant noted, the

trainers appeared to be concerned with trainees enacting values.

They emphasize life as a classroom so much that it honestly doesn't blip on my

screen when I walk in and out of class. Because when you're in class, it's

particularly structured, but when we're [at] meal times, we're continuing the things

49

we're learning: teamwork, the atmosphere of community. When we're on our own, we're often working on things that they are encouraging us to value. (Focus Group 2)

Trainers weren't the only ones looking to see whether trainees were enacting values. The trainees were also observing each other. One trainee from Focus Group 3 mentioned that trainees enacted the values because the values themselves were understandable and attainable.

I would say that the values they have are realistic in the sense that others that are not trainers could reciprocate them. In terms of living, I have noticed that trainees have already applied them to real life. Since we are in a living setting that is with one another, I have noticed that the values that AFM expresses and shows, these have already been shown throughout the trainees' lives in reciprocating the values that they see from the trainers. (Focus Group 3)

As participant observer, I also noticed trainees enacting AFM organizational values outside of the classroom. For example, one of the values discussed by trainers was relational healing. After the trainees were given step-by-step instructions on how to approach difficult conversations with someone, I saw trainees practicing difficult conversations with each other on their lunch breaks, or while traveling to and from different activities.

Just as on the Final Values Survey, the method that almost all participants in the focus group and interviews mentioned as pivotal to their learning organizational values was how the trainers modeled those values. A participant from Focus Group 2 commented that the trainers "are exhibiting what they're saying in their life." A

participant from Focus Group 3 gave an example of how the trainers modeled a value, saying, "to create the open space for the [trainees] to be more vulnerable, the staff and the teachers have been vulnerable with us in their stories." Another way that participants saw trainers model their values was through their one-on-one coaching session with the Training Director.

> The one-on-one session says a lot about them, too. They're taking the time, an hour [for each trainee]. And it just reinforces their value of friendship and time and adaptability and valuing people, discipleship. You know, making that connection. Being available. Living the gospel they preach….I think in many ways, here at training, they're showing us, doing for us what they want us to do for others." (Focus Group 1)

### Motivation to Learn AFM Values

There were several factors that study participants identified as impacting their motivation to learn organizational values. Most participants agreed that it was important that missionaries act according to a specific set of values. When asked why, the most common answer had to do with teamwork—one of AFM's core values—although a couple of individuals referenced missionaries as brand ambassadors for an organization.

The participants chose to go as missionaries through AFM. In one participant's words, "I was really motivated to be here." I asked participants why they chose AFM. The answers regarded positive communication by the organization, the organization's reputation and/or being recommended to the organization, and agreement with the organization's values and/or mission. From reading through my observation journal (see Appendix G), I saw that I started buying into parts of the mission of the organization on

51

Day 3 of training, but didn't understand this consciously until Day 11.  Believing in the

AFM mission had an impact on me.  I filled out a Demographic & Values Survey on the

first day of training and a Final Values Survey on the last training.  Though I did not

include my surveys in the results of this study, my values shifted to reflect the

organization's values, and I attribute it to my acceptance of AFM's mission and being

persuaded that AFM's core values would assist in accomplishing the mission.

When I asked participants what motivated them to learn AFM values, several

referenced their mission and that they realized AFM values would benefit them. "All the

values that we're being taught, they're very relevant for what we'll be encountering in the

field," said a participant from Focus Group 2.  A participant from Focus Group 1

mirrored this idea: "a lot of this transparency, vulnerability, and the how they teach us

and live it—how to solve differences between each other—just made me aware how

important this will be in the coming year." And a participant from Focus Group 3 added,

"I don't have an easy time just adopting everything people say.  But I've chosen to

because I believe it's going to help me be a better missionary."  This participant further

explained,

> To understand what AFM's values are and to realize that those values really align
>
> with the values that Christ has in so many respects, that is really a powerful thing,
>
> because that ties me to the mission in more than just 'I'm doing this for AFM.' It
>
> ties me to the mission at heart level because I'm doing it for Christ." (Focus Group
>
> 3)

This participant was able to describe the link between values and mission that most

of the other participants simply alluded to.  He/she felt motivated to learn organizational

values because of commitment to the mission. Other participants identified motivation to learn as being influenced by commitment to the organization. Two participants identified positive experiences practicing AFM values as influential in motivating them to assimilate the values. And some participants even mentioned their motivation to learn stemming from the trust the organization placed on them to learn the values. "AFM doesn't say: 'these are our values and we're going to help you instigate them and we're going to keep helping you instigate them.' They say: 'These are our values, now it's up to you,'" explained a participant from Focus Group 1. The participant continued:

> It's discipleship. They're teaching you how to do it on your own….They just give you a principle, and then….they leave it up to you, which is actually a really big risk. But they leave it up to us to enforce the principles that they teach. (Focus Group 1)

Another motivator mentioned by participants was the affirmation they received from AFM trainers as helping them in the value-assimilation process. "[The trainers] give us feedback, and affirmation, and just really help us along the way," said a participant from Focus Group 1. Similarly, a participant from Focus Group 3 felt affirmed by the trainers' belief in him/her.

> A motivation for me is that someone is willing to listen to where I feel my weaknesses are, and who also believes that I can do it; that my relationship with God is strong enough to carry on. And because someone else believes in me, I feel motivated to take on the same values that the person who believes in me has. (Focus Group 3)

But the factor most-mentioned by participants as motivating them to learn AFM values was seeing those values modeled in the trainers. "They are exhibiting what they're saying in their life. And that can't help but motivate," commented a participant from Focus Group 2. A participant from Focus Group 1 described the benefit of seeing values modeled:

> Just seeing how their values played out in their own lives and giving us practical examples, it shows me how it improves the quality of their life and so it makes me think, 'oh, well, it's probably going to improve the quality of my own life, too…. You can see it played out. You see that it's an attractive thing. You think, 'that's what I want.' (Focus Group 1)

In addition to seeing the benefits of values modeled by trainers, some participants seemed to be motivated to learn organizational values because of the passion and enthusiasm the trainers demonstrated.

> I like how they'll get fired up about what they're teaching. And you can really just see on their faces, it actually matters to them. Or when the trainer's telling a story, you can see…it brings emotions and stuff like that. And it just really makes you want to buy in to what they're saying. (Focus Group 2)

**Summary**

Adventist Frontier Missions trainers used both dialogical and immersion learning methods during the 2015 Short-Term Missions Training. The values mentioned explicitly during training included leadership, teamwork, transparency, community, cultural sensitivity, healing, multiplication, and vulnerability. The values that participants identified as AFM values include transparency, teamwork, humility, vulnerability,

cultural sensitivity, discipleship, obedience and relational healing. Participants' personal values appear to have shifted to reflect congruence with organizational core values over the course of training.  This shift appears to have taken place mainly because participants believed in the mission of AFM and were persuaded that organizational values would help them accomplish the mission, and because participants were positively affected by seeing the values modeled by trainers.  The next chapter discusses the implications of these findings.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the organizational

communication methods used during the 2015 AFM Short-Term Training and to identify

which methods were perceived by newcomers to be the most beneficial for their

assimilation of organizational values.  I collected data through participant observation,

surveys, focus groups and interviews.  Then I analyzed the data inductively.  The results

of the study indicate that nonverbal communication of organizational values during

socialization can be effective.

**Major Findings**

The major finding of this research is that organizational newcomers perceived

nonverbal communication of organizational values during socialization to positively

impact their motivation to learn and assimilate organizational values. Adventist Frontier

Missions trainers used both dialogical and immersion learning environments to teach

values during the 2015 Short-Term Missions Training, but research participants

responded most positively to their method of modeling organizational values. Several

participants stated that they were persuaded to accept AFM values because of the way

trainers practiced what they preached, and because the participants believed that enacting

organizational values would help them accomplish their mission.

Similar to a study by Cable and Parsons (2001), I found that participant values shifted to reflect congruence with espoused organizational values during socialization. Also, at the end of training, the trainees attributed the values of transparency, teamwork, humility, vulnerability, cultural sensitivity, discipleship, obedience and relational healing to the organization. This correlates with the values mentioned explicitly most often by trainers during training: leadership, teamwork, transparency, community, cultural sensitivity, healing, multiplication, and vulnerability.

## Discussion

The following section discusses how the results of this case study address each research question and how they apply to the field of communication.

### AFM's Communication of Organizational Values

Research question #1: How does AFM communicate organizational values to newcomers during orientation?

When I planned the study, I defined organizational values as the five core values espoused by the organization.  I expected AFM trainers to communicate the organization's five core values to trainees through formal verbal and/or written communication because espoused values are defined as values used by organizational management in formal verbal and written communication (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013). I was surprised to find that AFM trainers did not explicitly identify the organization's five core values during the training program. They verbally emphasized the values of leadership, teamwork, transparency, community, cultural sensitivity, healing, multiplication, and vulnerability.  Two of those are part of the organization's core values. The other core values were illustrated or alluded to.

During my interview with the AFM Training Director, he indicated that the organization's core values are embedded values rather than espoused values. Embedded values can be either attributed values, meaning values that members of an organization ascribe to the organization, or shared values, meaning the aggregate system of values held by the members of the organization (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013). This led me to change the focus of the data analysis from organizational communication of espoused values to attributed values.

The instruments—including myself as the participant observer—had already been prepped with espoused values in mind, to see how the organization communicated the core values of reliance, integrity, humility, teamwork, and transparency to participants. But since the focus of the study shifted to embedded values, I had to identify which values participants attributed as embedded values of AFM before analyzing how those values were communicated. Participants identified transparency, teamwork, humility, vulnerability, cultural sensitivity, discipleship, obedience and relational healing.

Most of those values were communicated verbally. The only two values identified by participants that I did not observe to be explicitly identified during training were humility and obedience. In addition to explicit verbal communication, the values were alluded to and talked about, without being specifically mentioned. One of the most common ways that trainers communicated values was through storytelling. In 2010, Barker and Gower introduced the idea that a key way of communicating organizational values is through storytelling. Their storytelling model of organizational communication highlights that storytelling creates swift shared meaning and is participative rather than simply instructive (Barker & Gower, 2010; Barker, Rimler, Moreno & Kaplan, 2004).

This was evident in the way AFM trainers used storytelling to transfer organizational knowledge to the trainees.

The trainers also communicated organizational values by modeling them. In modeling the values, trainers used a rich medium to communicate the values. According to media richness theory, the more complex the information, the more rich a medium should be used (as cited in Fulk & Boyd, 1991). Through their method of modeling core values, AFM trainers selected the richest medium in order to communicate the complex and abstract meaning and application of organizational values.

<div align="center">Participant Motivation to Adopt AFM's Values</div>

Research Question #2: How are trainees of the AFM training program persuaded to assimilate organizational values?

Participants were persuaded to assimilate AFM values because they were impressed by the way trainers modeled the values. This was mentioned in each of the focus groups and interviews I held, making it the most important aspect of persuasion. Though participants identified seeing trainers model the values as influential in their values-assimilation, few participants delved deeper to explain why. One participant mentioned seeing positive results of the trainer's behavior, one participant mentioned enjoying the trainer's enthusiasm, and one participant mentioned appreciation that trainees could replicate the trainer's behavior.

Another element that persuaded participants to assimilate organizational values was a belief that enacting those values would help them accomplish their mission. Several participants referenced how adopting organizational values would help them

achieve their goals, demonstrating that the AFM had communicated that whether an individual enacted organization values would affect the individual's success. Though no participants identified an explicit organizational message tying values with mission success, I observed this type of message communicated explicitly and implicitly through storytelling.

Based on all of the responses, it seems that Fishbein and Ajzen's 1975 theory of planned behavior could be used to explain how AFM trainees were persuaded to assimilate organizational values. The theory of planned behavior describes behavioral intentions as being affected by an individual's positive or negative evaluations of the behavior, whether they believe the behavior is desired by another individual and their relationship to that individual, and how difficult they perceive participation in the behavior to be (as cited in Armitage & Conner, 1999).

Value Congruence

Research Question #3: Do the values of AFM newcomers shift to reflect the organization's values over the course of training?

In order to assess the effectiveness of organizational communication of values, I wanted to verify whether participants adopted organizational values. I planned to see whether Cable and Parsons' (2001) findings that newcomers' values shifted towards their perceptions of their organizations' values during socialization would be replicated in my case study. The instrument I used was designed before I shifted the focus of the study from espoused values to embedded values. I was unable to test whether there was a shift of value congruence of embedded values because I had not yet identified the organization's embedded values when the Demographic & Values survey was

administered. Thus, I tested the value congruence of participants with AFM espoused values—as originally planned—at the beginning of training and at the end of training.

At the beginning of training, participants did have some value congruence with the organization. The participants had an average of 2.8 values congruent with AFM's five core values. That means the average participant shared more than half of the organization's core values. I do not know whether value congruence played a part in the participants being selected to work for the organization. But I do know that a couple participants mentioned value congruence as a reason why they chose to work for AFM.

At the end of training, the average participants had 3.7 values congruent with AFM's five core values. This indicates that participant values did shift toward organizational espoused values over the course of the training. It surprised me that participant values shifted towards the organization's core values even though the core values were not explicitly communicated during training. This is evidence that though the organization's communication of values may not have been traditional, it was effective. Even though at the end of training not a single participant could correctly list all five core values of AFM, the majority of participants had reprioritized their values to include more of AFM's core values in their personal top values.

Though participant values shifted towards organizational values during socialization, it is still unclear to what extent participant values shifted. For example, the instrument had participants indicate their top values but not prioritize them. For example, a participant may have indicated both humility and cheerfulness as top values both at the beginning and end of training, but considered humility less important than cheerfulness before the training and more important than cheerfulness at the end of training. Such a

shift in value prioritization would have been undetected in this study.  In addition to value

prioritization, value understanding was not measured.  For example, a participant might

not have shifted the importance of humility between the beginning and ending of training,

but his/her definition and application of the value might have shifted to reflect the

organization's understanding of the value.

<div align="center">Effective Methods of Communicating<br>Organizational Values</div>

Research Question #4: What do attendees of the AFM training perceive to be the

most effective methods the organization uses to communicate core values?

The method mentioned by participants as the most effective method AFM trainers

used to communicate organizational values was by modeling those values. The modeled

behavior appeared to be effective because participants were able to see and experience

the positive outcomes of the behavior (Gruys et al, 2008). These findings align with

Bandura's 1997 social learning theory that "suggests that employees may acquire much

of their learned behavior by observing and imitating others" (Gruys et al, 2008, p. 811).

Similar to modeling, storytelling was identified by participants as an effective method of

communicating organizational values. Through listening to stories, participants were able

to learn behavior by visualizing the behavior and experiences expressed in the stories.

In their storytelling and modeling, the trainers often illustrated values without

identifying them; participants were expected to fill in the blanks.  The trainers' use of

modeling and storytelling indicates a basis in andragogy, the idea that people need to be

actively involved in the process of educating themselves (McGrath, 2009). This put

responsibility on the trainees, and often meant that the values trainees assimilated would

be the values they perceived, identified and were self-persuaded to assimilate.  The

participants referred to this as the discovery method of learning, which is supported by Brinol, McCaslin and Petty's (2012) idea that individuals have the power to change their own attitudes or beliefs (Brinol, McCaslin & Petty, 2012).  The emphasis on nonverbal and implicit communication is contrary to the traditional idea that information needs to be clearly and explicitly communicated to newcomers during socialization.

## Message Content

Research Question #5: Which messages do AFM newcomers find to be effective in aiding their understanding and internalization of organizational values?

I wrote this research question when I equated organizational values with espoused values, which by definition must be communicated through formal verbal and written communication.  My assumption that the communication of organizational values would be explicit verbal communication led me to believe that I would find the answer to this question through participant responses to my interview/survey questions. Instead, my study had unexpected results highlighting the importance of nonverbal communication in the transferal of organizational values to newcomers. Participants did not reference specific messages as important to their value-assimilation process.  In this case study, the methods of communication had greater impact on participants than specific messages.

## **Recommendations**

As research is wont do to, this case study triggered more questions in addition to providing answers.  It would be beneficial to conduct more research see whether methods of communication take precedence over the messages communicated in socialization programs structured differently or for for-profit organizations as well as nonprofit organizations. Peng, Pandey & Pandey (2015) suggest that nonprofit organizations are

more likely to foster individual-organizational value congruence than for-profit organizations. It is possible that the same factors that influence value-congruence might influence employee motivation to learn. For example, a part-time worker at a fast food chain restaurant might not care enough about organizational values to appreciate the discovery method of communication.

Another area for more research is to compare the effective ways of communicating the different types of organizational values as identified by Bourne and Jenkins (2013). I began this study with the goal of identifying effective methods an organization uses to communicate espoused values, but ended up identifying the effective methods an organization used to communicate embedded values. It is possible that different methods of communication might be more effective for different value types.

Adventist Frontier Missions' method of approaching the communication of embedded values appeared to rely heavily on implied communication and on nonverbal communication of those values. Further research should be done that compares the effectiveness of verbal and nonverbal communication of organizational values. One method might be better than the other, or perhaps the best method is a combination of the two. It is possible that, if AFM were more intentional about verbally communicating core values, trainees might have more accurately been able to list AFM's core values and might have shown an even greater shift in value congruence over the course of training. It might be worthwhile for the organization to test and see if this would improve the effectiveness of their training program.

Another question that AFM or other researchers could ask is whether participant motivation for assimilating some values is different than their motivation for assimilating

other values The question I asked participants regarding persuasion of organizational values was open-ended, allowing participants to respond to the question for any value. Similarly, further research could be done on participant understanding and definitions of organizational values before and after socialization. For example, before my interview with the Training Director, I would have defined integrity as *doing the right thing* rather than *enduring results*. Several participants either listed integrity as one of AFM's values or their personal values both at the start and the end of training.  But it's possible that their understanding of the word shifted as mine did.

Finally, it might be useful to conduct additional case studies of the communication of organizational values in AFM.  Longitudinal studies could follow up on participant understanding and enactment of organizational values while they are in the field, or upon their return to the U.S. Another focus of additional studies on AFM training might include before and after interviews with AFM management and/or trainers.

### Conclusion

This research attempted to identify the methods of communication that individuals perceived to be effective in their internalization of organizational values.  The study found that modeling values can be an effective form of communicating organizational values.  When organizational values are consistently modeled, it appears that organizations don't need to be explicit about verbalizing values in order for the values to be understood and assimilated by newcomers that have bought into the organization's mission. Rather, the values can be assimilated as newcomers come into contact with an organization and see how organizational members behave.  It could be that communication context is more important than message content during the process of

newcomer value assimilation. This supports Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of planned

behavior (as cited in Armitage & Conner, 1999) and Bandura's 1997 social learning

theory (as cited in Gruys et al, 2008).

       The results of this case study should be beneficial for organizations that attempt to

train organizational culture or values to newcomers during socialization, especially to

those organizations for which values and culture are essential to their mission.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL: TRAINING DIRECTOR

| Date and time of interview: |  |
| --- | --- |
| Location: |  |
| Interviewer: |  |
| Interviewee: |  |
| Relationship of Interviewee to AFM: |  |
| Description of project: Responsive Interview regarding the organizational methods and strategies Adventist Frontier Missions uses to communicate organizational values. | |

| Questions: | Time Stamp and Observations: |
| --- | --- |
| 1. What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions? | |
| 2. How do you incorporate those values into the AFM training? | |
| 3. What strategies do you use to communicate AFM values to individuals during AFM training? | |
| 4. Do you think knowing the values will help AFM missionaries in the mission field?  If so, how?  If not, why? | |
| 5. List additional questions: | |

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC & VALUES SURVEY

1. Name:

2. Age Range (please circle the option that corresponds with your age):

18-24          25-29          30-34          35-39          40-44

3. Sex (please circle option that corresponds with your sex): Male   Female

4. Country of origin:

5. Ethnic background:

6. Most recent occupation or job:

7. Are you a student (please circle the correct answer)?  Yes          No

      If so, do you attend: Pubic Institution/Private Institution

8. Is this your first time going on a short-term mission trip?


9. Why did you choose to go as a missionary through Adventist Frontier Missions?



10. What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?



11. Please circle your top 7 values:

| Ambition | Broad-mindedness | Capability | Cheerfulness |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cleanliness | Courage | Helpfulness | Humility |
| Imagination | Independence | Integrity | Intellectuality |
| Logic | Obedience | Politeness | Reliance |
| Responsibility | Self-control | Teamwork | Transparency |

APPENDIX C

FINAL VALUES SURVEY


1. Name:


2. What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?




3. Please circle your top 7 values:

| Ambition | Broad-mindedness | Capability | Cheerfulness |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cleanliness | Courage | Helpfulness | Humility |
| Imagination | Independence | Integrity | Intellectuality |
| Logic | Obedience | Politeness | Reliance |
| Responsibility | Self-control | Teamwork | Transparency |


4. Do you feel that any of your values changed over the course of the training?  Why/why not?




5. During the training, were you most influenced by the communication of values that was done (please circle all options that apply):
     - Visually
     - Orally
     - Interactive activities
     - Other


6. What do you think was the best method Adventist Frontier Missions used to communicate core values?

PROTOCOL: FOCUS GROUP / INTERVIEW

| Date and time of interview: | | |
|---|---|---|
| Location: | | |
| Interviewer: | | |
| Interviewee(s): | | |
| Relationship of Interviewee(s) to AFM: | | |
| Description of project: Responsive focus group/interview regarding the perceptions of Adventist Frontier Missions values and the methods used to communicate and persuade newcomers to adopt them. | | |

| Questions: | Time Stamp |
|---|---|
| 1. What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions? | and |
| 2. Do you think it is important for missionaries to act according to a specific set of values? Why/Why not? | Observations: |
| 3. Do you think knowing the values of Adventist Frontier Missions will help you in the mission field? If so, how? If not, why? | |
| 4. What does it look like for someone to act according to Adventist Frontier Missions values? (Give an example) | |
| 5. What do you think was the most effective method Adventist Frontier Missions has used to communicate their values? | |
| 6. Describe a moment when it "clicked" and you understood AFM values. | |
| 7. What, if anything, has persuaded you to enact AFM's core values? | |
| 8. What did you learn about AFM values outside of the training sessions? | |
| 9. Are there other values that you think should have been emphasized more during the training? If so, what and how? | |

APPENDIX E

OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

| Date and time of observation: | |
|---|---|
| Location: | |
| Individuals present: | |
| Description of activity: | |
| <u>Descriptive notes:</u> | <u>Reflective notes:</u> |

APPENDIX F. INFORMED CONSENT FORMS

Andrews University
Department of Communication
Training Director Informed Consent Form

Thank you for participating in this study, a capstone research project for my graduate studies at Andrews University. The purpose of my study is to explore the ways AFM communicates core values during newcomer orientation. Please read the following information about how participation in the study might affect you, and sign at the bottom of the page.

- I agree to participate in a research project on the campus of Adventist Frontier Missions training facilities regarding the communication of organizational values.
- I consent to be observed as I present segments of the short-term missions training.
- I agree to a 20-30 minute interview before the start of the short-term missions training. I understand that because of my position in the organization, statements I make during the interview may be traced back to myself.
- I understand that the researcher is the only individual who will have access to the field notes of the observations and transcriptions of the interview.
- I understand that participation in this research is voluntary and will not affect my relationship with or treatment by Adventist Frontier Missions.
- I understand that I may discontinue participation in this research at any time.
- If I have any questions regarding this research or my rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board at irb@andrews.edu or:

Caralin McHan                          Dr. Williams-Smith
Principal Investigator                  Chair, Department of Communication
Andrews University                      Andrews University
4633 E Hillcrest Dr.                    4141 Administration Dr.
Berrien Springs, MI   49103            Berrien Springs, MI  49104
caralin@andrews.edu                     rwilliams@andrews.edu
707-337-0555                            269-741-6314

**Participant**                 **Investigator**                **Witness**

_____         _____        _____
(Printed Name)                  (Printed Name)                 (Printed Name)


_____         _____        _____
(Signature)                     (Signature)                    (Signature)



_____         _____        _____
(Date)                          (Date)                         (Date)

Andrews University
Department of Communication
Presenter Informed Consent Form

Thank you for participating in this study, a capstone research project for my graduate studies at Andrews University.  The purpose of my study is to explore the ways AFM communicates core values during newcomer orientation.  Please read the following information about how participation in the study might affect you, and sign at the bottom of the page.

- I agree to participate in a research project on the campus of Adventist Frontier Missions training facilities regarding the communication of organizational values.
- I consent to be observed as I present segments of the short-term missions training.  I understand that my name will not appear in any descriptions or write-ups of this research.  Instead, a composite profile will be creating combine my characteristics with other presenters that will be observed during this study.
- I understand that the principal investigator is the only individual who will have access to the field notes of the observations.
- I understand that the completed research paper may be provided to Adventist Frontier Missions management.
- I understand that participation in this research is voluntary and will not affect my relationship with or treatment by Adventist Frontier Missions.
- I understand that I may discontinue participation in this research at any time.
- If I have any questions regarding this research or my rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board at irb@andrews.edu or:

Caralin McHan                            Dr. Williams-Smith
Principal Investigator                   Chair, Department of Communication
Andrews University                       Andrews University
4633 E Hillcrest Dr.                     4141 Administration Dr.
Berrien Springs, MI   49103              Berrien Springs, MI  49104
caralin@andrews.edu                      rwilliams@andrews.edu
707-337-0555                             269-741-6314


**Participant**                  **Investigator**                 **Witness**


_____          _____          _____
(Printed Name)                   (Printed Name)                   (Printed Name)


_____          _____          _____
(Signature)                      (Signature)                      (Signature)


_____          _____          _____
(Date)                           (Date)                           (Date)

Andrews University
Department of Communication
Participant Informed Consent Form

Thank you for participating in this study, a capstone research project for my graduate studies at Andrews University.  The purpose of my study is to explore the ways AFM communicates core values during newcomer orientation.  Please read the following information about how participation in the study might affect you, and sign at the bottom of the page.

- I agree to participate in a research project on the campus of Adventist Frontier Missions training facilities regarding the communication of organizational values.
- I understand that I will be observed during segments of the short-term missions training.
- I agree to fill out a 10-minute Demographic and Values Survey at the beginning of my training experience, and a 10-minute Final Values Survey at the end of my training experience.
- I agree to participate in two 45-60 minute focus groups and/or interviews. I understand that my responses in these interviews will be confidential.  The researcher is the only individual who will have access to the interview recordings and transcripts. My responses will not be provided to Adventist Frontier Missions and will not be traceable back to me.  I understand that in the write-ups of the research, my characteristics and responses will be combined with other participants to create a composite profile.
- I understand that participation in this research is voluntary and will not affect my relationship with or treatment by Adventist Frontier Missions
- I understand that the final research paper may be provided to Adventist Frontier Missions management in an effort to improve their missions training program.
- If I have any questions regarding this research or my rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board at irb@andrews.edu or:

| Caralin McHan | Dr. Williams-Smith |
|---|---|
| Principal Investigator | Chair, Department of Communication |
| Andrews University | Andrews University |
| 4633 E Hillcrest Dr. | 4141 Administration Dr. |
| Berrien Springs, MI   49103 | Berrien Springs, MI  49104 |
| caralin@andrews.edu | rwilliams@andrews.edu |
| 707-337-0555 | 269-741-6314 |

**Participant**                    **Investigator**                    **Witness**

_____          _____          _____
(Printed Name)                    (Printed Name)                    (Printed Name)


_____          _____          _____
(Signature)                    (Signature)                    (Signature)


_____          _____          _____
(Date)                    (Date)                    (Date)

OBSERVATION JOURNAL

**Date:** July 20, 2015
**Day of Training:** 1
**Notes:** It has started.  The project that I looked forward to all summer is now upon me.  I showed up at the Adventist Frontier Training Center a couple minutes later and called Greg (my witness) to make sure that he was on his way.

Though I thought that I was going to attend the entire training, I found out that worship starts at 8:00 - even though the training schedule shows the training starting at 9:00.  Unfortunately, this means that I will miss the first hour that the trainees are together each morning.  As an ethnographer I want my experience to reflect that of the newcomers (the short-term missionaries).  But it became apparent to me a couple times during the day that my experience might not be representative of the experience of the trainees for the following reasons:

- I am not a missionary, so my hopes/fears/goals for the training are different.
- Because my motivation for attending the training is different than the other trainees, I will prioritize information differently.  For instance, I am carefully listening for any reference to a value, while the missionaries are looking for advice about how to succeed in the field.
- I will miss out on valuable experiences that the other trainees share.  They live together and will cook together, sleep together, wake up together.  I will constantly be coming and going, mission morning worships and meals, leaving at lunch (to go to work) and leaving right after the training ends (to go to work).  Therefore the 'outside the classroom' experience that the other trainees share will shape them in ways that are not accessible to me.

I made sure that The Training Director and any other AMF staff exited the room before I handed out the informed consent and values & demographic survey.  I assured the attendees that their participation was voluntary and I would be keeping their information confidential.  I didn't expect that everyone would agree to participate.  But all 16 attendees did agree to participate.  I'm so very excited about that!

Today's training was split into two sections before lunch, and two after.  I will refer to them as sessions 1-4.  Session 1 began with a presenter going over communication.  It occurred inside Morgan hall.  The attendees were seated at 5 circular plastic tables that were arranged in a half-circle.  Trainees sat on the outside, which was the outside, in maroon chairs.  The 1st presenter was dressed in black pants & white shirt with a black collar and tie.  His session was about the missionaries' responsibility of writing and taking photos.  He talked about how those in creative access countries should protect their identity.  He gave handouts to the trainees with tips on writing, taking good photographs, and videos.  He asked the trainees why AFM needs stories.  The answers were to record answers to prayer, transparency (show that Christians go through hard times) and customs/culture. He stressed to the missionaries that when they are writing articles, they never put down a person, a country, or a government.

There was a break, in which I spoke to the 1st presenter about my research and had him sign an informed consent. Then session 2 started. It picked up where session 1 had left off, with the same presenter talking about blogs. He requested that the missionaries always behave in a professional manner. He reminded the trainees, "You are ambassadors for Christ. you are ambassadors for AFM."

Session 3 began after lunch. The training director was in charge of sessions 3 and 4. He started off my commending the trainees for their timeliness, and letting them know that those who are late in the future will have a penalty of 10 pushups per minute they were late. Then, his assistant had the missionaries move so that they were sitting near those people whose destination country was the same as their own.

At this point the training started in earnest. The training director said that "adult education focuses learning on the student rather than the teacher." He went on to explain that he expected each trainee to bring something to the class and that discussion and self-discovery would be important aspects of the training.

Next he had an activity where each of the trainees wrote on stick notes what they were excited about, what they were fearful of, and what their goals were. Once this activity was completed, the missionaries shared with the group some of the things they had written. I was surprised to hear how many of the AFM values were mentioned indirectly during this activity. I could tell that the training director picked up on it, because he would reiterate or expound upon whatever a trainee said that was connected with the AFM values (both explicit and implicit - see interview) Yet, he mostly did not explicitly refer to the values by name while connecting them to AFM's core values. Also, it seemed they were transparent in the honesty with which they answered questions. One example is a Participant in Focus Group 1 sharing that she wasn't even sure why she is going as a missionary because she didn't plan on doing this.

These are the values I heard during this portion:

- "Transparency is one of our values." It's why people choose AFM. This was in response to the what someone said is the reason why they chose to go as a missionary through AFM.

- "In order to have movements we need to have multipliers." the importance of the training. This is one of the implicit values.

- Reliance. In response to the question 'what are you excited about?' one trainee said that he looked forward to relying on God.

- "Making friends is what your job description is," - Director

- Indigenous. A Participant in Focus Group 3 mentioned that he was afraid of imposing his culture on the people in the field.

- "Failure is a part of growth" - Director. I believe he was referring to humility.

- "Learn how to be a team and make a team." Long-term goal of Participant in Focus Group 3. She was talking about the value of teamwork.

The 4th session o the day started with deconstructing the AFM mission statement. Each word was defined. The mission statement is to "establish indigenous Seventh-day Adventist church planting movements among unreached people groups. if all adjectives are deleted it reads, "establish movements among people groups." During the deconstruction establish was identified as being a foundation (Participant in Focus Group 1). For indigenous, the Director told a story about how men in West Africa wear 3-piece suits to church in the sweltering weather. Somebody took church planting to be a garden metaphor. Movements were defined as: energy, go forward, spread, dynamic.

The director emphasized that movements are simple.  They have to be something that anyone could see and think "I could do that."  He showed a TED talks video about leadership with a crazy guy dancing (I used it in my COMM skills class!)  and also drew an illustration to demonstrate the missionaries are tools in God's hands.  The illustration demonstrated reliance and humility.

Participant in Focus Group 2 said that the training is "not about book knowledge, it's about how you apply it."  The Training Director said, "In order to have significant growth, you must have significant change of heart.  I think he might have been illustrating humility.

Throughout the training there were several breaks, during which people could stand outside and talk, while most people played pickle ball.  The Training Director asked what it had to do with training.  As this was discussed I watched a Participant in Focus Group 3's face.  He was leaning forward with his mouth slightly open, as if he were having an epiphany.  How is training like pickle ball?  A participant in Focus Group 2 observed that it is a process of explaining, modeling, and then passing the baton for someone else to experience on their own, while still being around to help.  A participant in Focus Group 2 added that if there are two many players, new courts should be opened.  The Training Director then stated that people get skills by practicing and not being afraid to step in and try and fail.  He emphasized, "Failure is an event, not a person."

**Date:** July 21, 2015
**Day of Training:** 2
**Notes:** Before the training began I ran into one of the career missionaries.  She said that she and her husband had gone through the training 10 years ago, and the training strategies have changed significantly in that time.  Ten years ago the training sessions were taught lecture-style whereas now they are discussion-based.  Also, values were not emphasized 10 years ago.  I appreciated hearing this from her.  She stated that now (possibly because of the new training style, possible because of her own personal growth) she is more aligned with AFM values and has made them part of her life.

Today's training started out as a recap of yesterday.  The Training Director asked the class to reflect and write what they learned yesterday.  The trainees were given several minutes to write their thoughts, and then discuss in their small groups (each table is a group - the tables were assigned by destination country.  There are 5 groups.  I have ended up in the group with someone going to Thailand, Cambodia, and Turkey).  After discussing within the groups, each group mentioned 1 item to the rest of the class.  I have a gut feeling that the silent reflection and writing will probably help some of the trainees verbalize and internalize what they learned yesterday.  In fact, I wondered if in fact it was a sort of self-persuasion technique that The Training Director was using.  Some of the ideas that the trainees emphasized were:

- "We don't do this alone." (A Participant in Focus Group 2).  He was alluding to the values of teamwork and reliance.  The Training Director picked up on the Participant in Focus Group 2's thought and expanded on it.  He referred to the illustration (man-centric vs. God-centric) he had drawn yesterday, and proposed that  a practical application of the idea of not going alone is prayer, but that the paradigm shift also requires a paradigm shift in the way the trainees will pray.  He challenged those trainees who will be leading out in evening worship tonight to wrestle with their ideas regarding prayer as they prepare the worship.  This is another experience outside the classroom that I will not have access to.  Perhaps I should ask questions about worships—and journal—in the focus group. Another thing The Training Director said was,

"I couldn't care less what you say.  How you live shows what you believe."  He was making the point that head knowledge does not always transfer to heart knowledge.  And that parroting that one understands the God-centric paradigm does not mean that one lives his/her life that way.

- "Failure is an event, not a person." (Participant in Focus Group 3).  A participant in Focus Group 2 unpacked this phrase to mean that success is not a person, either.  He took it further to say that people are not successful.  God is successful.  While the participant in Focus Group 2 was unpacking Participant in Focus Group 3's statement, I felt like I was having a personal breakthrough.  I have always struggled with hating failure, feeling like any failure was a reflection of my character and would diminish my self-worth.  It appeared that I was not the only person having a breakthrough, because several people were taking notes (Participant in Focus Group 2, Participant in Focus Group 3, Participant in Focus Group 2, Participant in Interview 2).  Some others were listening with rapt attention, mouths open, or leaning forward in their chairs (Participant in Focus Group 3, Two participants in Focus Group 2).

- The final lesson learned yesterday that was mentioned was that is important to sit back and let God do the work, but that is not a passive activity.  At this point, The Training Director played a song titled "Jesus I am resting."  My observation notes say that at this point pickle ball was brought up as a metaphor again.  I remember this happening, but do not remember the importance of the thought.

The second session of the morning was focused on ethnocentrism.  The Training Director showed a staged picture of a man in a suit facing a group of 'native' men in what looked like a tropical biome. He asked for responses.  Most of the responses had to do with the differences in culture, and meeting people at where they were.  Because I don't want to influence the training, I kept my thoughts to myself.  But my first thought was that Jesus is supposed to be accessible, and something we easily apply to our day-to-day.  But nothing about the suited man looked day-to-day for the other men.  The Training Director used the photo to illustrate the cultural differences between missionaries and their host culture. He said that missionaries should be cognizant of the differences between their culture and their host culture, and that it is often greater than it seems.  He emphasized, "for you to think that you can help them when you arrive is an illusion."  In fact, it is the other way around.  "Your first work is going to be a learner or a listener rather than a teacher," he added.  I saw this as an allusion to the value of humility.

Next we watched a video clip called Norse to Norsewest or something like that.  A spoof on missions and humanitarian attempts, the video followed a group of Norse people who tried to impose their beliefs on North American culture, destroying electronics, changing the diet, implementing hand-to-hand combat, and other things.  Though many of the trainees seemed to think that the movie was an over exaggeration of what happens in mission work, I have my doubts.  Additionally, what struck me about the video is that if the North Americans in the video had hypothetically been asked whether they agreed with the Norse values (health, strength, etc.) they would definitely have agreed.  What differed was the application of those values.  This is definitely something that missionaries should be cognizant of as they head into the mission field.

The illustration that followed as a video documentary about a man who learned how to ride a bike that had been re-engineered so that turning the steering wheel right turned the bike left, and vice versa.  He traveled over the country giving presentations about how people cannot reprogram their muscles to work just because their brain understands the concept.  He challenged himself to learn how to ride the bike.  It took him 8 months of practicing before he was able to ride the bike.  He would get going for a couple seconds, but with any small distraction he would find himself wobbling and crashing.  Once he learned how to ride the backwards bike, he wasn't

able to ride a normal bike at the first try.  It took him 20 minutes before his body remembered how to ride a normal bike.  This video clip had many applications.  The biggest message was that knowledge does not equal understanding.  The trainees appeared to apply this concept to the new cultures they will be exposed to.  That they will not understand the culture until after they get there, and will experience reverse culture shock upon reentry into their home culture.  What most struck me about the culture is how easy it is to fall back into old habits.  A simple distraction will pull someone back into his or her old frame of mind.  And new experiences are fraught with distractions.

The Training Director recommended a book to the trainees titled "The Talent Code" that is about genius.  The other studied places from which a disproportionate number of a particular kind of genius come from (i.e. female tennis players from Russia, soccer players from South America).  The author found that three things produce genius: ignition or inspiration, deep practice which involves being comfortable with being uncomfortable or the gap between where one is an where one wants to be, and master coaching.  The Training Director applied this concept to discipleship.

The morning session ended with The Training Director likening AFM policies with a uniform.  Some of the ways trainees took the metaphor was to mean leveling the playing field, and The Training Director added representing the organization.  What struck me about this metaphor is that a uniform makes someone instantly recognized as part of a particular brand, and often speaks to that brand's mission or the wearer's functionality (i.e. student, policeman, sailor, etc.).

Finally, The Training Director emphasized that the crucible is to learn teamwork, and that nobody can make it on his/her own.  It was blatantly obvious then, that the value we will be taught this weekend is teamwork - although I would imagine that humility and reliance are right up there with it.

Sessions 3 and 4 after lunch were not very eventful.  Because of how The Training Director prefaced them with the metaphor of a uniform I thought that integrity or other values might be emphasized.  Instead, it was a pretty straightforward presentation regarding child abuse, and a step-by-step guide for filling out W-4's, I-9s and other documents.  The only two values I saw potentially referred to during these presentations were 1) integrity when the presenter stressed not to sign the agreement unless trainees had read the AFM policy book and 2) teamwork when one office member was volunteer to help fill out forms and the trainees were instructed to applaud her.

At the end of session 4, The Training Director came back with an announcement.  He reads the trainees daily journals.  He wanted to remind trainees to structure their journals by starting with a summary of the most important data they learned, then a reflection/interaction with what they learned and then ending with an application or how to use the information.  It struck me that the journal could be an "aha" moment for some of the trainees.  They might not identify it as a turning point in their value-assimilation, but it might work as self-persuasion or the repetition needed to solidify the values.

**Date:** July 22, 2015
**Day of Training:** 3
**Notes:** I hate to admit it, but 13-14 hour work days are getting to me, and I was not able to focus as well today as I could yesterday and the day before.  Unfortunately, this means that I am not as observant or as  insightful as I might have been otherwise.  I also realized that my journals do not

include level of detail and personal reflection that they should.  But I'm afraid that if I spend more time journaling and stretch myself thinner, I will get sick or have a break down.  Once again, I will not be able to reflect much on my observations from today.  That will need to wait until after the observations are over and I no longer feel like falling asleep on my feet. Incidentally, this morning two girls had their heads down on the table and looked like they still wanted to be in bed.  This made me realize that I am not the only person who might have personal factors that inhibit my learning.

There are 1 or 2 new trainees - I think.  A pastor and his wife from Togo.  I am not certain yet of their roll in the training.  If they are new trainees, I will try to see if they would like to be involved in my study.  On the subject of my study, I finally had time last night to go over the Values & Demographic Survey, and I realized that not all trainees

The Training Director started out the day with a reminder of punctuality.  He commented that there were several individuals who would have had to do 40 pushups if his pushup policy had been implemented.  "Early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise" he reminded the trainees.  He then said that this is a biblical principal because starting with creation, a day begins with rest and ends with work (evening and morning were the first day).

Along with disciple, The Training Director talked about daily devotions.  He requested/demanded that trainees do their personal devotions differently.  That they pair up in groups of two of the same gender and read the same number of chapters in the Bible each day. If, at the end of the week, one of the partners has not studied the number of agreed-upon chapters, both trainees will start over again.  I thought that this might be a consequence of teamwork, but the values that The Training Director specifically mentioned were transparency and accountability.  "Major changes often only take place when there is a relationship of accountability."

Another way that The Training Director is keeping the trainees accountable is by reading their journals.  For the first time this year he is interacting with the journals - writing comments and feedback.  This might be an important learning experience for some of the trainees and influence them regarding their values.  I am curious to see if any trainees mention it during the focus groups.

Some of the values that are not AFM core values or those alluded to in the mission statement, but that I think are still values of AFM based on things that The Training Director has said are change and structure.

At the end of session 1 The Training Director had the trainees practice SOAP journaling on The Great Commission.  I had a significant revelation doing the SOAP journaling (that Christians are not supposed to simply teach, but to teach to obey.  The focus is on the action. The response of the receivers of the message), and wonder if other trainees experienced the same thing.

After a break of Pickle Ball, we reunited in Morgan Hall and picked up where we left off. Different individuals shared what they found impactful during their SOAP journaling.  Similar to the previous days, when The Training Director heard something he agreed with, he expounded upon the idea.  I noticed that he got pretty excited about each aspect.  Nobody had a wrong answer, and he was able to twist each comment into a point that he wanted to make.  The points were the following:

- "faith looks at a certainty greater than the uncertainty."  This had to do with faith and doubt, which The Training Director suggested are not opposite ends of a spectrum.  Rather certainty and uncertainty are opposite ends of the spectrum.  Certainty does not leave room for

doubt or faith.  Uncertainty can have the reactions of both doubt and faith.  They are often felt simultaneously.  But faith is focusing on a certainty, while doubt is focusing on an uncertainty.

"A prerequisite to great leadership is great followership."  When he said this, The Training Director's voice became quieter and slower, emphasizing the point.  In addition to changing his vocalics, The Training Director acted things out, raised his voice, and whispered.  All of these techniques worked to illustrate his passion and enthusiasm, and maintain listener interest while he was speaking.

I saw The Training Director model quite a bit of transparency during the Session 2. He talked about how difficult it is to be a student missionary.  "One of the things that kills student missionaries is mission"  "You will survive the year, but you will come back broken" - regarding a student missionary that is working from a self-centric paradigm instead of the God-centric paradigm.  He was honest and transparent about the emotional stress of being a missionary.  At one point, one trainee voiced concern.  He felt overwhelmed and didn't know how he was going to be able to remember everything he needed to during the year.  The Training Director put a stop to the lecture portion of the training, and started a group prayer (demonstrating reliance).  In addition to this silent affirmation of the trainee's transparency, The Training Director verbally thanked the trainee for his transparency.

At the end of the Session 2 The Training Director had the trainees write down four phrases: 1) salvation looks like relational healing; 2) the way we live together is the gospel we preach; 3) living together in community reveals relational brokenness; 4) relational brokenness is an opportunity for me to experience deeper salvation.

Session #3 after lunch started with us picking up with the great commission.  The Training Director brought up an idea that I had never heard before, that baptizing people in the name really means to immerse people in God's character.  Baptism the way the church practices it is just a symbol of the immersion that people have already experienced.  To illustrated what immersion means, The Training Director talked about pickles (purposely chosen because of pickle ball?  Probably).  They have to be immersed in brine in order to turn into pickles.  And this immersion produces a change in their character.  They cease to be cucumbers when they become pickles.  The Training Director then stated that AFM has a long-term mission.  The organization is looking to create pickles, not cucumbers.

I was extra tired during the afternoon sessions and almost took a 10-minute nap instead of stepping outside to play pickle ball.  At the last minute I decided that I wouldn't get enough rest in a nap to make it worthwhile, so I headed outside.  I was able to see The Training Director introduce the guest pastor to Pickle Ball.  I felt bad for him - that he had already missed out on the amazing pickle ball metaphors from the previous days.

Session 4 continued with discipleship.  The Training Director stated that the Great Commission has been God's plan since the beginning of the earth.  Starting with creation man was commanded multiply.  Abraham was also given the same commission.  And each time God's covenant is renewed, he also renews his promise of blessing.  The Training Director mentioned that blessing is linked with obedience.  This resonated with me, because it reminded me of when I went to Grace Point SDA church, and the emphasis there on abundance, and how the 10 commandments are a description of a life of abundance rather than a list of laws.

We spend time in groups of 2 going through the discipleship book.  I didn't feel completely comfortable being part of this activity, because I am a researcher.  And I wasn't sure if my partner was comfortable being partnered with me.  Also, I hate to say, I am probably not as biblically knowledgeable as most of the soon-to-be missionaries.

Just as with the morning session, the Training Director was a dynamic discussion leader. He used dynamics and gestures. He acted out the story of Peter walking on water, and used sound effects. Later on he invited one of the trainees to arm wrestle with him on the floor. They both gave it all they got. The point the Training Director was making was that "if you fight sin, you will surrender to sin, because it is stronger than you. If you wrestle with Jesus, you will surrender to Him."

Both yesterday and today the training went longer than 20 minutes past 5:00. Since I have to be at work at 5:30 pm because otherwise I will be locked out of the building, once it reaches 5:00 I am more preoccupied with time than with content the trainer is sharing. Unfortunately this is one of my weaknesses. Again, I was reminded that personal issues can impede a person's acquisition of organizational knowledge and values.

**Date:** July 28, 2015
**Day of Training:** 6
**Notes:** There are several days that I need to make up for. Thursday immediately following training, we left for the Crucible weekend, and Sunday/yesterday I was too tired to catch up. So here goes…

Thursday was training day #4. We met in the AFM training center just like other days. The Training Director was in charge of the training, and the entire day was focused on discipleship. It was noted that the stages of discipleship are introduce, wrestle, apply, and share. He reiterated the points from Day #3 that salvation looks like relational healing, the way we live together is the gospel we preach, and living together reveals relational brokenness. As we went over these concepts from yesterday, I wondered whether it is possible that the repetition of talking about what they have learned helps trainees solidify what they have learned.

The Training Director also mentioned that disfunctions in a team are inevitable, because nobody is perfect. "Teams are inherently dysfunctional because they are made up of imperfect people." The way that the Training Director (TD) talked about high functioning teams made me wonder whether the mission of AFM is to create high functioning teams. In that way, the process is the goal.

Session 2 started with the TD using a metaphor of firemen coming to put out a fire in order to illustrate high-functioning teams. Members of high-functioning teams need to walk toward the fire to put it out. That means that they need to confront crises instead of ignoring them. They need to be skilled at conflict management. One of the skills necessary for members of high-functioning teams is learning how to manage difficult conversations, learning conversations and listening.

Because of the transparency, vulnerability, and courage it takes to confront something, it is essential for high-functioning teams to have a safe environment of trust and open communication. One of the things that help with conflict management is being aware of attribution error. We see offense as an internal attribute of a person; but we see our own actions that caused offense as an external attribute. We studied attribution error in Communication Theory I believe. I was excited to see Communication theories applied to missions!

Session 3 continued the conversation about learning conversations. The key in learning conversations is to have genuine curiosity in the other person and to believe in his/her goodwill. To give him/her the benefit of the doubt. As an illustration of learning conversations and listening conversations, the TD had two trainees demonstrate their listening/learning skills. One thing I learned is that questions are off-limits when one is listening in a conflict situation because

questions are a way of maintaining control and focusing the conversation on what you are interested in rather than on what the other person wants to communicate.

The TD stated that he is going to institute a weekly meeting where the trainees will have an opportunity to take out the trash and participate in difficult conversations and learning conversations. He emphasize that this will require an environment where it is safe to have high levels of transparency.

Session 4 after lunch was lead by a Trainer (T) instead of the Training Director. This T's focus was on missions. He started by splitting the guys and girls into groups and giving them a scenario to which they had to respond with a plan for missions. When the groups got back together to discuss their various plans, I noticed that both the guys and the girls used metaphors that had previously been used in training i.e. "pickling" or illustrations like the leadership video with the leader who inspires a group on a grassy bluff to start dancing.

Session 5 included a game to illustrate a point. The girls each held the end of a sheet with the word evangelism on it. The boys held a sheet with the word church printed on it. There was a ball that represented a believer resting on the evangelism sheet. The girls' duty was to land the ball into the church sheet without touching the ball. We failed. The boys tried, and they were able to make it, but when multiple balls were added, they failed.

To teach the trainees about giving people the tools that they need, the T told a story about a drought in PNG in which flour and oil were given to the native peoples. They were told that the flour and oil was food, but were not told how to use it. So some people drank the oil, and tried to eat the raw flour. They became sick and had to be transported out to a hospital when they were in critical condition. The T then asked the class what should have happened instead, and the trainees responded that those helping during the crisis should have met the PNG people where they were at and either taught them how to use the flour and oil, or give them food that they were familiar with.

In Session 6 the conversation about differences in culture continued. Then, as soon as this session was over, we all left on the Crucible. Though this is the first time I have journaled about the Crucible, it has been on my mind for months. The Crucible is a camping survival weekend that the AFM trainees are taken on with the intent of turning them into a high-functioning team. There is a general policy that what happens on the Crucible stays at the Crucible. As the Crucible is an integral part of training, I cannot leave it out of my research. But as it is part of the secret sauce of AFM, I cannot divulge the specific activities that went on during the Crucible.

The crucible started Thursday evening, and went until Sunday evening. During that time, each of the trainees came to some sort of melting point, either spiritually, mentally, physically, or emotionally. Sometimes these meltdowns were public. But most of them were private. At the beginning of the Crucible the TD told all trainees that the purpose of the Crucible was to form high-functioning teams. And thought the weekend the trainees were put through different levels of challenges and hardships in order to foster an environment that would force them out of their comfort zone and to rely upon their teammates. Once the trainees returned, the next day of training was spent debriefing the crucible. Each trainee described their melting point and what he/she learned from the event.

On Monday, Training Day #5 before we talked about the melting points during the crucible, we talked about moments that hit us as hilarious, and the biggest lessons that were learned. Some of the lessons that trainees mentioned were that teamwork is important, how to push past barriers when you or someone else needs help, and that what is important in a team

isn't the goals as much as it is the process of building/maintaining relationships. The TD affirmed that the Crucible is not the events that the trainers plan, it's what each trainee brings to the experience.

The TD stated that "great leaders create a space for people to be at their best." The TD also used the illustration of a fire and girls warming themselves at a fire after being wet and miserable during one Crucible, likening it to sharing the gospel. It requires vulnerability so one can warm him/herself up.

The TD congratulated the trainees on becoming a high-functioning team during the crucible. He asked the trainees what it was that led them from where they were to when the training started to where they are now. The answers included the Crucible, vulnerability, community, and an environment of trust. The TD responded to one of the trainee's answer that "true church is when you're known for who you are, and loved anyway,"

During the debrief, one of the trainees thanked the TD for the feedback that he gives the group as well as individual trainees. She stated that the feedback helps her. Perhaps it is one of the things that will help her assimilate the organizational values.

Training Day #6 was today. The TD was not present. Instead a new trainer came. I was able to get him to sign an informed consent after session #1. Session #2 started with talking about language and culture acquisition. All of the trainees were sitting in the same position as last week. Apparently we have adopted a system.

The T asked the trainees how learning a new language is a path of humility. One of the trainees responded that learning a new culture is a path of humility because there will always be something new to learn. It is possible that she has thought long and hard about this, or she has been picking up hints that this is one of AFM's values.

During the morning, the trainees were mostly doing work out of a workbook. It reminded me a bit of high school, with the fill in the blanks and busy work. The T did make an indirect reference to a value, though. He said, "This isn't to scare you, it's to prepare you," when talking about the difficulties of language/culture acquisition and mission work. With that statement, he was modeling and reinforcing the AFM value of transparency.

At the end of the morning session, the trainees had to repeat the future worker's pledge about promising to use language learning to share the idea of redemption. Just by making this commitment and reading the pledge out loud, some trainees might have been persuaded to adopt the ideas/position of AFM, otherwise they might have experienced cognitive dissonance.

During the afternoon, the trainees were split into groups for language acquisition. I was put into a group with three other trainees that are focusing on the Korean language. Throughout the afternoon we used dolls, toy animals, and pictures of personal relationships and actions to learn Korean vocabulary. One of the trainees got excited every time we were able to act out a Korean command, or put the animals/dolls in a position that illustrated a Korean sentence. From his excitement I deduced that he is a kinetic learner. Therefore he probably will have learned much more from the Crucible experience than through any of the classroom portions of the training. But we'll see what he says during the interviews/focus groups.


**Date:** July 29, 2015
**Day of Training:** 7
**Notes:** Today I did not feel like there was much reference to organizational values. Both the morning and afternoon sessions were focused on languaculture acquisition. The Trainer

presented in the morning, stressing the CUTER method and why it is important to recognize the difference between definition and meaning. In the afternoon, the individual groups met for language practice. Again, I was with the Korean group. The two trainees who are learning Korean with me had both studied last night. I did not study, but my recollection of the Korean we learned yesterday was greater. I believe this is because I am already bilingual. And if I remember correctly from a language-limiting activity during the Crucible, the other two trainees are currently monolingual.

At the end of session #1 the trainees were encouraged to sign their name at the bottom of the Evolving principle pledge after reading the pledge out loud. Again, the process of reading the pledge out loud and signing my name caused me to feel committed to the task. It is possible that pledging has the same effect on the others, motivating them to be more intentional about their languaculture acquisition.

Just as yesterday, the morning was spent mostly working in a workbook. The busy work does not motivate me to learn. Rather, it makes me feel like I am in high school, learning a required amount of information instead of discovering it for myself. Nevertheless, this teaching method might be helpful for some of the trainees, and I do not want to discount it.

Though workbooks limit my learning, stories increase my learning. I have found that when one of the Trainers uses a story or a metaphor, I spend considerable energy applying the concepts I have learned to the situation. The Trainer told a story and gave an illustration to demonstrate pieces of life. The concept is that an object is not simply an object in a culture. The object plus its meaning equals a piece of life. The examples he told were a drum in a temple. Just knowing the word drum would not give someone a sense of Turkey's culture. But knowing that every time someone hit the drum, they were announcing the merit they had just earned, that does touch upon culture. In the same way, New Zealanders use sheep for eating and for clothing. So do Turkish people. But in Turkey they also use sheep for sacrifices. Someone needs to know about the sacrifices, or else they do not understand the Turkish meaning of sheep.

In the afternoon for the language practice we added furniture, food, and relationship (in, on, under, beside) to our vocabulary. Once again, one of the Trainees demonstrated considerable excitement whenever he was able link the sounds kinetically with actions. The other trainee appears to be an auditory learner. Somehow this does not surprise me, since he sings in choirs and plays piano.


**Date:** July 30, 2015
**Day of Training:** 8
**Notes:** Similar to yesterday, I did not notice many direct or indirect references to organizational values today. This is partially because the training this week is focused on languaculture acquisition - which could be considered a job skill rather than organizational knowledge. During the afternoon the language nurturer who helped 5 trainees and myself learn Thai was not an AFM employee and was not affiliated with the organization, so though I sat in on the training, I did not take observation notes.

During the morning the trainees learned about the zone of proximal development, which is the zone in which a person is able to have growth in a new languaculture. The zone of proximal development is balanced between comfortable and uncomfortable. Too comfortable and a person will not learn; too uncomfortable and the person will be in over his/her head.

At one point during session 2 one of the trainees asked the Trainer to clarify one of the guidelines for languaculture acquisition. The Trainer responded, "we aren't looking for rules, we are looking for principles we can live by." '

**Date:** July 31, 2015
**Day of Training:** 9
**Notes:** I feel like today's journal is going to be a repeat of yesterday's journal.  Once again, not much reference was made to organizational values, either directly or indirectly.

The morning focus was once again languaculture acquisition.  The afternoon was focused on acquiring a language.   During the morning session #2, the trainer mentioned the frustration and feelings of being strange and foolish that missionaries will feel as they are beginners in a language.  I felt that this was an example of transparency, and a reminder that the trainees need to keep a humble attitude when they go out into the field.

During the afternoon I felt less inclined to pay attention and learn the language than I had for the rest of the week.  While trying to analyze my feelings I wondered whether I would have been more motivated to learn if I were going to use the language in the future.  It might be possible that the student missionaries are focused on learning the AFM values simply because they know they will need to use the values in the field.

**Date:** August 3, 2015
**Day of Training:** 10
**Notes:** We had two different trainers today; one if the morning and one if the afternoon.  The morning trainer focused on discipleship and the afternoon trainer focused on cultural issues and mental models.

In the morning, the trainer affirmed the trainees for their excellent job on their learning journals.  He also talked quite a bit about listening to God.  This reinforces the AFM value of reliance, as defined as reliance on God.  He said, "If God is going to speak to your heart, it's probably going to be when you are listening."  He discussed the voice of God and the story of Samuel.  He also confessed that his biggest failures and wipeouts are when he faces crises without going to God.  "Listening to God is not a one-time event.  It's a process." he explained.  I noticed this morning that my attention is drawn every time the trainer tells a story or uses a metaphor to make a point.  Those are much more effective to my learning than a simple explanation of the facts.

Before lunch, we discussed the story of the Good Samaritan.  We used the discipleship books as a guide as we studied the story.  Though the study, I was convinced of several things: people are much more broken than they would like to admit but they need to admit their brokenness in order to be healed, community is important and people need to accept those who are broken and help them heal, Jesus is the answer (reliance on God).  I noticed that what I saw in the story was related to AFM values of humility, teamwork, and transparency.  As we talked about the story of the Good Samaritan, the trainer reinforced the value of vulnerability (which I translate as transparency) and the importance of the church being a safe place.

The afternoon started off with an illustration of the differences in culture.  The trainer (a man) held hands with one of the trainees (a boy) and talked about how differences in worldview affect the way a person experiences that occurrence.  His worldview as an American filtered the

interaction as gay the first time he encountered the behavior, when in reality he was in a "man's world" and the action was completely acceptable. Because of the differences in culture, the trainer told the trainees that they need to strip Christianity of all culture until it is the bare bones before they apply Christianity to people in another culture.

Session number 4 continued with the culture theme. Trainees were instructed to write on a board words that describe what American culture revolves around. He then used those words to help describe mental models. He also drew a diagram that illustrated how mental models are formed. During this session he told a lot of stories and used illustration to explain the concept of mental models. He started talking about culture shock, and encouraged the trainees that when they encounter culture shock, they should get help form someone (humility, teamwork and community) and plan fun events.


**Date:** August 4, 2015
**Day of Training:** 11
**Notes:** This morning we had a surprising conversation during the first session of training. The trainer admitted that it was the first cubicle they had allowed to finish without practicing dealing with interpersonal issues. I had understood the crucible to be specifically about teamwork - and that was true for our crucible, but in the past the crucible was about learning conversations as well as about teamwork. In fact, learning conversations are crucial to the good functioning of teams. The trainer told the trainees that only once before in the 16 times they have led a crucible did a group not deal with interpersonal issues. In that instance, the trainers manufactured and argument and learning conversation in the presence of the trainees. In the debrief that followed the argument, the trainer found out that none of the student missionaries had seen adults process disagreements healthfully. Either they had never seen their parents argue before, or the arguments had been unpleasant, harmful, and unhealthy. When the trainer talked about this, I realized that I have never seen my parents argue, therefore I do not have a mental model of what healthy disagreements look like. I am missing the tools needed for a successful learning conversation.

Because we did not practice this skill over the crucible, one of the trainees asked for a bullet point list of how to conduct a learning conversation. The trainer brought in another trainer who was outside, because this was the other trainer's area of expertise. The bullet-point list was as follows:
- Think of what happened from the other person's perspective.
- Request a learning conversation
- Attempt to tell the story form the other person's perspective.
- Give the other person time to clarify the story, and listen to his/her response
- Acknowledge what you personally did to contribute to the problem
- Come to an agreement on what can be done to avoid the problem in the future

One of the things that were not emphasized in this list was that one needs to go about initiating the learning conversation with an attitude of curiosity and belief in the goodwill of the other person. At the end of the bullet points about a learning conversation, the trainer mentioned that a learning conversation is not a confrontation. A confrontation has a winner and a loser. A learning conversation is win-win

When the trainer mentioned that our crucible was the first crucible that did not have to practice learning conversations because of interpersonal conflict, I felt a little bit jipped, and

wished that we had encountered conflict in order to practice difficult conversations. I asked the trainer why the trainers did not manufacture a difficult conversation for our crucible. The trainer replied that the trainers had agreed that the themes of our crucible seemed to be leadership, followership, and teamwork. Crucibles might change based on what people bring to them. But, this trainer still wished that our group had been able to practice difficult conversations. Perhaps because I saw the logic in learning conversations as beneficial, or perhaps because we did not receive practice in them, turning the skills into a scarcity. Either way, I resolved in my heart to use learning-conversation concepts and skills in my interpersonal relationships with my family and significant others.

For a short while during the first session, I sat in personal reflection rather than listening to the training. It occurred to me that the trainees might be committed to learning AFM values because they have already bought in to the mission. I have started to try to incorporate components of the AFM training into my personal life. Why? Because I have been persuaded in the importance of a portion of the AFM mission. The other trainees believe in the mission - it is part of the reason they joined the organization. And since the values have been linked with attaining the mission, the trainees might have high motivation to adopt AFM values.

During the second session, the trainer talked about nonverbal communication and its importance. He used the example of clothing. In one particular culture pants signified prostitution. Because of that meaning, he required that his wife and daughters not wear pants. Not because there is anything wrong with pants, but because of what pants would communicate to the members of that culture. After this illustration the trainer told a series of stories and asked the trainees to tell him what lessons could be learned from the stories. One of the stories was about two Mormon missionaries who took of picture of themselves sitting on top of a Buddha, which landed them in jail. Another story was about a man who found himself with an unexpected wife because he had shaken hands with his "uncle" in a culture which signified a handshake to mean a proposal. The stories segued into the differences and culture. The trainer talked about the stages and symptoms of culture shock and how to deal with it.

Session 3 before lunch was very short. The trainer only had time to introduce the idea of high context and low context cultures. He mentioned that high context cultures are big on saving face and using half-stories.

During lunch we had our first focus group. 6 trainees, 3 girls and 3 boys, participated. Although one of the boys did not say a word. It made me wonder why he even showed up, except that he must have felt obligated.

After lunch the 4th session started 30 minutes late because the trainer was running late. He told the trainees to use the 30 minutes for personal quiet time. This ended up being an excellent way to practice the "listening to God" concept that he had introduced to the trainees yesterday.

The afternoon sessions were focused on discipleship. Session 4 was about the parable of the sower and the importance of competence (our discipleship sessions have already talked about called, committed, and community). The trainer stated, "You will not have an audience for your words until you've earned an audience with your life." I enjoy writing down key phrases that the trainer says. These proverbs catch my attention, and probably help persuade me to assimilate organizational values.

Today I noticed that some of the work trainees did together and some work was done individually. During the sessions some trainees took notes on their t-shirts that they were given

in order to fill with notes.  Some took notes in a journal that they were given to fill with notes.  And others sat listening without taking notes.

During session 5 the trainees were instructed to think about instances in which they did something in their personal walk with God that strengthened their relationship with God.  After listing these things, 3 of the trainees were asked to share something from their list.  They shared setting aside quiet time with God, intercessory prayer, and prayer journaling.  The trainer explained that just like the wheat in the parable of the sower has roots that touch the roots of other wheat, people in a Christian community sometimes should share what happens in their personal lives (private walk with God) with people in their community.  This will serve to strengthen the community.  He encouraged the trainees to share their private lives with their Bible study accountability partner.  This reminded me that I do not have an accountability partner, but it would be advantageous for me to have one.  So when I left the training, I asked a friend to be my partner.  She agreed!  :)


**Date:** August 5, 2015
**Day of Training:** 12
**Notes:** Today was focused entirely on worldviews and the differences in cultures.  The morning started with the trainer telling stories and asking the trainees to tell him the meaning of the stories, or the lessons learned.  As he told the stories some of the trainees drew on their t-shirts while some sat listening to the trainer, and others wrote in their journals. As I looked around the room, I realized that I have become attached to all of the trainees and cannot imagine the group functioning without any single one of them.

Several of the stories that the trainer told illustrated the difference between high context cultures and low context cultures.  After a couple stories, the trainer used the metaphor of gum to talk about evangelism.  If we hear a list of the ingredients in gum, gum does not sound appetizing to us (He read out the list of ingredients and asked the trainees whether it sounded good to them).  Then he stated that Christians often do the same thing; they list the ingredients without offering unbelievers a product.  But just as you or I want to taste the gum to see whether it is good, unbelievers want to experience that Christianity is good before hearing about the ingredients.

Towards the end of session 1, the trainer stated that the AFM trainers act in certain ways and plan the crucible so that everyone on the team (referring to the trainers) is thinking in terms of modeling the gospel, not talking about it. They hope that this attitude rubs off on the student missionaries.

Session 2 used an illustration of three buckets for the entire session.  The trainer brought in a sick on a base with three branches sticking off of it in different directions.  From these three branches hung buckets.  The bottom and top ones were platinum, while the one in the middle was white.  He explained that the buckets represent classifications of behavior.  The top bucket represents actions which are required, the bottom bucket represents actions which are prohibited, and the middle bucket represents actions which are neither required nor prohibited and therefore require principles to determine behavior.  Some of the principles might be "what would Jesus do?" or "is the action helpful or harmful?" or "does the action have the appearance of evil?"

What is classified in the top and bottom buckets is often the result of cultural norms, although in some cases it is religious norms.  As someone moving from one culture to another, the trainees were told to remember that the cultural norms of behavior in America (or their home country) will be different than that of their host culture.  There were two key phrases that the

trainer said: "Every choice you make either moves God's work forward and back" and "Just because you can do it doesn't mean you should do it." He was emphasizing the importance of appropriate behavior. He made it clear that as the student missionaries go out into the field, some of the behavior that they have classified as prohibited might move to the optional bucket, and some behavior that they have classified as required might move to the optional bucket, and probably a lot of behavior that they have classified as optional will move to the required or prohibited buckets. These changes take a lot of work.

At the end of session 2 all of the trainees were given a piece of paper on which were listed many different behaviors (I think there were 44 in all). The trainees had to list next to these behaviors whether they classified the behavior in the top (1), middle (2), or bottom bucket (3). Each of the behaviors was assigned a letter(s) A through RR. The trainer then made all trainees fold their paper so they could not see which behavior corresponded with which letter. He then read out a letter and then 1, 2, and 3. When he called the number that trainees had put next to the letter, the trainees raised their hands. The trainees kept their eyes on their paper and did not see whether the other trainees had the same answer as them. The trainer kept track of how many times out of 25 the trainees had 100% consensus on whether a behavior was required, optional, or prohibited. Out of 25, the trainees only had 1 in which they all agreed. The trainer used this to illustrate that even though Christians all agree on a set of principles (The 28 fundamental beliefs for Adventists), they do not agree on the application of these principles.

To start out the afternoon sessions, the trainer asked the trainees to reflect upon which behaviors they might need to move into new buckets when they move into their new host culture. This seems like an invaluable skill for missionaries; being able to apply the principles that govern behavior to different cultural settings.

Next, the trainer introduced two paradigms of Christianity. One of the paradigms is a circle. What is inside the circle represents following Christian principles and being saved. What is outside the circle represents unbelievers or unchristian behavior. In this paradigm the focus is on simply doing what is right so that one is inside the parameters of what is Christian. The second paradigm is a dot, which represents Jesus. In this paradigm people aren't inside or outside a circle, rather they are at different distances from the dot. The people can either be moving toward the dot or moving away from it. A person who is closer to the dot and moving away from the dot is in a more precarious position than one who is far away from the dot and moving toward it. The trainer emphasized patience. Often people will try to evangelize others by trying to bring others up to speed to the evangelist's understanding, instead of meeting others where they are at and discovering what the next step toward Jesus would be.

In session 4, the trainer said, "Jesus spent 30 years learning how to talk effective to Jewish culture." He was emphasizing the importance of listening, patience, and preparation. Then we moved on to analyzing American culture. There was a board on which the trainees had written words that describe what American culture revolves around, 2 days ago. We spent time identifying which of those words were players in American culture, which were tools in American culture, and which were the core foci of American culture. The core foci were identified as self, entertainment, pleasure, status, money, and sex.

During session 5 we did the same culture activity with the book of Acts, writing words that described the culture in Acts and then classifying them as either players, tools, or core foci. The core foci we identified for the book of Acts were the Godhead, body of believers, salvation/healing, and reaching the unreached. It didn't skip my notice that the mission of AFM is aligned with these core foci. In comparing the core foci of American and Acts cultures, it was

noted that in one self is the center while in the other God is the center.  And in American culture the other foci have to do with pleasing oneself, while in the Acts culture the other foci have to do with other people.  Such a radical difference!  It was noted that quite often in American culture people will use "tools" from the Acts culture and they will believe that they are true Christians, when the truth is that their core foci have not changed, and they are completely leaving out the call of discipleship that identifies a Christian.  For example, music can be played in church simply for entertainment.


**Date:** August 6, 2015
**Day of Training:** 13
**Notes:** The first session started out with a story about a maturing church practicing what they believe.  The trainer described several instances where a church implemented programs where they cared for the sick or helped out people in their communities, and members of the community wanted to get baptized not because of church doctrine, but because of their experience with the church members.  One of the stories was about a lay pastor who beat his wife because he didn't know a better way of being in control of his family.  This story was told in the context of church members' responsibility to help people understand how to apply the gospel to their lives.  The lay pastor had read the Bible verse that said that men should be in control of their families, and they only way he knew of to be in control was to beat his wife.  Instead of chastising the lay pastor and rescinding his role in the church, the trainer (who was a missionary at the time) had the lay pastor help him teach the community productive ways of dealing with conflict.  They role-played and discussed scenarios.  By the end of the training, the lay pastor was stricken with repentance and told the trainer/missionary that the was well disciplined.

During the second session the trainer introduced the idea of "soft teaching" to the trainees.  He suggested that this is an important aspect of sharing the gospel with people of different cultures.  Soft teaching is telling stories without giving a reason why or explaining them.  Instead, the teacher tells many stories and lets the audience infer their own meaning and glean their own lessons from the stories.  It suddenly occurred to me that this trainer has been using this same method with the trainees.

In the middle of the second session the trainer started talking about spiritual warfare.  He prefaced the topic by explaining how the book of Genesis can be seen through the lens of spiritual warfare.  His idea is that the book's theme is sons and seed - and the Moses is following the descendants of Adam in an effort to keep track of the line of the messiah.  This appeared to be a new concept for many of the trainees, and several of them gasped or vocalized their appreciation at this idea.  Then we started going through a list of Bible verses that have to do with spiritual warfare.  The tables were split into groups and each group would analyze a different verse, and then come back together to share their findings.

During the second half of the lunch break, the trainees met for a penguin circle. This time, instead of being led by the trainer, the penguin circle was led by one of the trainees.  The circle started with affirmation of what has been working well.  Then, the floor was opened up for any issues.  Again, the issue of time management was brought up.  Several members of the group spoke up, and they made sure to analyze the problem before trying to speak about solutions.  I was impressed, as this showed a good foundation in group decision-making.  Another thing that impressed me is that the trainees decided that they were willing to spend extra time in "class" in

order to get as much training as possible from one of the trainers who will be leaving after tomorrow.

The afternoon sessions started as a continuation of the morning session, with the groups testing Bible verses to glean principles of spiritual warfare. This continued into the fourth session of the day, except instead of working in groups, the whole group worked together. I believe it is because the trainer felt pressed for time.


**Date:** August 7, 2015
**Day of Training:** 14
**Notes:** This morning I found out that today is only going to be a half-day of training. This sort of disappointed me, as I have been immensely enjoying attending the training. Is it ethical of the investigator to get so invested in her research project? I'm unclear on this.

The first session started out with the trainer addressing the fact that some of the trainees were fasting. This was a reminder of dependence/reliance on God, one of AFM's core values. After this announcement, another trainer took over the session. He started to talk to the trainees about realistic and unrealistic expectations. He had the trainees list both realistic and unrealistic expectations for their year abroad in relation to the host culture/people. As trainees called out realistic and unrealistic expectations, the trainers would occasionally insert comments or stories to affirm what the trainees were saying. Once all of the expectations (both realistic and unrealistic) had been listed, the trainer broke down/analyzed each one. After all of the expectations had been analyzed, the trainer asked the trainees to make a list of their goals/plans for the upcoming year, taking the exception into account. He then broke down/analyzed each of their goals.

The second session started out with a case study of a short-term mission trip. It was a satire of the way many mission trips are organized and led. In the case study, a group from rural Mexico was requesting to come to "our" home church on a mission trip. Their plans did not take into account any of "our" culture. After he was done reading the case study, the trainer asked what should have been done instead.

Once the group was done discussing the case study, the trainees listed realistic and unrealistic expectations of their future dealings with the career missionaries. These expectations were analyzed in the same way as the expectations listed during session 1.

Session 3 continued with the realistic expectations listed in session 2. Then, as it was close to noon, the trainer wrapped up the day—and his time with the trainees—by giving the trainees a lot of advice about how to interact with the career missionaries, what to do or not to do, what should be discussed in their first meeting, etc. I felt that the advice he gave the student missionaries will have the effect of increasing the integrity of their projects. But so far, the word integrity has not been mentioned in the 3 weeks of training.


**Date:** August 10, 2015
**Day of Training:** 15
**Notes:** The first session today was on discipleship. The trainer asked the trainees to use 5 words to describe their weekend. One by one we went around the room sharing our weekend experiences, and in this way strengthened our sense of connection and community. Once we had completed this activity, we spend one minute reflecting on being present in the moment with all

of the individuals in the room.  The trainer made the comment that this past weekend (a free weekend for the trainees) was practice for this coming weekend, when they will disperse around the world and no longer live together.  This thought hit me in an emotional spot.  I have become attached to the trainees, and I don't even live with them!  I can't imagine their sense of loss come the end of the training.

The next item that we spent a minute reflecting on was a person who has invested into our lives and helped us become the person we am today.  After we reflected on this person, the trainer requested that the trainees thank the person who has been their mentor, and that they find someone else to pay it forward to. That they become a mentor and invest in someone else's life. I noted to myself that this would be discipleship in practice.

Next, all trainees were instructed to spend five minutes designing their dream garden. After the five minutes were up the trainees shared their dream gardens with the people around them.  Then, we spend a while talking about gardens and what it takes to maintain a garden.

During the second session, the trainer became passionate about the persona that he would like to be.  He talked about his past when he was super conservative and vegan and would not eat anything that had been processed.  He confessed that this was not the person who he wanted to be, because he had been trying to gain his salvation through diet.  After this confession, he brought the conversation back to gardens by mentioning that the Master Gardener is who can change him to be the person he wants to be.  It is not his work to prune his own garden, but the Gardener who will work out the roots and blaze the new paths.

Sometime during this session, the trainer admitted that he is a "prayer kindergartener" and has a lot to learn about prayer.  When he mentioned this, I understood him to be demonstrating an attitude of humility and the willingness to be instructed in prayer.  After concluding his comments on prayer, the trainer turned the topic to Bible study.  He borrowed a water bottle from one of the trainees and asked each of the trainees to take turns studying the water bottle and observing something new about it.  I began, and therefore had the easiest job.  I mentioned that the water bottle was slightly less than half full.  As the water bottle made its way around the room, other trainees observed that it was plastic, orange, well-used, had a grey lid, could stand up on its own, was durable, held water, etc.  After all of the trainees had made an observation, the trainer picked it up and made at least 10 more observations, showing how little the trainees had scratched the surface of describing the water bottle.  This activity was used to illustrate the importance of slowing down to study the Bible.  That reading the Bible with a cursory glance does not constitute study.

During the afternoon a new trainer came specifically to talk to the trainees about medical emergencies and protocol and wilderness medicine.  Because the trainer was not affiliated with AFM and was not attempting to transmit organizational values to the trainees, I did not have her sign an informed consent and did not take notes during the afternoon sessions.


**Date:** August 11, 2015
**Day of Training:** 16
**Notes:** The three sessions this morning were a continuation of medical training.  I sat through the sessions, but did not take notes.

After lunch, the trainer who has been leading out the discipleship training returned. Sometimes this trainer has had the trainees work in groups, but this afternoon we all worked as a group to complete the discipleship workbook.  TO start out with, we looked at 1 Corinthians 12.

This is the chapter that likens the church to a body.  The trainer commented that as humans, we need each other.  He had the trainees turn to the person next to them and say, "I need you."  Though not related to God, this emphasizes the value of reliance.

The next session focused on the parable of the talents.  The point of this study was to show that the parable's moral is not related to abilities/talents, but rather to multiplication/discipleship.  The servants were given talents (the master's property, which could be equivocated to his work/life work) according to their abilities.  The talents, therefore do not equal abilities.  At the end of the parable all of the servants had 'talents'/the master's property, but only the ones who had increased/multiplied the investment were rewarded.

During this session I noticed that the trainer has stated many times over the course of the one-month training period that it is his deepest desire that the trainees will apply what they are learning to their lives, and teach what they have learned to others.  It suddenly occurred to me that this might tie into the motivation the trainees have to adopt organizational values.  If they have an affinity or liking towards the trainer and they wish to please him, they might work harder to adopt organizational values.

During the final session of the day we looked at the first chapter of Acts.  We looked at the verses through the lens of discipleship, and the importance of the calling, and inspiration with belief in the ability to change the world.  The trainer was very passionate about his subject, and his enthusiasm appeared to be contagious.  He truly believes that if the trainees alter their behavior to model relational healing, they can change the world.  I believe that his passion may have rubbed off on the trainees.  His absolute belief in the method he teaches may motivate them to put his teachings into practice.


**Date:** August 12, 2015
**Day of Training:** 17
**Notes:** The theme of today's training was "the inward and upward journey."  The trainer started out by saying, "the very core of what you bring to Adventist Frontier Mission is your heart."  He continued to say that it is manipulative to send out student missionaries without addressing two items: 1) everyone has a heart that has been hurt by life, and 2) salvation looks like healing, both the healing of hearts and the healing of relationships.  At this point the trainees were each given five minutes in which to draw their hearts, including the scars.

Next, the Training Director handed over the training to a guest, who led the rest of the morning session.  I did not have a chance to speak with this guest speaker beforehand, so I did not take notes during his session.  Afterward, he gave me verbal permission to have observed his presentation.  What I remember of his presentation is that it dealt with his personal experience with depression and relational healing with God and his wife.

During session 2 we talked about how the brain processes information with images.  the trainer emphasized that the brain processes falsehoods with the same efficiency with which it processes truth.  The trainees were asked whether God loves them.  The answer was a quick and definitive yes.  Next, the trainees were asked whether God likes them.  This time, the trainees hesitated.  Nobody seemed to want to commit to the idea that God might actually like him or her.  The trainer then displayed a list of statements of what God thinks of individuals such as "I am God's masterpiece," "I am God's beloved friend," "I am the one who ravishes God's heart," and the trainees took turns reading these statements.  I was surprised at how good it felt to read the

statements and hear them read. Warm and fuzzy doesn't even begin to describe how empowered I felt after this activity.

Session 3 was more focused on the upward part of the "inward and upward journey." There was a prayer journey in which the trainees were asked to close their eyes and imagine the Biblical story when Jesus welcomed the children to come to Him. Next, the trainees were instructed to see themselves in the place of one of the children, to imagine themselves held in the arms of Jesus. The trainer encouraged the trainees to practice this activity on a regular basis and to put themselves mentally and emotionally in the shoes of Bible characters.

I don't remember how, but the prayer activity led into a section on structures of healing. A diagram was projected that showed two different tracks that somebody can use to guide their behavior and outlook on life. In one track, wounds lead someone to believe lies and distortions about themselves or the world around them, which result in emotional upheaval. The emotional upheaval leads to dysfunctional behavior that influences life situations, often causing more wounds. The key phrase for this paradigm is "hurting people hurt people." But people don't have to live their lives this way. "We can choose to act like an unhealed wounder, or we can act like a wounded healer." What this means is this: people have the ability (with God's help) to break out of the wounding cycle. If somebody allows God to heal him/herself, he or she will begin to believe in truth and acceptance, which results in comfort and peace. The feelings of comfort and peace leads to empower living that influences life situations, often causing healing to begin for other people. Of course the empowered living life track sounds much more appealing to us (the trainees) than the dysfunctional behavior life track.

The guest trainer used to be the training director for Adventist Frontier Missions. Right before we stopped for lunch, one of the trainees asked the guest trainer for a piece of advice. The answer was two words: dependent vulnerability. In order to be effective, the student missionaries will need to be dependent in community with their host culture. They will also need to be open and vulnerable with them. He told a story about his first contact in the culture where he was a missionary and about how that contact died, and how he mourned for months with member of the host culture. After months of mourning with them, the people said "he isn't a missionary. He is one of us." In a tragic way, he needed his contact to die in order for him to truly connect with people and be dependent and vulnerable with them. The guest trainer then challenged the trainees to go and meet people and to connect with them.

Student missionaries who were returning after their stint in the field arrived for their Reentry training. They led out in the afternoon sessions. The trainees were split into groups depending on what type of work they would be doing in the field. There was a group of English teachers, a group of nurses, and another group that I don't remember. I sat in on the friendship evangelism group. The student missionary leading out this group had spent a year as a missionary in Ireland. Because she was not a formal AFM trainer, I did not take notes on her session.


**Date:** August 13, 2015
**Day of Training:** 18
**Notes:** Today when I arrived, I found out from the Training Director that I should give the final values survey this afternoon instead of tomorrow, like we had been planning. Unfortunately I was not prepared with the survey, so I had to leave to print off copies of the survey. Because of this, I missed the first hour of training. The returned student missionaries at AFM for Reentry

gathered together with the trainees and took turns giving them advice.  I arrived for the last 10-15 minutes of this session.  But because none of the Reentry missionaries knew about my project, I did not take notes during this session.

Session 2 was similar to session 1 in that the trainees met with the student missionaries, but this time it was segregated.  All of the boys met upstairs to talk about issues that men deal with in the mission field, while the girls met downstairs to talk about issues that women deal with in the mission field.  Again, the Reentry missionaries did not yet know me, so I did not take notes during the session.  But I appreciated the foresight of AFM to provide this opportunity for the trainees.

During Session 3 the trainees split into groups by the country that they would go to.  This session was also led by the Reentry missionaries.  I went with a Reentry missionary from China.  She was meeting with a random group of people including myself who didn't have Reentry missionaries for their destination country (Cambodia & Turkey, and myself).  I was excited about the Reentry's mission.  If I were to go as a missionary, I would want to do what she did.  Though I did tell this Reentry missionary about my reentry role, I did not have her sign an informed consent and I did not take observation notes during this session.

Lunch was an hour late today. The Reentry missionaries cooked lunch for the trainees, which was very nice.  But it kicked everything back.  The afternoon session, which was supposed to start at 2:00 didn't start until 3:30.  To begin the afternoon, the asked the trainees to talk about what they found beneficial about having conversations with the returning missionaries.

Next, the Training Director continued with the topic of the inward and upward journey, discussing how a person can go from wounded to healed.  Most of this processes is an inward journey, though, so there was a quiet activity that took up most of the afternoon.  Each person was given an outline of a person.  The trainees were instructed to reflect on lies that other people have told us about ourselves (15 minutes of reflection) and then to reflect on lies that we have told ourselves about ourselves (15 minutes of reflection).  We wrote those lies down on the outline wherever the lie corresponded.  For example, a lie that I have been told about myself is that I have already reached my potential.  I wrote that near the head since it deals with my intelligence.  A lie that I have told myself was that I am not capable of love.  I wrote that near the heart since it deals with a heart issue.  Next, the trainer gave each of the trainees a list that included all of the Bible verses pertaining with how God sees us.  This is the same list that we read through that gave me the warm fuzzies yesterday.  On our paper, we crossed out each lie, and wrote on top of it a truth of how God perceives us.  This took approximately 20 minutes.  It was a very powerful and healing activity for me.  I did not have the opportunity to speak with other trainees about how it affected them, but I would hope that it was just as healing for them.

As the trainees were completing this activity I handed out the final values survey, and the Training Director left the room.  The trainees brought their survey to me as they completed it.


**Date:** August 14, 2015
**Day of Training:** 19
**Notes:** The last day of training.  I have a heavy heart because training has become such an important part of my life.  I don't want to go back to an 8-hr workday without the trainees there and without learning important skills about dealing with people from different cultures and treating them from a basis of relational healing!

Today was not a typical training day.  The trainees did their final exam, which consisted of them each designing a training to pass on what they learned.  They needed to come up with how they would train student missionaries to be disciple makers.  I think this is a great way for trainers to have the trainees synthesize what they learned as well as receive feedback about what they could do to improve training.

While the trainees were completing their final exam, the career missionaries gave presentations about their plans for their missions.  I attended these presentations.  One family is going to Cambodia, one family is going to Turkey, and one family is going to Iraq.  I was impressed with the amount of thought and planning that each of the career missionaries put into their plans.

And that was it!  I slipped away at the end of the presentations, knowing that this wonderful phase of data gathering is over.

APPENDIX H

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW WITH AFM TRAINING DIRECTOR

**July 16, 2015**

**Investigator:** All right this is Caralin McHan and I'm interviewing Laurence Burn, the Training director at Adventist Frontier Missions. Thanks again.

**AFM Training Director:** You're Welcome

**Investigator:** My first question is: what are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?

**AFM Training Director:** We have, we've got five core values that articulate the behavior that we expect for missionaries. So, I'll start with that, and then we'll look at our mission statement and the values that are implicit in the mission.

So first core value—if you going to our website you'll see we have a one word, a sentence and a paragraph that describes each of these values. The first one is reliance, is the word, reliance. And in essence what we're describing there is that if you want to be a part of Adventist Frontier Missions, one of the behaviors, the non-negotiable behaviors is a willingness to depend on God for resources, for strategy, for the success of your work; it's really heavily dependent on God because, you know, obviously there's the fundraising dimension, we're working in very different difficult areas, etc. So reliance is the first value. And that's kind of where it starts. That's the beginning of the journey. And all the way through, you know, that's kind of where it starts: Reliance.

Then, the second core value is integrity. And what we mean by integrity is that we actually want to work towards enduring results. So that would be the key word. So this is not permission to play kind of integrity although that that's included in the description, you know, that we work with a code of honesty and such; but really the core idea as I see it and teach it is this idea of enduring results so that the missionaries when they work in the field will work towards leaving something behind that will be there when Jesus comes. That we don't want to do a flash in the pan and then and then leave and then have it all crumble. So we understand it's a very high ideal but that's our goal. That's a core value we spend a lot of time and energy and money, and to have that kind of integrity that will actually bear the weight. Like if you think of this table, if the table has integrity, it's because it can carry the weight that it was designed to carry. So that's the kind of…

**Investigator:** That's the kind where you, where people talk about products or structures having integrity.

98

**AFM Training Director:** That's correct. So we want to work in such a way that our project and outcomes have integrity. That's the goal, the final product. So this is where it starts, and then that's the final product. Those are the first two and how we define them. Then you've got three others, and those three are humility, teamwork and transparency.

So what we mean by humility is that, you know, if you want to be a frontier missionary then humility is not an option. So learning another language, you know what it's like. You have to be willing to become like a little child and learn from other people. Another way that humility is described, and is expressed in the organization, is that anyone can teach anyone. Like I could learn something, no matter, even though I'm the director of training, but I could learn something key from one of the missionary children, and am willing to have an attitude of I'm teachable no matter what, that I have what we call dependent vulnerability, and that it is the sense of openness and vulnerability and a recognition of my dependence on God, and my dependence on you, and a willingness to learn from others. So that would be humility.

Teamwork is a core value because our work is a team sport. It's kind of like saying teamwork is a core value to soccer players. You know, it's pretty obvious. And that means that we play, we spend a lot of time building cohesive teams that work well together. A huge part of that is that I believe the way we live together is the Gospel we preach so functional teams is not simply for getting results but it's actually, the functional team delivers results; that in order to communicate the gospel we have to have healthy relationships to do that because the gospel is that relationships can be healthy. Does that make sense?

**Investigator:** Yes

**AFM Training Director:** So if I were to go and share the gospel with highly dysfunctional… we 're actually being duplicitous. So to have high-functioning teams and to build high functioning teams both internally and externally. So when we establish movements we're wanting to establish high functioning teams, you know, community that will work and that are healing, and then, when we are actually internally, and in movements, and in our relationships with other agencies, you know, with the church. We play nicely with other people as part of our core values and you can understand why, you know, the mission is too big for us to play by ourselves.

And the final one is transparency, and the idea behind that is that if I have something that I need to talk to you about, I'm not going to talk to anyone else. I'm going to talk to you about it. So I'll be transparent. I'm not going to be political with you, and kind of hint or be nice to you, your face and then tell other people about all the bad things about you. I'm actually going to be transparent. And then the other thing is that if we make a decision in a committee, we actually publish that decision for all of, you know, unless there's some confidentiality issue, like if we, you know, have an employee and they have something private that we have to discuss and then we'll protect their confidentiality. But other than that we're, our president writes, you know, sends an email to all the employees about anything that's come through committees or we've decided, just, like transparency.

So we're committed to a culture of transparency, a culture of teamwork and a culture of humility. And that's how we go from reliance to integrity. Those three; the how, where we start, and where we end. So those are values; those are explicit values that we call behavioral values and they come within the context of, where that idea came from is from a work by Patrick Lensioni; he's got a booked called The Advantage, and he talks about how there's two things, companies can be smart or healthy, and that it's very difficult to maintain a competitive edge by being smart. But healthy organizations, because it takes the human dimension, healthy organizations trump smart all the time. You've got a healthy organization that becomes smarter. If you've just got a smart organization, it can actually become stupid if it's not healthy. So you start making stupid strategic decisions, stupid financial decisions that actually start harming the business and harming the collectivity in result because it's not healthy. And there's two things that make organizations healthy: one is cohesion and the other one's clarity.

**Investigator:** So you have that with the teamwork and transparency

**AFM Training Director**: High-functioning teams, and then clarity around 6 questions, and I will go through all those 6 questions.

**Investigator:** You know them off the top of your head?

**AFM Training Director:** I'll give you what I remember. The first one is 'Why do we exists?' That's the question of purpose. The second question is 'How do we behave?'

**Investigator:** So the culture.

**AFM Training Director:** Yes. That's these values. These values describe how we behave. That's the culture. All right? And then the third question is 'How will we succeed?' which has got to do with strategy. And the fourth question is, um, I'm missing one. So: 'Why do we exist?' Oh! 'What business are we in?' So, are we in the education business? Are we in the service industry? Are we in the food industry? We're in the faith-based NGO. That's our category.

**Investigator:** So it's different in that one is about what you are and the other one is what need you're meeting?

**AFM Training Director:** Yeah. So, it's 'Why do we exist?' 'How do we behave?' 'What business are we in?' 'How will we succeed?' And then, 'What's most important right now?' and then 'Who must do what and by when?' So those six questions are questions that create clarity, and there's four disciplines that actually help create a healthy organization and that's building a cohesive team at the top, creating clarity around those six questions, over-communicating clarity, and then reinforcing clarity through human systems. So that structure has really deeply influenced my thinking when it comes to the place of values in an organization. That values are really about shaping culture, and that culture is actually part of the vision of a healthy organization. So organizational health, right? Now, for a church-planting organization, all of those are like, really critical to our mission. So, you can have a widget-developing organization. And having health just helps them make more profit and be more innovative and have a better

competitive advantage. But with people just using their widgets, you know, there's not a direct connection outside of the by-product of health. It's clever, it's competitive, it's functional, etcetera. For a missions agency that's focused on church planting, organizational health is the core of what we do. Because we need to be a really healthy organization in order to plant healthy organizations. So our organization's mission is to be a catalyst for organizations. So organizational health. So that's why values are critical within the context of our mission, our purpose for existence. Does that make sense?

**Investigator:** mmmhmmmm

**AFM Training Director:** Okay. Now, there's one other thing. That those are explicit values. There are implicit values as well, and those come from our mission statement. Our mission statement is to establish indigenous Seventh-day Adventist church planting movements amongst unreached people groups. So, what's implicit in that is this idea that we start something, typically where there's nothing. That's the idea of establishment. So one of the things that we're wanting is kind of a pioneering spirit. And as I say, these are implicit values. All right. And they're not behavioral values, but they're things that we care deeply about as an organization. So, I'll cite Romans chapter, I think it's chapter 10 or chapter 15. It's Romans chapter 15. Paul says, 'It's always been my ambition to lay a foundation where no one else has built.' Paul wants to be the first one who is starting a new work. What's implicit in that is pioneering. So establish.

And then indigenous. And this idea that we're not actually coming in from the outside and wanting to export American culture or African culture. We're actually wanting to establish something that's relevant and owned locally. So that's indigenous.

Seventh-day Adventist assumes a partnership with the church that when we are planting churches, we're actually planting churches that will be integrated into the sisterhood of churches. And so there's the idea of teamwork that's built into that. And theology. Our theology tends to be very aligned with the denominational theology. We're not here to do theology or to change theology. We're actually here to support, you know, what the church does. So Seventh-day Adventist.

And then church planting movements, that we're looking at multiplication. So the idea of movements is very very important to our mission. And we highly value that.

And then there's a specific place. And that's among unreached, and the idea that if you would take the global population, 7 billion, about 1/3 of that population—it depends on where you look—but 30-40% of the global population is unreached. And that means that they live outside of the reach of the gospel.

**Investigator:** Despite all of the interconnectivity nowadays

**AFM Training Director:** Exactly. And that if I were to reach all my friends and you were to reach all your friends, they still wouldn't be reached because they live outside of those networks, that they're isolated from that. And that can be by geographic, political, economic, racial, social barriers that create those pockets. Religious barriers that create those pockets where people are

unreached.  So if you were to take our mission statement and eliminate all the adjectives it says, 'To establish movements among people groups.'  So at the very core is movements.  So all of our teaching, then, focuses around how do we shape people or how do we equip people to do that?  Does that answer your question?

**Investigator:**  It does.  And as you were speaking, I realized that I had another question that I hadn't put down here.  And it's just from looking at the website, in that I think it's in the disclaimer at the bottom of the website, where it says that AFM does not have an affiliation with the Seventh-day Adventist church.  But then, when it describes what a church planting movement is, the last stage is the transferal.   I can't remember what the name of the stage is, but the stage when the church gets transferred over to the Seventh-day Adventist church.  So how do you have a relationship without being affiliated?  This is more of a technical question.

**AFM Training Director:** No, it's a good question.  Our name is Adventist Frontier Missions.  And Adventist is a registered trademark with the legal entity that is registered with the United States.  So it's actually copyrighted.  So in order for us as an organization that exists as a separate legal entity from the Seventh-day Adventist church, we actually have to have permission from the church to use that.  So we have to have formal permission to use the name Adventist as part of our name.  And part of the agreement, as I understand it, is that we need to have a disclaimer that explicitly states that we're a separate legal entity.  We're not under the jurisdiction of the Seventh-day Adventist church.  Although, indirectly, we have several of our board members who are employees of the Seventh-day Adventist church.  But AFM is a 401-C3, a non-profit organization that is registered with the state of Michigan as a separate legal entity.  And the church could tell us to jump and we would say, 'thank you for your suggestion.'   They have no legal authority over us as a completely separate.  We are considered separate but supporting.  So a supporting ministry is an organization that is funded separately that that has positive relationship with the church and a posture of support of its mission.  So that 's how those two are connected.  We're not affiliated.  We have to say that in order to have that.

**Investigator:** Thank you.  I've been wondering that for months now.  I'd just never asked you.  The next question is, you mentioned the values, the core values as well as the implicit ones.  And I was wondering how you consciously incorporate those into the classes that you teach.

**AFM Training Director:** So we have two ways of doing that.  One is explicitly, and the other is implicitly.  So we have classes on teamwork.  So we're literally going to be training people in teamwork.  We emphasize, model, and coach a posture of humility.  And when we see a need in that area, we work very very diligently with people to cultivate that spirit.

Transparency is, our teaching style is very vulnerable.  So we tell a lot of stories about ourselves and our own journey and our own experiences.  And then with our students we actually foster humility and transparency in terms of addressing things.  So there's a lot of vulnerability that's fostered in the training process. The idea of real.  You know.  We're not looking for people to posture; people need to be free with their stuff and be confronted with who they are.  Because a missionary is basically the DNA, you know, they're taking their DNA.

Reliance, we've done a, I think, probably a better job this year at least, than years gone of nurturing—at least from my perspective, from my own involvement—of nurturing a spirit of reliance through prayer.  It's how we integrate prayer into the overall experience and the way that we lead.  So practicing that.

And then integrity.  There's a lot of talk about how strategy and why we choose to do certain things and not to do certain things.  So for instance, we use 2$^{nd}$ CIRCLE, the acronym; 2$^{nd}$ C-I-R-C-L-E to describe the process that we use for church planting.  So 2$^{nd}$ stands for 2$^{nd}$-coming focus, which implies integrity to last until Jesus comes.  Then the first C stands for connecting with people.  And then I stands for Introducing them to Christ.  Renew their thinking, Cultivate a Christ-centered culture, Leadership development, and then Expect multiplication.  So that paradigm embraces the values.  Those values are inherent in that.  So there's congruence between the strategy and the values.  They mutually support and are enriching.  So training them trains around that.  So to have integrity, rather than just present information, we're actually coaching people, we're actually presenting people with, you know, giving them an opportunity to embrace the gospel by meeting Christ.  There's a process of worldview transformation so that with renewed thinking people begin to see.  If you want to make small changes, you change behaviors.  If you want to make big changes, you change paradigms.  All right?

**Investigator:**  But that's not an easy task.

**AFM Training Director:** Right.  And so what we use in missiology, we don't say paradigms.  We say worldview.  Okay?  So, missions is actually a process of worldview transformation.  And worldview transformation, we understand that worldview is shaped through life experience, how that's interpreted both culturally, through, like "this is what that means" explicitly and implicitly, and our emotional response as a result of that.  And that life experience, interpretation, emotional response, and then encountering new life experience and reinterpretation kind of reinforces how we see and think and respond to life, right?  Well, when you have worldview transformation, that actually is shifted, so that we begin to see the same life experience, but now we interpret it differently, and different emotional response, and different behavior that results from that.  Scripture is actually reshaping that.  The power of God's word and the power of His Spirit are actually reshaping how people experience life, and interrupting a worldview that is not tending towards life, that isn't tending towards the gospel, good news of reconciliation and restoration and salvation and all those things.

The training event that we do, we have several teaching strategies or didactic strategies.  One is, as I shared with you, is very vulnerable.  It's very personal, it's very deep.  We do deep work and we build a lot of trust through the process of going through this together because we're really wanting to address real issues with people because they're the vehicle of the gospel.  And they need to experience the gospel themselves in order to share it.  And not just have like, their cards and they can go read a script to do it.  It's really, we're calling people to live their life, 10 years, 12 years amongst the people group is kind of what we're calling people to do.  So, it's very vulnerable.

The other thing that we do is, our process is designed, rather to be focused on information, it's focused on transformation.  So we're really interested in seeing growth.  Not only thinking, but

behavioral and emotional growth.  Like healing.  I actually want to see that taking place.  So we see training as an immersion experience.  And we use terms like simulator or immersion to describe that once you arrive, everything that you experience, whether it's something at morning, night or noon—the whole experience is designed to embed these values and confront you with issues, you know.  So that's kind of the philosophy of training that's designed to prepare people for a task of frontier, cross-cultural church-planting movement making.  I don't' know.  Does that answer your question, is that helpful?

**Investigator:**  It does, but I have another question to interpolate into the questions I had here, since you used that word earlier this week.  It has to do with, when you were talking about the mission statement, emphasizing the indigenous, but it seems to be slightly incongruous with the thought of changing world view, which is part of the mission statement.  Is there, I don't know, any dissonance between those two concepts?

**AFM Training Director:**  What we believe is that; well, first of all, what happens is that in the first term, the major focus on our missionaries is language acquisition and culture study.  So they get to spend significant time—up to three years—deeply immersed in the process of trying to understand the culture that they're working in.  And here's what we understand.

We understand that every culture is that people group's attempt to answer life's deepest questions.  And so, you've got cultural components.  There's three categories of culture.  The first category is what we would call morally or biblically neutral.  That means that they're just there.  Like, do you eat with your hands or do you eat with chopsticks or do you eat with a fork, or do you drink your food?  Exactly.  So, that's neutral.

The second one is biblically aligned.  So there's actually elements of cultures, every culture has elements that are biblically aligned, that are actually, if you were to take the biblical worldview and overlay it on the culture, you would actually find that there's reinforcement.  For instance, American culture is a post-Judeo-Christian culture, right?  However, there's a lot of Judeo-Christian influence in American culture.  There's a high work ethic; you want to be productive, you want to do something.  And bringing good into the world, like doing good.  And generosity is a huge thing in this culture, right?  Well, this culture is actually tremendously individualistic.  Right?  So people live in relative isolation from one another.  Whereas in other cultures where there may not be the same level of 'let's do good in this world,' there may not be the same level of generosity or expression of generosity, there actually may be a very high regard for elders and respect and honor, which is actually much closer to a biblical world view.  All right?  So the language of honor and the idea of shame is very close to a middle eastern, you know, where we got shaped this way.

Then there's a third dimension.  So there's neutral, there's positive, and then there's a third dimension which is dimensions of culture which are contrary to a biblical worldview.  So there's actually gaps, or it's actually in conflict with a biblical worldview.  So the idea is that when the gospel is introduced, the gospel is good news to every culture.  All right?  And that the places that are not aligned with scripture are not culturally neutral, they're actually places that are inherently destructive within the culture.  For instance, one of the things that Hudson Taylor, no, William Carey was horrified by when he went to India was bride burnings, which was based on a

world view that assumed that if your husband died, then you actually did your husband's family and your family honor, and earned merit by being burned with him. Okay. And so that is based on assumptions about life and death and what happens after you die, and how one sets yourself up for the best possible life after death. All of those are based on assumptions that are not necessarily aligned with scripture, and actually result in tremendous suffering for individuals. So their husband dies and then they are going to die a horrible death, burned alive, basically they're burned alive.

So that would be an example of worldview transformation, where aligned with scripture a loving God. And that person may still wear a Sari, and eat with her hands, and may still speak her local language, build their houses with a certain architecture, greet in a certain way, all of those things which are culturally inherent, but that practice is unbiblical. And so the gospel confronts those things which are destructive within the culture. Now, that doesn't mean to say that you have to become, dress like me and be like me and even think like me in many ways. But there's till good news for them. Many cultures are animistic. That means they live in fear of the spirits. And they live in a world in which you manipulate spiritual realities by using magic. The Bible actually addresses that, and one of the very wonderful things about the gospel to animistic people is that you don't need to be afraid of the spirits; that Christ has given you freedom. Now, they may still live in grass huts and wear grass skirts, and hunt for their food and drink out of rivers. But they're no longer afraid of the spirits because the gospel has described the spiritual reality in a way that actually has a greater level, that's more aligned with the truth that's present in the gospel so that there's no longer fear. Does that help? So that contextualization, the deculturalization, we talk a lot about that because it's easy for me to come from South Africa, for me to come to you in California and say, "you guys don't have it right. You need to become like me in order to become Christian. You need to eat Marmite" and, you know, many of those are culturally neutral elements. So in the past, missionaries have made the mistake of designing worship services and having liturgy and clothing and everything that's aligned with their culture, and they were actually exporting their culture rather than Christianity. And that's what we talk about when it's indigenous.

**Investigator:** Okay. I respect that a lot. It's one of the big questions I've had with evangelism in the last several years.

**AFM Training Director:** And it's something that's so easy to do. And even with our care, we realize that we really have to be vigilant that we're not forcing our culture on people with a sense of cultural superiority. Like, you know, "we're Westerners, and therefore electricity and gasoline and power motors, and laptops, and those are more sophisticated than you and more advanced than you or more intelligent than you." And often, cultures that seem to be more primitive are actually more resilient or more, there's actually some really wonderful things about them that are closer to a biblical world view and that we shouldn't be coming in and changing there. For instance, an example would be weddings. A western wedding is deeply pagan. Except for the pastor and the preaching and the vows before God. Like, all the bridesmaids and grooms and, highly individualistic…but you've got a lot of pagan rites within our weddings. So when we go into another country we don't need to necessarily force that form of marriage on them. Because they may have cultural elements that are biblically neutral. They may not be invoking evil spirits and getting drunk and those kinds of things.

So the question is, how do you parse those out?  That's a huge missiological question.  People debate, and we wrestle with those things, but that's part of our job; part of our professional responsibility to discern our way, pray our way through that.  And the best way to do that is to introduce the gospel to nationals and then walk alongside nationals as they make those decisions. Because then it's owned by, and is an expression of the gospel as it works itself out in their midst, rather than coming from the outside and saying, "this is how we say you should do it," which is definitely not a paradigm of indigenous churches.  It's a paradigm of a foreign invasion. It's a more imperialistic model of missions. So AFM's deeply committed to having Christianity sprout up in a way that the local people say that "God has saved us.  The Creator has saved us. And this is a faithful expression of God's work in our community."

**Investigator:**  Thank you.  So, I think you've already answered my third question, because it was really close to the second one.  It was: what strategies do you use to communicate AFM values to individuals during AFM training?  But we sort of incorporated that into the other, second question.

**AFM Training Director:** Yeah.  So the biggest one is immersion learning, and then we have 3 or 4 didactic environments.  One is the team and how it works together. We have the classroom, and the classroom is a lot of dialogical learning, So we're having conversation around issues, right?  So there's the simulator and how people live together, that's one.  Then there's the classroom and the way that the classroom is structured.  And then the third one is the Crucible. The crucible is immersion learning, but we're actually doing a lot of one-on-one mentoring and coaching, etc.  But the Crucible, what we do is, you know, you're going to be coming on the Crucible, and I'm happy for you—if you can—be a participant observer….The idea is that this is kind of an initiation in our values.  So it's very intense.  It's designed to be a very intense experience.  And we've got structures, but the structures themselves are only servants to what happens between.  It's in the spaces between, that 's where the real learning's taking place, as we interact with.  So we're watching the human interaction, we're watching how people hold up, we're watching emotional responses, how we communicate, and then we're coaching them through that.  There's a lot of impromptu training that's taking place in the crucible.

**Investigator:** I have a sudden question about it because I know that people are encouraged not to discuss it afterwards.  So, should I even go, because if I experience something like that, it would be hard to keep what I've learned or observed out of my writing.  Or I'm sure it would change the way I see things.

**AFM Training Director:** So here's what I think, and we can discuss it.  Our goal, part of the Crucible is unknown.  So, there's certain elements and activities that we do that are supposed to be surprises.  Like people aren't supposed to know.  You know, we've done it long enough and there's enough that's leaked out that people, like, have an idea of kind of what we do and the structure.  But we still have this element of surprise.  People ask us for information about us, and we're like, "well, ask us any question that you like," and we don't tell them anything.  We're just like, 'alright.'  So there's that.  Now, the real Crucible is something that people bring to the Crucible.  It's not what we do.  And that's sacred.  Those are sacred spaces that are very personal.  Now, as a researcher, I would be comfortable with you analyzing and reflecting on the

experience on two conditions.  One, that the personal experiences and the anonymity of the individuals are protected.  And then number two, that it be done in a way that it doesn't compromise the value of the experience by divulging particulars about it.  And I think it's possible that you can do that, because the real value of the Crucible is not in the structure or the suspense that's created.

**Investigator:** It's not a sensational piece that I'm trying to write here.

**AFM Training Director:** Well that's true.  You're trying to get answers and you will notice behaviors that we as coaches exhibit that you could probably document that may be helpful to your objective.  Then of course, if you have questions, I'd be happy to give you feedback in terms of whether or not that language would be considered helpful or not helpful if you've got any questions.

**Investigator:**  Definitely.  Especially that section, I'll let you look it over before I would let other people see it.

**AFM Training Director:**  If you want to attend the whole training, missing the Crucible would really set you back.  Because that, it's 72 hours of intense time.  And that is a major shift.  There's a major shift that takes place in terms of our objectives.  So you would be missing more than 75% of the overall learning experience by not going.

**Investigator:** Wow

**AFM Training Director:** That's what I would say.  You know.  Between 50-70%

**Investigator:** As an ethnographer, I really want to be there.

**AFM Training Director:** Yeah.  And, you know, I can't tell you what you're going to learn.  Because each group's different.  Does that make sense?

**Investigator:** Yeah.  Well, each person is different so you couldn't possibly tell me what I'm going to learn.

**AFM Training Director:** That's true, too.  The curriculum comes to the Crucible, and we discover it together.  That's the thing about the Crucible; it's real life.  So we have space that we create, but it's not the space, it's really the conversation around it that's the classroom.

**Investigator:** I didn't interrupt you when I started asking about the Crucible did I?

**AFM Training Director:** No, you had basically said that you were done because you had answered the third question…

**Investigator:** Okay.  Sometimes I will interrupt people and I am trying not to.

**AFM Training Director:** No, you didn't do that at all.

**Investigator:** Okay.  Excellent.  So then I have the answers to that.  And I'm so glad that we have technology to record it.  Because I can't possible take all of the notes, and I live having eye contact and watching you, so that's really going to help.

(Interruption by Training Director's son)

**AFM Training Director:** All right, well, I hope that was helpful.

**Investigator:** I have one last question.  It's a closed question followed by the open part of the question, which is, do you think knowing the AFM values—I supposed both the explicit and implicit ones, do you think it will help the missionaries in the mission field?  From listening to your talk, it sounds like so, so the following question is if so, how, or if not, why?

**AFM Training Director:** There's two answers to that question I think.

(Interruption by phone call from Training Director's mother)

The values help to create clarity.  And clarity is critical to organizational health, right?  People need to know what their behavioral expectations are.  And I think values need to be deeply aligned with two things.

(Interruption by Training Director's son)

The other thing is, there's actually three things.  One is it helps to create clarity, and people are aware of expectations.  Number two, that our values need to be deeply aligned with our mission.  And I believe that they are.  Number three, and this is a final element that I think is important.  And that is that I think that values need to be aligned with your mission, it's really important that people have clarity.  But there's a truth.  And that is that values really ultimately are defined by the leader, and they're defined by the behaviors—these are core values—are defined by the core behaviors that the leader expects and opposes.  So I've discovered that culture radiates from leadership.  So in order for values to truly be core values, they actually have to be the values of the person with the greatest authority in the organization, which typically is your president, okay?  Does that answer your question?

**Investigator:** It does; that tied together with everything else that you had already mentioned.  I think it really helped going through the mission statement as well.  Of course, the five core values, and the mission statement, and the importance and what you see is a succinct version of what they signify.

**AFM Training Director:** So I think that the clearer people are on their values, the greater the clarity they have around the values, the greater alignment we have in the organization, the better.  It creates a healthier, more cohesion, and moral, etc.

**Investigator:** So by organization are you referring to AFM?

**AFM Training Director:** Yeah, I'm referring to AFM, because then we know what we're expecting and why we're expecting it and so on.  I think it's also fair to say that in terms of AFM, the training department is kind of the guardian of the values.  So in terms of understanding and thoughtfulness, and mindfulness, we spend much more time and energy thinking about and clarifying and defining and reinforcing our values than any other dimension of the organization.  Explicitly.  But, other dimensions of the organization will reinforce them more implicitly.

**Investigator:**  Okay.  That makes sense, because of your function.

**AFM Training Director:**  Right.  So, the President's going to call for a one week/month of prayer and fasting.  He's reflecting the value of reliance.  He's not necessarily going to make the connection explicitly.  We're going to ask people to serve with AFM for 12 years so they can actually deeply establish and nurture, and then once they leave we send them back for five years, once a year, for follow up, after that, with their project.   That's integrity.  But it's implicit.  So that's implicit.  We expect people to learn the language.  And to become life-long learners.  That's implicit; humility.  Then, typically, our individuals go out and work with teams, work with the church, they develop collaborative relationships.  That's one of the expectations, part of their job description.  Developing healthy teams and maintaining them.  That's implicit; teamwork.  And transparency, I mentioned how the President writes a document called the AFM Worldview that basically gives a global perspective of what's going on around the world, and that's an example of transparency.

Or, for instance, I just had a phone call today with some missionaries who, there was a conflict with a donor and concerns and it just got pretty emotional.  So I heard from those missionaries that they were discouraged because they, there were all kinds of questions, etc.  So my response was to say, "let's get together and we'll have a phone call and sort it all out."  So we spend two hours, this morning, of our time, carefully listening to one another, piecing through the details, checking out the gaps, taking ownership for our contributions to the misunderstanding, and the emotional apologizing for the pain, and just restoring trust.  So, you've got several things going on there.  You've got transparency, tell you what it is.  And if you made a mistake, you'll admit it and ask for forgiveness.  We've got teamwork because we're restoring teamwork.  You know, the five dysfunctions of a team, the first dysfunction is a lack of trust.  So we're restoring trust.  And then humility is saying, "we need all people at the table to sort this out and we can have a conversation; we can clear the air."  And it's worth spending $30 on an international phone call to do that.  So that shows that's a value.  That we're willing to invest in that.  Does that make sense?

**Investigator:** Yes, it does.

**AFM Training Director:**  Okay, so we're not going to have as much conversation about values

**Investigator:** But they still guide all behavior.

**AFM Training Director:** That's correct.  I would go even further to say that I think value statements can be modified.  So there's a difference between core values, which are like gravity, they're like principles.  They're there whether you name them or not, because they just have to

be there in order for your organization to accomplish its mission. And they're just there from the present. Okay. So how you name them is different from what they are. I believe that we can shift how we describe them, and we can do that so we can say we want to shift them so that we more accurately describe what we're talking about. So I think the core value itself doesn't change.

**Investigator:** Okay, that leads me to another question, which should be the final question now. Who, then, gave AFM the names for the core values? You had said that they often radiate from leadership. Where do the core values that you currently have come from?

**AFM Training Director:** Yeah. So we had a set of value statements, which would be more like statements of belief. You know, "we have a high value of scripture, we're theologically conservative, we support the Seventh-day Adventist church." Those are all kind of statements, not defining behaviors. And when I joined Adventist Frontier Missions, we were going through a culture crisis in the organization. And one of my tasks was to research—and it wasn't just me, I had an assistant—and we researched how values are shaped in an organization. We realized that core values were important. So we got a group of, our executive team got together, and we wrestled with what would be our statement of values. And our values are actually modeled, the way we structure them are actually modeled after REI. I was doing research on them, and I really loved the way that REI did it. One word, and then a paragraph, a sentence, so that you can remember. So, our founder was the President at the time. He presided over that process. And we kind of hammered out those statements.

**Investigator:** Did you create what you wanted to be, or did you describe what you thought you already were?

**AFM Training Director:** Well, that's a debate within the organization. Core values should describe who you are. And the greater effectiveness with which they do, the more powerful they are. So, I worked with an aviation company to help clarify their values, and we came up with three. They had 10. We came up with three. And when they said them, they were just like, "That's us! That is totally us." Values that, when you describe behavioral values that don't perfectly align with who you are, we talk about aspirational values, not core values, right? And there are some of those that, within the organization, feel are more aspirational than core. But I've felt—and this is partly because I've spent so much time thinking and articulating and teaching those—I think we could really make a fairly strong argument that all of those that we currently articulate them are core values. But you would find, if you spoke with other directors, a person might say, "well, for this reason I think this one is less of a core value and more of an aspirational value."

**Investigator:** It would make sense, though, that the longer that the training is functional, the more that people go through the training, the more they actually becomes a core value, rather than just an aspirational.

**AFM Training Director:** Yeah. So, we've had really horrendous problems with teams. We've come a long way to build high-functioning, healthy teams. Like, a long way towards that. Humility. I think that's, you know, if you're not willing to be humble, you're not going to be an

effective cross-cultural language learner, culture student.  And frontier work is just so difficult it's actually impossible to do; the reason people aren't reached in 2015, after 2,015 years of missions, is because they're really, really resistant to the gospel.  So you need to have humility in order to actually go and engage that, and part of humility is, "I can't.  I have to trust that God wants to do something for these people and that He may be wanting to use me."  Anyway, I see it as much more core.  And I recognize that it's partly because of my own immersion.

**Investigator:**  That makes sense.  Thank you.  I took a lot more of your time than I meant to, but thank you so much.

**AFM Training Director:** You're very welcome.  I think you're going to enjoy being immersed in the process.  I think you will.  I hope it's a blessing to you, beyond your research.

TRANSCRIPT OF FOCUS GROUP #1

**August 4, 2015**

**Investigator:** This is Caralin McHan and it's August 4, and we're doing a focus group. I have nine questions that I would like to get your take on, but you don't have to give an answer to everything. So if a question I ask doesn't really connect with you, you don't have to answer. But if you do have something to say, I would suggest that you say it. And the reason for focus groups is so that you can bounce ideas off of each other. There might be something that one of you remembers that somebody else doesn't. The first question that I have is, I want to know what values are of Adventist Frontier Missions?

**Focus Group:** I would say integrity is one of them. Another one is vulnerability.

I would add transparency.

Service. Serving people—the needs of people.

Community.

Relationships—building relationships, healing relationships. To establish movements is one of them, I would say. Establish movements.

Giving people more than friendship.

Christ-centered model is one of their values.

**Investigator:** Is there anything else?

**Focus Group:** Uh, Cultural sensitivity.

Contextualizing, Christianity that will fit their culture, their ideas.

Adaptivity, Adaptability.

**Investigator:** All right, I'm going to go to the next question. It's whether or not you think it's important for missionaries to act according to a specific set of values (say AFM values). And why or why not?

**Focus Group:** Could you ask the question again?

**Investigator:** Yeah. Do you think it's important for missionaries to act according to a specific set of values? Why so or why not?

**Focus Group:** I would say that they should act according to Christian values, and I believe that they're all the same.

**Investigator:** The reason being?

**Focus Group:** The Bible. That's where we get them from.

Do you mean kind of there are a set of values that are right –if you think that there are certain set of values that are right to have as a missionary and there are those that are not compared to "it doesn't matter at all?" Is that the question?

**Investigator:** I suppose it comes from a basis of believing in values, so everyone has some sort of values that you value but you prioritize them. So I suppose I'm asking if it's important to have a specific prioritization of certain values.

**Focus Group:** At the same hierarchy of values.

I think if you are on a team it's really important because you need to have the same hierarchy of values as other people on your team. Whether the missionaries in Africa and those in Asia need to have the same hierarchy. . .like obviously they'll be similar if it's Christian but whether or not they need to be the same, it's not important particularly… but I think with any team, within a project, they need to be similar, especially within an organization.

Yes. The same with similar principles, they can differentiate in the ways that they are expressed based on the culture and the way people are used to grow up but the value and the principle in itself should be the same, otherwise you'll be pulling in different directions and won't be a team anymore.

I mean, as far as all the values that we named, I would say those are important values to go by, pretty much whether you're a missionary or not.

**Investigator:** Yeah. So my next question is sort of linked to this last one that I asked. It's if you think that knowing the values of AFM or Adventist Frontier Missions will help you in the mission field.

**Focus Group:** Yes.

Yeah, yes.

Yes, it makes you come from the same direction as the people you're working with—it just aligns everything.

And you don't want to be a part of an organization that you may not agree, because you are a representative not just--of course, first of all representatives of Christ, but the organization also has a place to play— 'cause they will associate you with that.

It avoids misunderstanding.

And even if there are differences to the values AFM gives us here, it even gives to the people you are working with, even then they are valuable. They will help us even to bridge differences, if there are any.

**Investigator:** OK. I know you've mentioned a couple reasons why it's important to have similar set of values, so then what does it look like. I'm hoping for a couple examples of what it would look like for someone to act according to the values of AFM.

**Focus Group:** I mean, you will be able…adaptability is one of the values. Of course different cultures, and I'm speaking for myself. Different cultures have different values. So you can't take one value, and say, vulnerability to one people group—that, they don't do that, can't do that. So you have to adapt. You know what I mean? If they're not vulnerable, you can't be vulnerable to that magnitude. You have to respect their culture, 'cause you might offend them. If that makes any sense.

Or the value about being Christ-centered value. For example if you go to a certain people group and, you cannot come there with the opportunities that you have and try to teach them with the tools that they might not have. So, for example, if they don't have Ellen White books translated, you are not going to use those books because they don't' have access for that. It's basically, you're looking at Christ how he was doing his mission work and we see that he was mingling with people, serving to their needs, living *their* life and actually living one of the most difficult lives, so that people who are poor, people who are struggling can also relate to him. So they live—what I appreciate about AFM values, they live the life of the people and this is how they show that their values go together with the theory and practice.

AFM's values are based on the gospel. When we live by the values of AFM, especially adaptability and culture sensitivity, we're living the gospel we preach.

**Investigator:** I recognize that.

**Focus Group:** I know, but it's really cool. I've thought a lot about it. It would look like. . . We've been here for two weeks. Essentially, we've learned to live by a lot of AFM's values. And things have kind of gone, you know, streamlined. Like, when we got here, we were really random; we did random things, we left random things undone. And now we're doing them and everything kind of flows together and meshes.

**Investigator:** I've noticed that and I'm not even living here, but I'm starting to live my life differently.

**Focus Group:** When you put food color into water. You get one color at the end. It's not a whole bunch of little different sparse bits. I don't know. It's very—I don't know…

**Investigator:** I like that. My next question is: What do you think is the most effective method that AFM has used to communicate the values that they have—so the ones you listed at the beginning.

**Focus Group:** They live them.

Yeah. Leading by example.

They are vulnerable with us and explain their past mistakes so we can learn from them. That's, I believe that's where they get a lot of their values from. Experience.

But also this is the values what you're going to live by. They set up the principle behind it—and maybe don't even tell you what the value is, but the principle and everything is so clear that you form that value almost subconsciously.

Yeah, I agree. Like learning from experiences. Not telling you, this is what the value is or the goal is, but you are figuring it out in the process of the conversation--
--Discovery--
--Yeah, discovery method.

They provide us with opportunities to learn by discovery such, as the crucible.

**Investigator:** When was a moment when one of the values that AFM has just clicked for you like an aha moment? If there were any.

**Focus Group:** I think the vulnerability value really clicked for me when what's-her-name decided that she couldn't do the upper body stuff anymore, on crucible. Just like her being vulnerable and realizing that, as a team, someone, if you have an issue, you need to say something about it and be vulnerable it for the sake of the whole team. And if she hadn't ever said anything about it, it would have hurt the team as a whole. And it just kind of hit me, and I was like, Oh OK, this is what it's about. Especially since I was raised, I just grew up, developed this thing of not being vulnerable with people. So yeah, it was cool.

A similar experience when someone was telling about his life story and made himself really vulnerable just by telling how much he appreciates this group and that he never had this before, and just to feel and see what it created in our group—
--the atmosphere—
--and in myself too.

One of them that clicked with me is on the unspoken crucible event. One of the biggest things that they spoke about before the crucible was, you have to be a good follower to be a leader or you have to listen first to really understand people in that sense. In that process of the crucible,

whatever we did in that crucible helped me understand that following is, being a good follower is sometimes more important than being a good leader.

**Investigator:** Were there any other moments when something just made sense—either in the classroom or outside the classroom? No? OK. So the next question is somewhat related, but I'm asking: What, if anything that happened has persuaded you to act or to change your behavior based on the values of AFM? Does that make sense to you, the question?

**Focus Group:** What caused us to change?

Like something which you did not agree before with and then you said, Oh, ok, this makes sense, I'll change my ways. Like that?

**Investigator:** Perhaps, although most of the things, I would imagine, that you listed you already believed in but perhaps you might change the way you behave. Or what, if anything, has persuaded you that you want to act a certain way?

**Focus Group:** For me a lot of this transparency, vulnerability and the way, how they teach us and live it—how to solve differences between each other, just made me aware how important this will be in the coming year. And I think I'm much more aware of it than I would be without the training. And also for me, I took a position I wanted. And I want to do everything that I can do, even though it costs me a lot of effort, to be that transparent –to make myself vulnerable.

Hearing the stories and examples from their own personal experience about how missionaries have come in in the past and not identified with the people but kind of kept themselves separate, and just hearing the results of that and real life examples really stuck out to me. Especially since I've already been in the other culture for a short amount of time. Like, I've seen in myself, how I've actually been making some of those mistakes. And realizing oh, ok, this is what I need to change because it's causing a gap between me and the people that I want to reach out to.

I also think just hearing their life stories and all what they were able to give up for God's sake made me value, like we take a second look at how much do I really value what I believe? Am I really ready to give up totally everything for God if he was to call me to do that? Not saying that everyone will have to do that. Give up their family, house, I don't know…anything that God might require you to give up in practice. So that's kind of…I've thought about it—how much do I really value God?

**Investigator:** I feel like all of you have a greater advantage in learning and putting in to practice what's being taught just because of living together and being with each other almost 24/7. So I was wondering if you've had experiences or if you've learned anything about AFM and their values outside of the classroom experience, when I'm not around.

**Focus Group:** We do the shopping together. Groceries for 18 people….

**Investigator:** It might be hard to think of because it's not direct, so you can take a moment to think.

116

**Focus Group:** Well, the discipleship and the listening and the learning conversations and we did that at lunch last Thursday, but we didn't have time to get through everything, so we did it by ourselves Thursday night and just like you're learning, you're practicing on your own. AFM doesn't say these are our values and we're going to help you instigate them and we're going to keep helping you instigate them. They say, these are our values, now it's up to you. It's discipleship. They're teaching you how to do it on your own.

So you saw the way they ask us to put in practice what we learn inside of a group without their interference.

And then they give us feedback, and affirmation and just really help us along the way.

Does the picnic count—like the potluck?

**Investigator:** Yeah

**Focus Group:** I think involving us in other events or suggesting us to help out with these other kinds of community events and just helping, involving us—still giving us leadership roles, it's kind of hard to explain, but just working together and being able to see how this is something that—seeing them live out their values and involving us in that with simple things like a picnic, just reaching out to the community. And doing fun things with them without any pressure. You know. Just having fun and mingling. I saw a lot of their values being laid out even just in that simple event.

They are just making friends without looking at results per se.

They like to, after an experience, either good, bad, or anything, they like to step out and say, OK what did we learn from this?--
--Debrief--
--They like to debrief everything which is very good, which is very good because you get to sit back and think about it.

True. Which is important because in this culture everything is rushed, rushed, and you just get to step away.

There have been times when I'm like, You've got to debrief this? Do we really need to debrief this? Then I'm like, OK, we'll just do it. Even if I didn't really learn anything from it, someone else did.--
--Then you learned--
--Then I learned--
--From the experience.

Some of the thoughts to me also is just to see how present the AFM staff is outside from classes; whatever, events, evenings. They are sacrificing a lot of their time for just being present. Also

making a connection to us. They are just very, they are close to us.  It's not kind of a they are somewhere up top and we are here.

One of the staff came through yesterday and passed out ice pops to everybody who wanted one. And it's just, I don't know. Yeah, it's a piece of frozen juice. But--
--It says something relationships---
--It says something. Yeah.  And the fact that another one of them is taking the time to actually read our journals…like some of us that's on page 200, it's like a lot. But taking the time to do that, and critiques spelling mistakes or grammar, and then writing little notes. And like if he was talking too fast and you missed something in your notes, he writes it in, "Hey, you missed this" You know?  And then at the end he writes you an encouraging note:, "I really enjoyed reading your work.  Or whatever.  This is what you can work on." And that takes him a lot of time. And he's just wanting to make sure that we're getting it, that we're keeping up, and that we understand the principles.

You can see he doesn't just look over it but actually reads it--
--He actually reads it.  Like, I mean, most teachers don't take time to read your whole paper, probably.

**Investigator:** I'm a teacher.  I read the whole paper.

**Focus Group:** So that was a gross assumption. But probably some just read the first page and the last page.  You can put filler in the middle.  They don't know the difference.  I haven't done that-- my relatives did that.

**Investigator:** That's awesome. Have any of you had the one-on-one session yet? No?

**Focus Group:** I am tomorrow.

**Investigator:** Yeah, I'm not until next week. But I don't know if any of our answers would change after having that session.

**Focus Group:** The 1:1 session, though, says a lot about them too.  Like, they're taking the time.

A Lot—
--I know!  That's a lot of time--
--An hour each--
--That's probably going to be like 20 hours of his time.  That's a lot. That's half of a workweek—
--More than an hour--
--That's almost a whole day—
--Day and night

And it just reinforces their value of friendship, and time, adaptability and—
--Valuing people—

--Valuing people.  Discipleship.  You know, making that connection.  Being available.  Living the gospel they preach. Christ had time. I think in many ways, here at training, they're showing us, doing for us what they want us to do for others.

They say by actions and explicitly, too.  They say, if I'm successful, then you will continue doing that.

**Investigator:** My next question, there' two ways you can read it. And I don't care which way you read it as long as you sort of tell me which.  The question is, Are there other values you think should have been emphasized more during training?  So that would be values you think would be necessary for the field or values you think that AFM should have, or on the flip side, values you think they have already that they aren't talking about.  Do the two parts of that question, or one of them make sense to you?

**Focus Group:** So you're asking, does AFM have any values, or is AFM lacking any values that we believe should be in the value system, or does AFM have values that we would like to reinforce?

**Investigator:** So they are ones they talk about that I identify, "Oh, that's that value, or that value." But are there others that they have that they never talk about that maybe should be acknowledged.  So that's the other part of the question.

**Focus Group:** I kind of don't think so.

I mean that's really thinking outside the box. I don't know if I could…

They're really big on communication. And so, a lot of their, I mean…yeah, as far as I know…

But if you don't have communication, everything else is going to go down the drain.  Like, it's like the root of, like, teamwork; the root of learning, everything in a lot of ways.

So I'm just saying it's hard to think of anything because they're so big on communication.

**Investigator:** I'm not saying there *are*. I put together these questions before the training ever started. I wasn't quite sure what the experience here would be.

No, I think they're pretty on track. AFM is the most on track organization I've ever dealt with.

I can second that.

**Investigator:** Wow

**Focus Group:** They practice what they preach and they don't have stupid rules.

I can agree with that.  And I really like rules.

It's true!  There's a reason behind their rules.  Like some rules, like, let me think of one.  No running through the sprinkler during PE class. Or no swimming in the pond except during free time. Like they just --

--They don't have those--

--No having a telephone in your room.  You're not allowed to wear skinny jeans with boots, even though you have boots on and you can't tell they're skinny. But you'd be able to tell they weren't skinny because then they'd bunch up.  But there are little things where you're like, I don't know, and AFM's rules they're just like, you know, cover yourself up.

I would say they just give you principle, and then….basically they don't dictate you.

Right.  They show you a lot of trust--

--They teach the principle behind it, though

--And they leave it up to you, which is actually a really big risk, but they leave it up to us to enforce the principles that they teach.

That's the point. A lot of times in the Bible we don't find exact rules. God gives us principles. If you have the principle you know how to apply it to many different situations. You won't be able to find a rule to cover every situation.

But AFM, like some organizations teach rules. They have a rule book and this is what you go by. But AFM's like, these are our principles and if you can get a hold of their principles, you're not going find yourself saying, "What am I going to do?"  It just covers everything, I think.

**Investigator:** I have one last question that I thought of after you were talking. But part of what I'm trying to get at is what persuades people to learn a value.  Because you can just sit in a classroom and have somebody tell you something, but in order to actually want to change your behavior a little bit more has to happen, and so I've asked you a little bit about that. About what has persuaded you. But I'm also curious what type of learners you are.  Some people have categorized them as kinetic learner or audio learner. But what most helps you learn something— if you've thought about it before?

**Focus Group:** So the question is what helps us learn or what motivates us to want that value?

**Investigator:** You could answer both of them, because it was sort of asking both of those in the question.

**Focus Group:** I think, just seeing how their values played out in their own lives and giving us practical examples, it shows me how it improves the quality of their life and so it makes me think, oh, well, it's probably going to improve the quality of my own life, too.

**Investigator:** OK

**Focus Group:** You can see it played out.  You see that it's an attractive thing. You think, that's what I want.

I mean they have values that are inherently good.  But the whole reason we're here is to reach people. And to know that they have acquired values from experience and they have adopted new things for the sake of reaching people, I admire that.

**Investigator:** So that the values are linked to their mission.

**Focus Group:** Yeah, reaching people.

If you're referring just to learning styles and methods, I think the discovery method learning when you learn for yourself—it's not someone telling you. It's not them just saying it, but you discover it for yourself, through experience, basic hands-on, like games, just everyday practice living.  Then you learn it for yourself.  That's the method—the learning style maybe.

Right.  And even through, just like the leadership roles that they gave us at the beginning, for cooking and worships and everything, those are more opportunities for us to discover what kind of values work well with this kind of group and what will work well in the field too.

**Investigator:** Well, thank you so much for helping me. I really do appreciate it. Because I have my own take and my own perception of what works, but it really will help to see how all of you were affected by their training methods.

APPENDIX J

TRANSCRIPT OF FOCUS GROUP #2

**August 5, 2015**

**Investigator:** This is Caralin McHan, Focus Group #2. And, I'm, again, very thankful that you're helping me with this. I'm just really excited. From some of the things that I heard yesterday, hearing reflected some of the things that I have experienced here in training. But also some different things. Because I know I'm just one individual and you perceive things a little bit differently. The first question that I have here is, what are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?

**Focus Group:** Teamwork. Do we have to go in a certain order of us talking?

**Investigator:** Any order. If a question doesn't resonate with you, you don't even have to answer it. If one really does, you can talk a long time.

**Focus Group:** Okay. Got it. Service

Humility, Cultural Awareness

Obedience. We talked about obedience to God.

Spiritual Growth

There's a lot there. It's just hard. It's like if someone asks you what your favorite song of hymn. Then you're like, I had a ton until you just asked me.

**Investigator:** Well, if you think of one later on in one of the other questions, you can pop out and say, oh, this is was another value.

**Focus Group:** Well I would still say, like, multiplication, but it seems like—
--Yeah, but is it a value?--
--yeah, I think so: be fruitful and multiply—
--yeah, I think so—
--multiplication—
--multiplication

Oh, discipleship. That kind of triggered…

**Investigator:** All right. And do you think it's important for missionaries to act according to a specific set of values?

**Focus Group:** If they're with that organization, I think so.  Because you don't want to work outside the values that the organization as a whole has, because I think you could do more harm.

Well, it will help a team function, if they have the same values and know of these values—
--right—
--So it just makes everything easier.

**Investigator:** Okay.  And then, brining it home, bringing a little bit more personal, my next question is: Do you think that knowing the values of Adventist Frontier Missions will help you when you're in the mission field?  And if so, why?  And if not, why not?

**Focus Group:** Definitely yes from me.  Why?  Because, don't ask why, but I was thinking about the "ready, aim, fire" this morning.  I don't know why.  I was like, I guess there's 3 commands there: And I guess one is the readiness; and then the aim is so you're not just like, 'phew', going in like any direction; and then the firing is the actual launching out.  And I was thinking of its relation to missions, and what we're doing here.  We're doing the ready and aim at the moment.  And I think it's, I've experienced mission experiences where there wasn't much aim, there was just a lot of zealousness,  "phew" do something, you know, like, just hit something.  But it didn't work out that well.  'Cause you lose motivation and a sense of direction very quickly.  So, this….what was the question again? The values?

**Investigator:**  Do you think knowing the values of AFM will help you in the field?

**Focus Group:** Yeah, they will, because it's very set aiming at what they value and what they're here for.  And being saturated in that before is, it makes you feel very calm as opposed to just, 'cause it's just like that aiming, the crosshairs, and being, "that's where we're headed."

It gives you clear direction as to where to stay.  Like, you know, to keep on the analogy,  if you're aiming, you could aim, but you may not see what you're aiming at.  Whereas having the values, you can clearly see where you're going.  If that even makes sense.

Yeah.  To me, it's just very relevant.  All the values that we're being taught, they're very relevant for what we'll be encountering in the field.  So they're very helpful, I think.

**Investigator:**  Okay, and then to flesh that idea out a little bit more, I was wondering: what does it look like for someone to act according to Adventist Frontier Missions values?

**Focus Group:** Well, that's a tricky one in my mind, because I have a pretty set idea of like, that, you could recognize it quickly if someone is living according to the values, or missionaries were.  But they're not…a lot of the values that they are instilling here are not cookie-cutter makers; they're principle-makers.  And we're sent out into so many different countries and cultures that one of the values that they have is to make us be aware and be able to function within a principle set rather than be like, are you telling a line and all of these things that we told you.  I don't know if that's just muddying the waters, but maybe just the values of principle-driven action.  And that would slightly affect, if you were to meet them in different countries.

**Investigator:** It does change. It's interesting, 'cause I create all these questions before ever starting the training, so I was thinking, 'cause in the original question I had 'give an example,' but you were just saying there that there isn't an example, or there would be way too many examples.

**Focus Group:** Right, right. It would be hard to quantify and be like, 'This is an AFM missionary." But you could hear their story and feel resonance with it, with the knowledge that we are given here. You would either resonate with, yeah they're actually putting into action the values we're being taught here; or you would get a feeling of, not, no, you know. So it is something somewhat experiential and story-based because the experiences are different depending upon culture and—
--As an example of that, I've recently starting reading the, I think it's called "True…" I can't even think of the name of it. But, by Elizabeth Elliot, who was the wife of
--Maybe it's Gates of Thunder—
--That's the one. Jim Elliot was her husband. And he was one of the missionaries in Ecuador that was killed by the Oga Indians…I'm not sure how to pronounce the tribe name. But as I was reading the description of what Jim and Ed McNulley started doing at the beginning, I was like, they're not Adventist, but they portray the AFM missionary values. Like, I could totally see them as being AFM missionaries. Even though that's not who they were at the time. –
--They had a lot of the same values--
--They had a lot of the same values so I think, like so-and-so was saying about how it's difficult to describe what a missionary would look like, it's easy to recognize them once you see them. But it's harder to quantify.

Yeah.

It's very difficult to say, okay, check, check, check, check, check , and AFM missionary would have all these things. It's more like , oh yeah, I can see it in their life. I can see what they're doing. I can see, and *that's* it. And, yeah.

**Investigator:** Anyone else want to add anything?

**Focus Group:** I know what you're saying.

**Investigator:** Okay, so let me move on. I'm moving away from the effect and importance of values and on to how it's actually trained here at AFM. So my question is: what do you think is the most effective method that AFM has used to communicate their values, either to the group or to you as an individual?

**Focus Group:** Well, they practice what they preach. And I'm thinking of like, learning conversations, penguin circles, things like that. It's all things they model for us, train us to do, and then teach us so we can do it on our own. So, that's really good.

For me personally, the stories. I mean, the lectures and giving the dos and don'ts, per se. I mean, like, the description of what things they wanna teach us is great, and it helps. But it's

when they provide a story that exemplifies that, that really solidifies it in my mind more.  Like, oh, that's what you meant!

That kind of connects to our last point that we just made.  The fact that they give principles, but then they give stories from different contexts to illustrate.  They're very…kind of what she said.  They're very action-oriented.  So, in fact, they almost feel as if it's a failure when they've only told us a principle and not given us a practical moment to see if we know what to do with it.  So we are allowed to mention Crucible?

**Investigator:** mmhmm

**Focus Group:** So, the Crucible is a very packed time, number of days when they fit in as many as the things they've covered as possible—and maybe even add some stuff they haven't covered yet, but that they're going to cover—and they're really conscientious about never letting a activity go by without reinforcing it then with debriefing and talking, which has been very helpful for me, because I wouldn't have gotten probably 75% of the gain from Crucible if we hadn't had constant constant constant debriefing and talking and digging into the hard stuff.  Like, "how'd that make you feel?  What was going on here?  Who was the leader?  How did you react to that?  What if you were the leader?  How would you have reacted?  I mean, it's putting the work in, honestly.  It's putting the work in to get the benefit from all the activities and all the things that are putting it into our minds; they are brining in almost every learning style possible.  So, yeah.

And everything they say and do, like, going back to the Crucible.  Everything they said, everything they did had a very specific purpose behind it.  You know, even with  just, I don't know, the smallest minutest act that they may have done was for a reason.  There was always a purpose behind everything they did.  And I think that even goes back to our lessons.  Everything they teach us.  There's a purpose, there's a reason for them teaching those things.  And the stories that they give.

Sorry, I know I've talked a lot.  The fact that they didn't even, they didn't right up front tell us 'everything we do has a purpose' in the first experience, was a purpose in itself because it taught us—we caught on.  And we realized, everything has a purpose, a learning purpose.  I just have to start looking at them, and seeing them, and catching them.  And so then they didn't have to start proclaiming it every time.  You started just gleaning, and that's one of the values that they're trying to instill in us, is to look for the learning activities, when there's not going to be someone leading or debriefing.  Or, you start just automatically…they're teaching you a process, to actually learn in the field.  And to take any kind of experience that you have, whether it feels like a failure or a success, and say, "there's probably something in this that I need to dig out."  And that's really helpful.  It's the teaching a person to fish, not just forking over a fish.

**Investigator:** You kind of mentioned this a little bit in talking about some of the things that you've experienced, but I was wondering if there was a specific moment where something clicked for you and you had an aha moment where you just understood one of the values that they were trying to get across?

**Focus Group:** Yeah. A lot. So many that I'm hoping that I'm not going to start forgetting them. Yeah. Many times there were aha moments. You're probably wanting me to illustrate one, which is…um…that's the silence. It's me going "oh…."

**Investigator:** True. My actual question said: describe a moment; not do you have one.

**Focus Group:** There have been a couple in class, where I'm following but not getting it, and then…the teachers seem in tune to that. I can see them just scanning our faces. And when, and they keep trying new ways. They'll sometimes even stand up and start talking in different voices and illustrating it with a story or a quote. Imagine…grabs somebody and like, "okay, stand here with me, and we're gonna pretend that we're wheat, and, you know, what are our roots doing right now? Look where our feet our." And there have been moments where I've just, like, it's been drop the pen, hit the table. "What?!" I got it! Like, that's amazing! And certainly the Crucible….oh, am I allowed to tell that? I can't be specific, but there was an activity—

**--Investigator:** You can, here. I will edit it out, and take out the theme and the concepts that you're talking about.

**Focus Group:** Oh okay. I apologize for all your editing. But, the hoola-hoop was a moment where it was really like "phhhhh" you know. 'Cause I was like, oh we do it again. Ahhh. They just started running out of activities. They're just trying to, like, make it really intense the last day. And so I was, like, okay, well, and um….no! Everything has a purpose. Everything does. And so here we are at the tail end, and we have to do this again, and then it works. And there's not a whole lot of talking. There's just a lot of encouragement going around. It's quiet. We're in tune with each other. And it works! And that was a really impactful moment for me because I was like, "how many things that I'm learning right now are going to follow the same route?" I mean, me totally not getting it at first, and not really getting the import of it, really. And then it just going, "oh man! I get it now! And if my team can focus and work together and kind of quite the voices and just encourage each other, and use the tools that we've been given, God's going to be able to bless. And we're going to get something done for His glory. And that was powerful for me.

**Investigator:** For me it's been a bit watching other people. So, one of the aha moments for me was the "failure is not a person; it's an event." And I heard it in class, and I thought, "oh, that's so amazing!" And I wrote it down, and then I went and journaled about it that night. But it didn't make sense until I saw it happen. And I don't really—it was probably on the crucible somewhere—but I don't remember the specific event. But I remember someone doing something where they thought they were failing, and then either they or someone else saying, "well, it's not a person; it's an event." And seeing the whole team just accept that person…and so seeing the concept in action was just, "Oh!"
**--Focus Group:** Yeah--
**--Investigator:** "That's what it means! " So I had understood what it meant, but I didn't understand what it feels like. And I suppose it's that feeling that was the aha moment for me.

**Focus Group:** That's really cool.

**Investigator:** Any other aha moments?

**Focus Group:** It's not really an "aha" aha, but, sorry, did I cut you off?--
--no, no no!—
--Smiling--
--I was just smiling—
--You're always smile!  Anyways, sorry.  It wasn't so much an aha moment, like, I don't know.
I don't know how to explain it.  But, anyways, when we were on the discussion of, like the
learning conversations.  And as civilians, we run from fire.  We run from conflict.  We run from,
you know, confrontation, whatever.  But as Christians, or as firemen, we're supposed to run *to* it.
You know?  And, I think that whole analogy of running to the fire, running to the conflict,
running to the confrontation instead of running away from it was pretty, like, wow.  'Cause I'll
be the first to admit that I hate conflict.  I hate confrontation.  And I will do whatever it takes to
avoid it.  But if we're going to have a healthy team, you can't do that.  You have to.  Because if
one fireman decides, "oh, I'm not going to go in to the fire today because I'm afraid of it," well,
the whole team shuts down.  You know?  You need all of the firemen to be able to put the fire
out.  So, in that sense, as a Christian, we need all of us to go together to put the conflict out.   The
fire out.  And that was just…

Yeah.  Mmhmm

**Investigator:** My next question here is just, it's going to sound a little bit like some of the other
questions I've asked, but I'm trying to get a little, a different perspective.  So the question is:
what, if anything, has persuaded you to enact AFM's core values?  And what I'm looking at
there is motivation, not necessarily learning techniques.  Does that make sense?

**Focus Group:** Perhaps…

Can you say that again?

**Investigator:** Yeah.  What's persuaded you to actually act or change your behavior to reflect
their values?  Not necessarily to understand them, but to act on it.  So the motivation.

**Focus Group:** I like how they'll get fired up about what they're teaching.  And, like, you can
really just see, like, on their faces, like, it actually matters to them.  Or when [the trainer's]
telling a story, you can see, like, you know it brings emotions and stuff like that.  And it just
really, like, makes you want to buy in to what they're saying.

**Investigator:** Yeah, that makes a lot of sense.

**Focus Group:** Could you repeat the question again?

**Investigator:** Yeah.  That one was about the motivation.  What's persuaded you to actually act
or try to assimilate their values into your life.

**Focus Group:** I'm coming back to the learning conversation. I've just seen—and also heard before—but just seen it here, that it works. And, it motivated me to try it more, and I've had one of those conversations with my Dad since, and…it was really hard, and he needed practice, but I just know that it's…you know. They told us that it doesn't make it easy; it makes it easier. And, that's how I experienced it, too. So…

**Investigator:** Did you tell your dad the rules before you started?

**Focus Group:** No. Not really. Yeah, it was different than..yeah—
--I think you were using them—
--Yeah, I was trying to use the rules—
--Yeah, yeah, definitely

Is this motivation that we've received here, specifically? I'm guessing…

**Investigator:** It wouldn't have to be.

**Focus Group:** Because a lot of the motivation for me is what I brought with me here. I was really motivated to be here. From what I knew about them. Obviously my understanding of their values is comparable to, like, it's gone from a kiddie pool to the ocean. But it's only been a greater revelation of what I already knew them to be. Because they're very transparent. That's one of their values. I know it because they talk about it, a lot. Transparency. They're very transparent. They don't make it hard to know what they're about. And my motivation, a love for people, and a love for how my life's been changed, and that combined to feeling a resonance with their aim and their values, so that drew me here. And then that same motivation has continued and only been fired by the way they live out the gospel here…in their lives. They're very interactive with us. It's not a classroom; we go to classes but it doesn't feel like a classroom, it feels like a community, which is another one of their values. Sorry, that's kind of popping in right now. But, they're teaching us to have community preach the gospel, and kind of like what she said, or he said, maybe both of them, actually. I don't know what I'm talking about. But…maybe it was her. Essentially---
---It doesn't matter--
--It doesn't matter, but essentially they are exhibiting what they're saying, in their life. And that can't help but motivate. Just add to the motivation. Multiply it. I mean, you start ending up with, "woah….it's call connected!" Anyway, I can't…you start going around a tree because there's like, "ah, that connects to this…"

**Investigator:** The two questions, I'll say them both now, and then if I need to repeat them I can. But the first one is: What have you learned about AFM values outside of the classroom experience? And then the second on is: Are there any other values that you think should have more in training? So that would either be values that AFM has that they haven't talked about, or values that you think should be AFM values. So it's that one, and then the first one was: what have you learned about AFM values outside of the classroom experience?

**Focus Group:** Would the Crucible be outside of the classroom experience?

**Investigator:** I considered that inside. I think outside being the mornings and the evenings when you're hanging out.

**Focus Group:** I think when it comes to teamwork, I think as a whole team, outside of the classroom we still tried to function as a team. You know. If somebody's supposed to be on cleanup duty, and they can't, somebody else will be there to help out. Or, you know, we work together to make sure things are done. You know. And people aren't able…if people don't know that it's time to eat, we try to go out and say, "hey, come eat." And so, making sure that the team is still taken care of as a team.

They emphasize life as a classroom so much that it honestly doesn't blip on my screen when I walk in and out of class. Because when you're in class, it's particularly, like, structured, but when we're—like she said—meal times, we're continuing the things we're learning: teamwork, the atmosphere of community. When we're on our own, we're often working on things that they are encouraging us to value: quiet time with God, listening to God, journaling our thoughts, unpacking things, having fun together—that's a value that they really promote. I mean, honestly everything is tied in. It's just a living out rather than just a, you know, "this is my note-taking time and my time that I listen." And on a somewhat trivial level, but it's not trivial at all, they really like games that teach lessons. They love them. Like, pickle ball. That's been used in our classroom lectures so much. And yet, we love it and do it on break. Our Sabbath afternoon picnic games. Yeah. We have a good time, but everything…yeah. There's a lot of lessons being taught, or just enjoyed.

**Investigator:** All right, so I guess the last question, then, is about values. And I'm not saying there are, I'm just wondering what your thoughts are. So it's if you think values should have been emphasized, either because AFM has them and just doesn't talk about them explicitly, or because they're values that the organization should have that they don't.

**Focus Group:** This is going outside the box a little bit, but this is what popped to mind for me. There's values that they're not, super, talking about all the time. And mainly that's just the foundation that we're all built on, which is the values of the Seventh-day Adventist church. Like, they enter in, but they are focusing on specific aiming values. So these are just kind of, they're not diminished as much as they're just foundational. Like, I know that they are AFM's values. They talk about how unity with the world church is definitely like front and center, but they don't take a whole lot, that's not their purpose of existence. They aren't a Bible college. They aren't—I don't know if I can say names of other Bible colleges—
--**Investigator:** I don't think it makes a difference—
--**Focus Group:** Okay. They're not Arise. They're not AFCO. They're AFM. And so, that's the only thing I can think of. The values that they definitely stand for but they definitely don't necessarily talk about all the time are mainly those. But I don't feel that they're neglected. It's just , that's not what we're here for. We're here for a purpose, to focus on developing these values that are pertinent and important for what we're wanting to do.

What she said.

**Investigator:**  Yeah, it makes a lot of sense, that those are more the assumed values.  You're here, which means you already agree to this other set of values—

--**Focus Group:** Right—

--**Investigator:** And so we're going to focus on—

--**Focus Group:** Yeah.  Definitely.  And I appreciate—personally.  I'm speaking for myself, obviously.  But, I'm fine with them doing that.  In fact, I appreciate them having respect for our time.  Of, we're here for a month.  Which is a lot of time.  But they pack everything, they pack it like a well-packed suitcase.  Like, nothing's just thrown in, like, "oh, since we're talking about it, lets just talk about, you know, everything's.."  Yeah.  Absolutely.  I feel respected by them packaging their values and the things that they know that we're gonna need.  They're packing our values suitcase for us before we leave or are getting launched out of the country.  And I think they're doing it well and wisely.

They wouldn't have even chosen us if we didn't already have the other values.  And I don't think…personally, I can't think of any other value outside of the ones that we've already been learning about  that would need to be… I can't, but—

--**Investigator:** Honestly, I don't know if are.  Again, these questions I wrote before the training started.—

--**Focus Group:** Right.  I mean, they teach us to be, like, growing always.  So will there one day?  Yes, probably.  But AFM is a growing institution.  They already are very transparent about how they have grown since they started, you know?  They are in the process of reexamining and looking and growing.  And that gives me a sense of comfort.  'Cause I know that they're not a stagnate, like, "We've been like this.  These are our pillar values that we've had from the very beginning, and we will stand by them, though the heavens fall."  You know, they're very, like, "No.  We're humans.  And we're here for a purpose.  And we've had to look at this again and go, 'oh.  Okay.  Let's go back.'"  Yeah.  Which is essentially being true to their values.  So…yeah…

**Investigator:**  Well, thank you.  I've really appreciated the input of each one of you.  It really will help, seeing your perspectives.

APPENDIX K

TRANSCRIPT OF FOCUS GROUP #3

**August 12, 2015**

**Investigator:** This is Caralin McHan, Focus Group #3 on August 12. And thank you all for meeting with me. I'm going to be reading you the 9 questions that I have, and you don't have to answer all of them, but as I ask a question that maybe you have an experience with, or you have an answer for, I would request that you do answer. Without further ado, my first question is: What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?

**Focus Group:** Transparency, vulnerability

Longevity.

Discipleship.

Sustainability.

Contextualization.

People.

Did you already mention relationships? Relational healing.

Generosity.

Communication.

Mission.

Self-propagation.

**Investigator:** All right. I'll leave it at those. But if you think of others later on, you can say, "oh that should be added. That was a value we didn't think about." So the next question is: Do you think it's important for missionaries to act according to a specific set of values? And if so, why? And if not, why not?

**Focus Group:** I think that it's important for missionaries to act on a certain set of values because often they may be the only, or one of the few opportunities for people you are reaching out to, to see the values reflected of God. Being that the mission is to bring more people to God,

I believe, therefore our values should be centered on something or Someone. 'Cause that's how we will be judged. Our product, so to say.

I agree. Generally with that one, and kind of bouncing off of that one too, like, it doesn't have to be, like, these, okay, these exact words for values need to be here. But, intentionality usually results in more results. I guess, like what you're saying, like, intentionally presenting a picture of God that is clear and accurate and contextualized is gonna have more accurate impact, leave a more accurate lasting, positive impact than just going in at random and just being spontaneous.

The Bibles describe the way we should go. The conviction on what we have. And the way we should go, we should be. Talking about Christian values makes the difference between what the worldview and Christ, you know, worldview. So it is through living those values that will portray the love to God to other people. It's a way of living the gospel. Without the Bible, we will not get anything to show people as far as the gospel is concerned. So living with these values portrays the weight of the gospel so that people who believe it will know that there was a change in our life, and that's really important.

I think that it's important to have values, but also no one's perfect and so, like, the stories we've heard, they've all made mistakes and they've all grown. And they learned new values through the process. So, I guess it's important to have a value of, like, growth, and, yeah, learning, so that you can go over, so that you have all the values at the very beginning of a mission trip. I don't think it's super important.

**Investigator:** So my next question is kind of linked to this past one, but instead of being sort of theoretical, it's a little bit more personal. Do you think that knowing the values that AFM has will help you in the mission field? And why or why not?

**Focus Group:** Absolutely. I mean, I think I hear what you're saying….that we want to be able to develop values as we are there, too. I realize that we're going to grow while we're there. But, it never hurts to have values, I mean, it takes me a long time to get something. And once I understand and get it, then it can stay there. But, it takes a long time for me to get stuff. And so to understand what AFM's values are and to realize that those values really align with the values that Christ has in so many respects, that really is a powerful thing, because it, that ties me to the mission in more than just, "I'm doing this for AFM." You know, it ties me to the mission at heart level because I'm doing it for Christ. It's actually something that I adopted as my own. And, anyway…

I want to say that what I have learned here so far, as far as AFM is concerning, that there little emphasis on how we should help our people to grow, in making disciple. Okay. We're used to teaching in order to baptize, but learning emphasis on making disciple is another value that I have, you know, that I have come to learn from them. And I think it is really necessary because that's what Christ told us to do. He didn't just tell us to go and baptize, but making disciples. It makes the one making the disciple grow as well as the one who is being made disciple. So I think it's a really good way of growing in Christ so that it won't be just the words, it won't be just a teaching, but it's a process of becoming a strong Christian. So that's what I think.

I think, getting to the actual question that was asked, AFM specifically, regardless of what their values are, that they should…the importance for a missionary is that they are raising awareness of values. Letting missionaries know what values they should have, and be able to have while they're out as a missionary. Assuming that we agree that it's important to have values as a missionary. They're letting us know what some of those values are, if you didn't have any coming into it. Because many people that are coming in to AFM possibly have never served as a missionary. And it's valuable that they start with zero, assuming everyone has nothing. And then work up.

**Investigator:** Okay. So then my next question is: what does it look like for someone to act according to AFM's values? So you can give examples if you can think of any.

**Focus Group:** Oh, for example, the Crucible we went to, okay? It makes us to understand that each of us, we are all belonging and we need to be together. To understand each other. And we need to grow together. We need to forgive us our faults, and love each other. I need you. You need me. It's a kind of teaching of, the Crucible teaches that we are learning that I need you. You need me. And I cannot get isolated as a Christian. I need to work as a team. And it is when we are together that the word of God—talking about multiplication—can be realized. So it helps us to view each one of us as a treasure…and helps us to grow together. That's what I learned from the Crucible.

It looks like, yeah, affirming each other. Sitting down in a circle and talking through things. You know, if we misunderstood someone, saying, you know, "well, where were you coming from?"

And I think we mentioned that vulnerability is one of the values. And to create the open space for the SMs to be more vulnerable, the staff and the teachers have been vulnerable with us in their stories. So, yeah, it has…they created that space, giving us an example so that we can also open up and be vulnerable.

**Investigator:** It's like you're answering my next question. So I suppose I'll move there. It's: what's the most effective method that AFM or that the trainers have used to communicate their values?

**Focus Group:** Their own testimony.

Them coaching, too. I mean, coaching in action. So showing us. Like the Crucible. Like saying, "Okay. Now here's a time for you to circle up and talk through this.

And there's, another thing I also like is the change of activities from sitting around a table, and then you exercise your body. So they are trying to tell us that we have to be both the mental as well as the physical. So it's another point that is really good in terms of showing how we should grow.

I think there's an effective balance between group communication and the assumptions they have of the group that is training to become missionaries, as well as personally, the trainers meeting

each of the specific needs of where the trainees are at specifically, and how they feel towards God and where they stand as a missionary, where they need to grow. And so, in that, they're effectively training all of us personally, and as a team. So we're all on the same page. And I find that especially effective, because it's all nice that we're training as a group, but missionary life is kind of alone in a sense, and therefore it's important that personally, individually, we are strong. And so they emphasize both of those.

**Investigator:** You're saying that you're all going to different places and you'll all have your specific tasks

**Focus Group:** Right.

**Investigator:** Can you define or describe a moment when you had an aha moment, when one of values, or when a part of the mission or something that one of the trainers was teaching, when it just clicked for you?

**Focus Group:** Kinda. An aha moment—I'm not sure if it quite answers the question, but—an aha moment was during the Crucible Sunday morning when we all had lack of sleep, but I realized that this was hard on the trainers as much as it was on us. That they were doing it out of desire to make us stronger or dependent on each other. And that it wasn't comfortable for them to act their role. So…I'm not sure if that…actually, that was an aha moment for me. The trainers.

A major value is people, and the relationships that we build. And that is kind of an avenue that the message of God can be sent through. And so the emphasis of all the trainers have shown to that in daily life has been in spending time with each one of us throughout the days, getting to know us personally and asking us questions about how we feel about things. Meeting with us alone and spending personal time with their interviews and discussions, and general just bonding time, creating a deep relationships with one another. So that they can better teach us to be disciples. But also so that we may also make disciples of other people, by taking their example.

**Investigator:** Does it happen more than just the one-hour time that's been scheduled for everyone? Or is that specifically what you're referring to?

**Focus Group:** What I'm referring to is that they're living that. And that creating and maintaining strong and tight-knit relationships with people is what they live out. And that it's actively taking place. It's not a set time. It's an active, passive, from the trainers, that I have felt.

**Investigator:** Yeah, from watching them I've been inspired to live my life differently.

**Focus Group:** Yeah, like, having the trainers come through and eat with us, and ask questions, and live life with us outside of class time, has been very inspiring.

I guess as far as aha moments go—I'm going to be a little bit vulnerable here, but—I guess on my hour walk one of the trainers…I guess that was one of my aha moments. When I

realized…for some reason it just …I get so caught up sometimes in my own way of thinking that I forget things that I need someone to be, like, a breath of fresh air me sometimes. Like, just show me what my value is, or whatever. And that was really neat, just to see. I was just reminded that I am valued, based not off of what I do, but off of who I am. And, yeah. That, actually frees me from having to worry about things as much. 'Cause I don't have to worry about every little thing that I do.

Last Thursday when we were going to the beach, I had the opportunity to be in the car with [the training director], and when we were in the car we didn't really know what to say. But he initiated the discussion. And he came down to our level to help us so that we could communicate. That was so good. Even my wife participated in the communication. And he brought something that we are familiar with…so we were talking until we got there, without knowing that we had reached the beach. And we were full of love to continue that. And that kind of valuing people, you know. Living what they are teaching. That's what I can share with you.

**Investigator:** Thank you. So, my next question might sound a little bit like some of the others ones I've asked, because they're all sort of in similar veins, but I'm wondering more about the motivation, what has persuaded you to act according to the specific set of behaviors or principles that they have been teaching? Does my question make sense? Your motivation, or what's persuaded you?

**Focus Group:** You know, for me the motivation is to be a better servant to the Lord. You know, we have been called to serve. That is the purpose of our calling. But in the process, we have to learn to grow. So we need interactions, we need to know, like she said, we need to add more knowledge, values to what we are doing. So the ending result is to serve. So for me, the motivation is service. That's why. I'm preparing to be a better servant. That's the motivation.

A motivation for me is that someone is willing to listen to where I feel my weaknesses are, and who also believes that I can do it, and that …yeah. That my relationship with God is strong enough  to carry on. And because someone else believes in me, I feel motivated to take on the same values that the person who believes in me has. If that makes sense.

**Investigator:** Yeah

**Focus Group:** Okay

Also for me I guess I see fruit in people's lives. I base probably too much off of how people live. Basically, if I see that what they're saying has caused positive things in their life, then I'm almost ready to just jump on board. Like, okay, good, this is great! Let's do it! If I see, not so much, then I'm like, okay, where is the problem? Where is the disconnect? And I guess I've seen, not perfection, but I've seen definitely some positive fruit as far as, just in the way that people live their lives. I just remember that one of the instructors saying, "I love God. I just love him!" And it wasn't faith at all, it was just a reaction to one of the stories that he was telling. And just thinking about how good God had been to him. Yeah. So, I guess when I see positive fruit, that that really motivates me, "Okay, I'm going to be…I want to be able to"…and that this

must be good.  So then, the service thing.  I guess it's like, "okay, well, I'm here to be a better missionary."  So.  Sometimes it's been hard.  Like, I don't have an easy time just adopting everything people say.  But I've just chosen to, because I believe it's going to help me to be a better missionary.

**Investigator:**  What have you learned about AFM's values outside of the classroom experience?  And I'm considering Crucible as part of the classroom experience, because the trainers were there and it was very intentional.

**Focus Group:** Could you ask the question again?

**Investigator:** Yeah.  What have you learned about AFM values outside if the classroom?  And there might not be anything.  But I was just wondering, if you have, what it is.

**Focus Group:**  So much.  So much.

I would say that the values they have are realistic in the sense that they could be reciprocated by others that are not trainers.  In terms of living, I have noticed that they have already been applied to real life by trainees.  Since we are in a living setting that is with one another, I have noticed that the values that AFM expresses and shows, these have already been shown throughout the trainees' lives in reciprocating the values that they see from the trainers.

**Investigator:**  I've been using those words a whole lot the last several weeks.  Trainers and trainees.

**Focus Group:** Yeah.  I mean, specifically, like, I almost think it's bigger for me what's happened outside of the classroom setting.  Yeah.  Like, going to the beach.  Like, rather than just going and like, having and evening every night when we're, "okay, now you're all going to go and pray for 2 hours."  Or something like that.  No.  We go to the beach and we play soccer, or swim, or sit and relax, or choose to pray, or choose to read.  That value of realizing that we need time for recreation and for fun, and for flexibility, and, you know, and for choice.

**Investigator:**  I have just one last question here, and it can be taken two different ways.  So the question is: Are there values that you think should have been emphasized more during training?  And so that could either be values that you think AFM has that they haven't ever identified, or values that you think should be taught during the training.

**Focus Group:**  This is not so much a value as it is a skill or something that should be incorporated.  But I believe there should be more emphasis on knowledge of the scripture and its application to being a missionary.  In terms of equipping us with the skills to be able to give an effective message in terms of a sermon, or Bible studies, or actual Bible training and how we can take that scripture and not just use it for our life, but be able to express those ideas and those messages in a coherent fashion that makes sense and is palatable for a non-believer or a believer.

**Investigator:** And someone inside a different cultural context

**Focus Group:** Correct.

**Investigator:** Yeah.  I see what you're saying. Were you going to say something?

**Focus Group:**  Well, I was just thinking, it's an impossible thing, which is to have more time to actually.  One of the big things that AFM emphasizes is practice.  Actually practicing things.  And, as far as actually practicing things, like, we would need a longer AFM training, probably.  Which means more money, which means difficult, which means more time for the trainers, which means, anyway.

Practicing learning conversations.    Or practicing seeking needs in the community.  Or practicing, what was the other thing I had?  Oh!  Worldview.  Like, and creating the culture.

So actually practicing going out to pray with people.  How to approach them.  That would be something, a very practical help.  How to know to knock on their door, pray with them.  Teaching something practical of that nature.  They should have put away time for that.  Maybe one day of the week, or 2 days of the week.  That should be part of the package.  'Cause there are some people that are aware of that, but some people don't know how to do it.  So maybe those of us who have some experience can show them.  And that would help them.

So doing the community involvement in this culture—
--Yes—
--So that we're able to learn to do it in another culture—
--Yes.  Wherever you will be, you will be using that kind of model.  Even though it may change, but the model will be there to help.

**Investigator:**  Well, thank you very much.  It's going to be very helpful.

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW #1

**August 10, 2015**

**Investigator:** Hello, this is Caralin McHan and we're interviewing on Monday, August 10. Thank you for being willing to be interviewed. I have 9 questions here about values and AFM. So the first one I was wondering is: What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?

**Interviewee:** Um….

**Investigator:** This isn't a test.

**Interviewee:** Right? I should have looked at their website before the interview. Um…….values…..I know their mission, but I know that mission is different than values. So different values, I guess, integrity.

**Investigator:** And you don't have to list them all. If you think of one later, then you can just say, "oh yeah, that would be added, too." And that works.

**Interviewee:** I honestly don't know what they claim as their values. Just knowing who they are, I'm assuming what their values might be.

**Investigator:** Okay, so experiential

**Interviewee:** Mmhmm…..um….service. I would venture some type of love is in there somewhere. I don't know what word they would use. But, yeah.

**Investigator:** Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. Okay, so my next question sort of has two components, and it's: do you think it's important for missionaries to act according to a specific set of values? And if so, why? If not, why not?

**Interviewee:** You mean, if I'm a missionary with AFM then I should act according to AFM's values?

**Investigator:** Yeah.

**Interviewee:** I think that if somebody chooses to go with an organization, then they should be at least somewhat aligned with the values of the organization so that when they are sent out, like, as a missionary when I'm sent out with AFM, I don't have a problem aligning myself with their values. That I shouldn't be uncomfortable or feel like I'm wrong in some way, with following their values. If there are ones that I don't agree with, then I guess it would be, just look at the

situation I'm in, and consider, do I follow my values at this point or their values, if there happens to be a difference.

**Investigator:** Okay. Thank you. So, then, you've kind of touched on this, but do you think that knowing the values of Adventist Frontier Missions will help you when you're in the field?

**Interviewee:** I think so, because it—right after I say I don't know their values—but because it helps me see what their mission is. Like, I know I already said mission and values are different, but it's almost like completing a goal, you need to know what the goal is. And the values help you achieve what you're working for, type of thing. So if I go out as a missionary with AFM but I don't know how to act, then it's kind of hard. But if I know the values that they're wanting me to uphold, then it helps me do what I'm supposed to be doing.

**Investigator:** Okay. So, what would be a specific example of somebody who's acting according to the AFM values? Or what does it look like for someone to behave according to their values?

**Interviewee:** I think that if somebody is acting the way that they are teaching other people to act, and they're not just teaching by word, they're teaching by example.

**Investigator:** I've heard that reinforced a couple times…..And now I'm going to move away a little bit from the importance of values and what it looks like, into how it is that they teach them. And the first question along those lines is: what do you think the most effective method is that they've used for—maybe not even teaching. Maybe that's the wrong word—but for communicating their values to all of us during the training?

**Interviewee:** I think rather than just listing them off as "here are our values," they give us scenarios that we enact and that, after the scenarios they have us think about, "okay, what did you do? Why did you do that? Would something else have been better?" And it helps us run through the thought process in our minds so that when we get to the ending point of "this is the proper action," we got there. And we know our thought process of getting to that answer, rather than just being told "a value for AFM is love." It's just a word. It doesn't really have a meaning at that point. But if we have an experience to tie to that value, then it makes it more real.

**Investigator:** Okay. Just to clarify, then, are you talking about the debrief sessions that we had a lot on the Crucible—which, I won't really be writing about, but I have to mention it.
--**Interviewee:** okay, yeah—
--**Investigator:** because I interviewed with the Training Director before it began and he was saying that about 70% of the learning during the training happens during the Crucible. So I can't completely ignore it, I'm just not going to say anything that actually happened.

**Interviewee:** Okay, yeah, that too. And I guess that was the most obvious, here's and action and now you get a debriefing. But I think it's also even in, when [the Training Director] does the discipleship class and we run through certain parables. And there's points we're supposed to get out of these parables, he doesn't just say, "okay, here's the point." He sits there and waits for almost and annoying amount of time. But he wants us to come up with the answer ourselves,

because if we're going through that thought process of thinking of the answer, the answer's going to stay longer.

**Investigator:** Okay…. And is there a moment where you had just an "aha" moment where it just clicked, that you understood better one of the values that they have here? Or, I suppose the real question is, describe a moment, but you'd actually have to have one.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, I don't know. I guess it's hard that I don't know what their specific values are.

**Investigator:** Well, because—I don't have to go into all the theory for you—but there are four different types of values: some of them are linked to what AFM calls their core values, but then when I interviewed the director at the beginning before training started, he mentioned those core values, but also the mission. So, two different sorts of values. It could be with either one.

**Interviewee:** Okay. Mission, I know then. So could you repeat the question?

**Investigator:** Yeah. Describe a moment when it just clicked with you, one of the values of the mission. When it just made sense.

**Interviewee:** Thinking of it now, I don't have the exact wording in my mind. But I think that when we were talking about specifically sharing the gospel with other culture groups that have little-to-no knowledge of even God or the Bible, that we can't just dump the Bible on them and expect them to want to know it and to understand it and to experience it. And I think that really connected with me, having done a lot of evangelistic series recently at my church, that we're just dumping information on them, and wondering why they're not staying, because they haven't experienced a life with Christ yet. And we haven't really given them the opportunity to experience it with us, either. So when we're taught that that's where we need to start in our ministry to people of other cultures, is to let them experience Christ through our lives, it really made sense to me.

**Investigator:** Yeah, for me, along those same lines, it was with the gum. When he sat up in front and started listing off all the ingredients in the gum, "does that sound good to you?" No, you'd want to taste it. But we often just give the ingredients for Christianity. And it was just, "Oh! That is what we do." And I got all excited. I called my dad and told him all about it.

**Interviewee:** I know. I told one of my friends who helps run the evangelistic series, "you have notes coming your way. Just letting you know."

**Investigator:** That's awesome…..What, if anything, has persuaded you to actually change your behavior in regards to the mission that AFM has? It has to do with more the motivation behind it, I think.

**Interviewee:** I think it's another reminder to just be more aware of where people are coming from when I'm witnessing to them. That my preconceived ideas of what they know about God and the Bible can actually hurt in me wanting to share with them.

**Investigator:** Okay. Thank you. There's two more questions. This next one is: what have you learned outside of the classroom experience? That could be…anything.

**Interviewee:** Outside the classroom? The Crucible's outside of the classroom, or no?

**Investigator:** I consider that sort of inside because the trainers were there. So outside the classroom would be any time when they're not there, instructing.

**Interviewee:** So what have I learned about the values outside of the classroom?

**Investigator:** Mmmhmm. What, or how.

**Interviewee:** I think that, the word teamwork keeps coming to mind for most of these questions. And one way that we use it outside of the classroom is in the kitchen, because somebody needs to be in charge of cooking each meal for all 18 of us, and it's not usually something that can be done with one person. So they need to ask for help, and then make sure that everybody is there and knows when the meal is. And then afterwards somebody needs to clean up. And that happens 3 times a day. So the communication that needs to happen with who's cooking, who's cleaning, does the cleaner know that the cooker is cooking. Like, sometimes that happened for breakfast, that somebody actually decided to cook for breakfast but the cleaner didn't actually know that they had to be awake early enough to do the cleaning for breakfast. So thankfully that only happened once, and then we just adjusted. And the teamwork and communication has definitely grown over this week. And, through that you learn how to work with each other, and "okay, these people work well together, and we can be really productive if these two are together." That type of…

**Investigator:** Hmmm. So does that happen intuitively? That it just gets rearranged? Or do you sit down and have small penguin circles and—
--**Interviewee:** We had a penguin circle, actually. We did. Yeah—
--**Investigator:** I mean, outside of the regularly scheduled penguin circles—
--**Interviewee:** Mmhmm. So we had our first penguin circle that Thursday during lunch. And then we had class, and then we had worship, and then after worship somebody actually brought up that, well, it got into that issue, actually. Of meals and cleaning, and that….yeah. Just working together to make it more efficient. That meals always started at a certain time, and that if you're not there by a certain time we're going to be cleaning up, and that the cleaner needs to know if there's going to be extra dishes or that type of thing. Like, people need to not run away, and say, "Well, why didn't I get the meal." Well, you knew the meal was going to be served. But it was actually discussed. So, yeah, it didn't just happen, like "oh! I should tell them…" But I think that the penguin circles, although awkward, really help. Because sometimes you don't even know that you're having those thoughts until somebody else brings it up and people start discussing it. And then you realize that things actually could be running a little better than they are. Not necessarily that they're running bad, but that they could be running better.

**Investigator:** Yeah. Penguin circles is something that I'm wanting to integrate into my own life now. And especially after one of the trainers, when they sat us down last week and said, "Oh,

well, you never should have been able to graduate from the Crucible without having all these difficult conversations." And I was thinking, "What?" And how people these days don't know how to deal with conflict. And I realized, "Oh my goodness! I don't know how to deal with conflict either." So I took all of these copious notes, because I was thinking, "Well, to really live well together, you have to confront issues, and not always run away." I tend to be someone who avoids conflict at all costs.

**Interviewee:** I think that the learning conversation is almost used in the penguin circles, because when somebody says something, you need to repeat it back to them before you opinionate on it. And most conflict is because I have my opinion and you have your opinion, and it just keeps going back and forth. But if we truly try to understand each other, then that's where resolution is going to come. And thinking in my workplace, now, too. If that were applied in a hospital, I'd start singing. Oh man! That would be amazing!

**Investigator:** That's awesome. But if only, if only people knew how to live with each other. It's a skill that's not really taught either, really at home or in schools.

**Interviewee:** Right. It's just kind of learn as you go, and try to read people's body language and tone of voice, which is hard because, I mean, maybe someone just has a bad day. But you're reading that into that person. And trying to formulate your whole interaction with them based off of that one bad moment. But if you understand that that was a bad moment, then you're able to work together afterwards. Because you have an open line of communication, and that helps.

**Investigator:** Okay, the last question here, you can take it one of two ways. So the question is: are there other values that you think should have been emphasized more during the training? And I realized during the first focus group that it could be taken two ways, and I don't care which way you take it. So the two ways are, one of them is: are there values that you think AFM should have that they don't? And then, the second on is: are there values that you think that they have, but that they haven't identified yet? So that they should incorporate them, or label them in their training.

**Interviewee:** I think that, for your thing if you're including values and mission together, the way that AFM portrays their mission, and the fact that it's explained in detail to us is very good. Because it gives us a purpose of what we're here for. For the values, if for AFM, if their values and their mission are separate—you said they had separate core values, if they were mentioned on the first day, I don't know what they are.

**Investigator:** They weren't. I was specifically listening.

**Interviewee:** Okay. Then, I know for another ministry that I was a part of, there was a motto and values and a mission and a, there was like 5 different things. And I knew each one. I knew the motto. I knew what the values were. I knew what the missions were. And everything was different. But for this one, if the values are so important, as important as the mission, then it's something that should be specifically shared as well. And why are they the values of AFM? Not just, why is this the mission, but why are these your core values?

**Investigator:** Yeah, that's something that I've been wondering about. 'Cause the mission has been very explicitly explained. And because my whole focus has been the values, I know what the values are. And so I'm always watching or listening for them being mentioned, and often they're done in a roundabout way. Where they're talked about, but not necessarily identified. So I don't know whether or not that's purposeful or not.

**Interviewee:** Right. Or they assume that we know them. I honestly don't remember if they were included in my interview because that was back in December at this point. So I don't know if [the office staff] asked me what my opinion was on the values of AFM.

**Investigator:** I don't know. I haven't yet talked to anyone in the recruitment process. I'll be doing that this week, hopefully.

**Interviewee:** And I think [the office staff previously mentioned] is gone now because she retired in June. But I think she interviewed all of us. But she might have scripted questions of what she asked. I think there was a script of questions.

**Investigator:** And now I'm really curious about it because a couple of people have mentioned the interview process and I thought, "Oh, why didn't I think of that before? It makes a difference."

**Interviewee:** I don't know where in any of those questions this would fit in to, but I really appreciate their interview process, even though it took a lot of work. It was basically—do you know what the interview process is?

**Investigator:** mmm-hmmm

**Interviewee:** It's like a 12-page application, and then a one-hour Skype interview. And, well the application included basically what's—
--**Investigator:** Video Skype?—
--**Interviewee:** Video Skype. If possible, video Skype. 'Cause [the office staff] wants to see our body language. The application, part of it was basically a job application. As in your work history, and what you consider your talents and volunteer experience, and, specifically, since this was a mission trip, any past mission trips that you've taken. But it also….I don't remember the things that were on it now. But it also included, like social stuff. What is your involvement at work? What is your involvement at school? At church? Like, it wants to get a big picture of you. And, then the interview. And then there was a 560-question personality test and essays. And those essays are mainly geared towards, like a psychological kind of thing. To….almost what-is-your-breaking-point kind of thing, but they want to make sure that you're emotionally strong enough for spending a year away form your security zone. So, has this type of situation happened before? Or, what would you do in this type of situation? And they want to know if you're—I forget if it was on the application or in the essays—but they wanted to know your experience with ministering to people. What type of ministry have you been involved with? Have you given somebody baptismal studies? Describe one of your strongest friendships and what aspects are in that friendship? That type of thing. And after all of that, and 6 references--- so they have a page that they fill out as well. And the references cover different things, like

pastor, coworker, and if you've gone on a mission trip, the leader of that mission trip. So they want to see different aspects of your life. Which most of us, co-worker means non-Christian or specifically not-Adventist. So it's getting that perspective of your life as well. How do you work with non-Christians in a stressful environment? So…I was very appreciative of that because, the phrase safe environment wasn't used, but it made it, for me, it made it seem like a safe environment where I could tell the recruiter that, "these are my fears. This is why I'm afraid to commit for a year." Or, at that point, "These are my options. I can either give up my nursing job and go on a mission trip, or not go on a mission trip but go work in the pediatric unit that I've wanted to work in for 4 years." And that was honestly my options. But through this interview process, and my fears and my questions and my options, [the office staff] was able to talk me through it and get me to actually apply for this. But, they're very realistic of, though they needed a nurse in the Philippines, my personality, my fears wouldn't match. And they weren't willing to put me there just because they needed a nurse. They knew that my qualities wouldn't match, and so they're not gonna do it. And I really appreciated that, when they first told me that, "Okay, I don't think you would be a good match for the Philippines." Because that made me realize that they really do care about their missionaries, about the team that they'll be working with, about the people, that they want good connection everywhere.

**Investigator:** Thank you so much!

APPENDIX M

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW #2

**August 13, 2015**

**Investigator:** This is Caralin McHan and it's interview # 2 on August 13, 2015. Thank you. Alright, my first question here is: What are the values of Adventist Frontier Missions?

**Interviewee:** The values? Like, not the mission statement, but the values?

**Investigator:** This isn't a test.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, I know, I'm trying to think. Like whether or not they are specifically mentioned? Just what I see the values to be? … Well, I think one of their main values is integrity in terms of how they just run everything. Like, You can see they're talking about their finances and how, you know that's one of their… just in terms of how they relate to people, like confidentiality in that sense integrity. For example, when we have one-on-one conversation with staff you know that they don't share or show that to anybody else that you may have mentioned, like not even in the way that they talk to them. So, that's something… that's like the integrity aspect that I really appreciated.

**Investigator:** How would you define integrity?

**Interviewee:** Just like, well first of all, honesty I guess is the face value definition that I mean. But not only that, but just staying true to their word. And you know, all the staff, if you ask them to help you or something, if you ask them to do something, they don't just do it ____, they do it pretty quick. They do it right away. So, that too. …. They're honest with us. They want us to know that what they're saying to us is genuine. I think that's an aspect also of integrity that I have witnessed in AFM .

I guess other values would be like…I don't know…I don't know what you would consider values.

**Investigator:** That's fine. If you think of one later you can say, "oh yeah that's a value, too"

**Interviewee:** ahhh, definitely mission-minded. They value investment in people. And that's something that I think we can all attest to. You included. They really spend time to get to know us. Like you can see how much they want to invest in us. I think that is a value that is expressed in our training a lot too, like that we do that, we share that with others. That we invest in other people.

Community, I guess. I don't know if that is considered a value, but that's also something that I've recognized. They're really big into community. Not just our community, but the community around us or the AFM community. They really value that and they focus on that and sharing community as well.

**Investigator:** Ok, Thank you. Do you think it's important for someone going as a missionary to act according to a specific set of values?

**Interviewee:** In terms of organization? Like, the organizations values? Well, assuming that the organization has good values, I think it is important. Like I personally think that, you know, of course integrity, community, investment… those are things, yeah that as… We are going to become missionaries and those are things that I'm assuming that we would hope to do. But I wouldn't have thought about it unless it wasn't taught this way. I wouldn't have been like, Oh, this is something I need to do. Like, listen to people in this way. Like investing people in that sense. Listening like this. I don't know if you heard me but… actually we learned how to listen to people at camp meeting this weekend. And on Saturday, I had the opportunity to listen to some of my friends that I've never really gotten to know on a deeper level. And because I spent time to listen to them… and I learned here, in three weeks. It's changed the way I communicate. So, that's something as an organization… It's really important to have these values that help people interact with other people. And I think that is something that AFM has. Because the way that I relate to people just changed in the past three weeks. And I experienced that on Saturday in the way that I talk to people and stuff.

**Investigator:** That's exciting.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, no really. Not only is it enjoyable to pay attention to what people say and actually focus on what they're saying. It's actually enjoyable. And then you get to know them better, and you know, they trust you more. That was a really valuable experience for me. So, yeah. What was the exact question again?

**Investigator:** If it's important as people or missionaries to act according to a specific set of values.

**Interviewee:** Oh yeah totally. And especially because we do reflect the organization even though not directly like to the people you are ministering too, but even the _____ missionaries or even the people who know AFM or even people we come back and talk to them and tell them about AFM. They're gonna determine that value of the organization based on how it's changed us or how it's influenced us. And that's why I'm not afraid to just brag about AFM because I know it's changed me. And like I said, it's only been three and a half weeks, almost 4 weeks since I've joined. But, even the third day I was like, oh wow, I love AFM. I'm so proud of AFM.

**Investigator:** Shoot, after the first day I was ready to go be a missionary.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, I've been telling everyone like, oh AFM is good because they teach you how to do community, they teach you how to listen, they teach you how to resolve conflicts amongst people. And, I was only able to be proud of that because I know that it changed the way I do those things. I'm hoping that people will recognize that. And that they recognize that I'm not

afraid to tell people that, that it's changed me. I don't know, I think that… It comes out of being part of the organization.

**Investigator:** So you sort of answered the second one, or the third question, but I'll ask it anyways. It's whether you think you knowing the values of AFM will help you when you're in the field. Why or why not?

**Interviewee:** Oh yeah. So, like I said, you know, the way I communicate with people really changed. But it's subtle. I'm not like, So what I hear you saying is…When I was doing it, the way I did it was like on Friday Saturday was when people would start on a topic and then like… I guess, I have a tendency to change topics quickly. I like to think about a lot of aspects in conversation and people. Not intentionally, it just happens. But when I was intentional about listening to what she's saying and then asking questions so that it can dig deeper into what she's interested in. Like for… she's a teacher and I was asking why she likes it and if she wanted to do something else. Just stuff like that. I can see the values of listening and just being a trustworthy person. Just integrated in that conversation. I really hope that I remember it because I know that it will help me in all relationships in my life, not just in the mission field.

**Investigator:** Hmmm that's important.

**Interviewee:** Yeah.

**Investigator:** So what does it look like for someone to act according to AFM's values? Do you have any examples of what it might look like?

**Interviewee:** Well, I guess… you can see it in all the staff members really, especially the training directors, you know. I'm recognizing the values of AFM through the way they've interacted with us. They didn't tell us, I mean they mentioned hear and there, we're about integrity, we're about investment and stuff. If they just told us, I would be like whatever, that's something that you are about, but that doesn't mean anything. But because, you know, the trained directors, they really show us that they are about integrity, and about investment, and about community. That really communicates those values to us in the example. Is that your question? Did that answer it? K, cause sometimes I forget the question.

**Investigator:** Yeah that works. And sometimes it's more about what you hear in the question rather then what the question really is. Alright so now we are going to move away from the theoretical, "what the values are" to how it's been taught. And the first question along those lines, or what do you think is the most effective method that they used to communicate values?

**Interviewee:** Well, the storytelling helped. Getting practical, like showing us practical examples of why their values, the values of AFM worked, or why they work. Like I said, one-on-one conversations, when they invested in, like getting to know us. They showed us how to have a community. Like obviously with the Crucible and even in the penguin circles and in living together and cooking together. I'm sure there's a reason why they kind of push us to cook together even though we're technically on our own, we choose to work together and like clean up and stuff, everything. They actually set up leadership roles. You probably heard of it right?

Every week there is a cooking team leader, and then there's like a clean up team leader, and like--

--**Investigator:** That was something they instigated?

**Interviewee:** They implemented that.--
--**Investigator:** I thought that you were just super organized--
--**Interviewee:** Oh, no, no, no. Those… They actually… I guess it's like stuff that has worked in the past. Morgan just made a list and we signed up for what we wanted. I'm doing like the media. So we have team leaders. But they… I think giving us the opportunity to be team leaders and then also in the Crucible teaching us how to give leadership to people and how to give people the opportunity to be leaders. That's something that… I guess, something that because we learned in Crucible I think it really changed… Like we're able to implement the teamwork aspect, the community aspect better here at AFM.

**Investigator:** Can you describe a moment when it just clicked for you? Where you had an "ah-ha" moment were you understood either a value or some aspect of a value?

**Interviewee:** Well, I kinda shared it already when I had that conversation with that girl and I realized that I never really practiced communicating with people this way but it just happened. And, once I started, of course I thought about it. And I was like man, this is something I learned at AFM. But when I first started the conversation it was out of the intention to actually listen to her. And I think that's when I realized, this is what they're asking us to do; to listen to people and get to know them on a deeper level.

**Investigator:** So it was as you were experiencing it--
--**Interviewee:** Yeah, well I experienced it. And of course, you know and also when I had my one on one conversation with [the Training Director], that also was like a "ah-ha' moment for me, cause it made sense what they meant by like listening to people like not the formality of it… So what you're saying is… but actually. [The Training Director] actually says "So what I hear you saying is that you think this about yourself. And so what I'm getting out of it, is that this…'" And he revealed parts of me, like aspects of me that I guess I kind of understood but I never thought about. Because he repeated what he said and then repeated what I said and then he added that on, on what he thought was valuable. So, I think that was like the investment aspect.

**Investigator:** I haven't had my one on one conversation with him yet. But it will happen, I mean it means a lot that he would still do that with me.

**Interviewee:** Yeah. And the community thing, of course Crucible is, when… that first time when we all realized that someone was putting the hula hoops on all of the balls we were all just like, "what is he doing?" He's cheating, he's trying to sabotage us.

**Investigator:** I know! I was so upset at him!

**Interviewee:** 'Cause we're all working so hard and he just comes over and grabs the hula hoops and just walks away

**Investigator:** And he was probably like, "Uh. they're not getting the point."--
--**Interviewee:** Yeah, But once that happened, the community thing just made so much sense-the teamwork. You know? It was like, oh that's what they wanted us to do. That makes sense.

**Investigator:** Yeah.. good memory…So getting a little bit to your own motivation, but what has persuaded you to act on it? So say maybe that one time you were mentioning where you actually used the conversation abilities. What made you want to do that or what motivated you or persuaded you?

**Interviewee:** Ok, well back to the conversation, the one on one that I had with [the Training Director]. When that happened, after it happened I was like, wow, that was probably the most comforting, not comforting but just like the conversation where I've felt most loved. And it's like I've known this guy for two weeks, you know? And so… Sorry what was the question again? Can you repeat it?

**Investigator:** Yeah, what has motivated you or persuaded you to act according to those values?

**Interviewee:** Oh yeah, I was like where am I going with this? So when I had that conversation I guess I kinda realized, man, just by him listening to me, I felt so good about just the person I'm becoming and just self Identity and of course one of the main problems of, especially in America is self image, self identity you know?. And I realized that the affirmation aspect, that's something that… my love language is words of affirmation and I do it but I realized that it was always at a surface level. Like, oh, thank you so much for doing this, I really appreciate it.  or like, man, I really love you. That's how I communicate affection. But then I realized, I'm realizing that you can do words of affirmation on a deeper level that changes the way people think about themselves. And I think, when, because, yeah, he's really good at words of affirmation. And not a lot of people are good at words of affirmation, myself included. And that's my love language. but because a lot of people aren't good at it, there are a lot of times when I don't feel loved because that's just how I communicate. Most people are quality time… that's my lowest. I do not need quality time to know I'm loved. And so with [the Training Director], the things that he says to you, that he affirms in us, that's like, man, that is something about myself that I guess I really do appreciate about myself. I mean it sounds weird but he helps you realize that there are really good parts of you inside, not just the things that you do but the person you are. And I guess when I realized that I'm like, man, if I could do this for other people… And the way it impacted me it was such a positive experience. If I could do this for other people and show people that I really care, just by me listening, that could change how they think about themselves.  And I think that's one thing that personally, that kind of persuaded me that investment thing is really worthwhile. Because it doesn't just change your relationship it changes both of the people involved in the relationship.

**Investigator:** Wow. Yeah, I haven't experienced that but some of the other things I've thought wow, I need to incorporate this into my life.

**Interviewee:** Yeah… I'm actually really glad we're doing this one-on-one because I'm an external processor and so these things are all in the back of my brain and when I start talking

about them, they all come to the front and I spit them out and I'm like Oh! I knew that but I never thought about it.

**Investigator:** That's funny.

**Interviewee:** That's why I have a hard time talking to my brother sometimes because we're opposites. Everything comes to me fast but he thinks about everything and then he talks about it.

**Investigator:** That's me

**Interviewee:** Oh! It's hard being an external processor and also I'm extroverted and so I can't spend a lot of time by myself… also I can't think about things when I'm alone. Anyway… Sorry.

**Investigator:** No, No problem. So the next question is what have you learned about AFM values outside of the classroom? And I'm considering Crucible as being part of the classroom because the trainers were there and it was intentional.

**Interviewee:** Ok, I mean we don't really interact with AFM outside of the classroom but I mean I guess this is something that they say, one of their important things is direct communication. Like being quick about communication. And that's something that if you ask people in our SM group, that's actually one of the reasons some of us are here. Because of communication. Actually that may be one of the reasons I'm here. Because I went to the Adventist volunteers website and their calls were so vague and I was like ok well, I'm looking at these calls but I have no idea what they are but when you go to AFM it's like teacher, English teacher and friendship evangelism needed to do this and this and this and it tells you about the projects, like where they're from and statistics about them like the language, population, stuff like that. And so, I guess you can say it's, kind of, part of like, I don't know I guess I wanna add another value is communication. Their method of communication. It may, to me, like if I didn't think about it I probably would just be like, well that's just part of their job. But then, if you think about it the way that they communicate with people, that influences people to trust the organization. As long as they were in work hours I knew I could count on someone to respond to my email and if not like a lot of times they'll forward it to people and then that other person will message me. And so in that context sometimes it would take longer but usually within a day or two the quickness of their communication, that was something I witnessed outside of the classroom. I'm trying to think of anything else. Like, I mean, all the other staff, besides the teachers, they're not technically part of the classroom but even for example like people that work in the office, you know people who work in the office.

**Investigator:** I don't actually know them.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, you don't have to spend time with them but I can see that they value these things too. And like community, [A member of the office staff] really actually tries to come here and like put herself into the community a little bit. And even though she's really busy and I know she's really tired. But one night when we went to the [someone's] house they, like she was trying to talk to the SM's especially me, I don't know if she was talking to other people as much. But, I felt invested in not just by these people but like [a list of other office staff], and I don't really

know a lot of the other people but even [another office staff], when I was having my interview, yeah. Just, even the questions they ask in their interview, it's like you know that they are trying to get to know you not just what you can do.

**Investigator:** Yeah, that's important. A couple other people have mentioned that too. Well, there's only one more question. And it can be taken two different ways. I realized the first time I was doing a focus group that, oh that's kind of unclear and I can think of two different ways it can be taken so it doesn't matter which way you take it so I'll just explain both of them. The question is: Are there values that you think should have been emphasized more in training? And I realize that could be values that you think AFM should have that they don't or it could be values that they have that they just haven't identified.

**Interviewee:** Oh ok… I think one thing, I mean, I don't know if this is, I guess this is a training thing and I don't know if it's like an, yeah, I guess investment in the sense that one-on-one relationships between the SM's are not as good as the one-on-one relationships with the SM's and [the Training Directors]. And so that's one thing that just being really busy takes away from. The person I got really close to was my roommate because I was with her the whole time. And so we were actually able to invest in each other but …

**Investigator:** That's true, you're really busy.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, just so busy that I only got to talk one on one and have a good conversations with a few people. And a lot of those were the first week before Crucible. And so, we didn't know the AFM values, we didn't know how to communicate the way they wanted us, like the way they teach us to communicate. And so like, with my roommate too, we started being friends before we even learned all that stuff so we don't actually communicate with that and I mean, we're already really close I mean, we've been rooming together. We're on a different level. I call her, I was like, you pass the sister threshold. That's what I tell her. But anyway, besides that I guess the community aspect is really nice but then we don't take that deeper. What I realized is that we don't have… we have time but they're always like, oh focus on your quiet time, focus on teamwork, and community building. But then like, especially for me, because the only other SM that I'm going with is a guy. That I met here and I mean there are some girls there but he's going to be the only guy there too. And so it's probably hard for him too. But like, I haven't had time to invest in our relationship and so I don't know him obviously as well as know my roommate or any of the girls either. Because, just because they don't emphasize I think, the actual teams that we're going with. Like the Irish team, they prayed together a lot but me and my partner we prayed once together. And apart from that we'll talk about expectations about [our destination country] and what we want out of it. But we haven't really been able to invest in a relationship with each other. And I know that's going to be something we struggle with because when we go to [our destination country], we will probably be more busy and the social norms, we're not going to be living in the same place, we'll be neighbors, we'll be living in separate houses, and so I think if they, like, they put us together in the tables but we just talk about things, we don't talk to each other. And I think that's something that I could have really benefited from that I know personally that if I had time to like even have this conversation with, the type of conversation we had with [the Training Director], with my partner, that probably would have helped me because it's been a month and I've struggled with my relationship with this person

because… just the context in which I got to know them, it's not as personal as I think it should have be because I'm going to be living with this person for a year.

**Investigator:** Yeah, and especially since you're going into a high context culture where they expect you to know a lot about each other. But, here where you're coming from, you don't know a lot about each other and it would make a lot of sense to learn that before going so that it would be easier so that at least you two would be more in a high context culture with the two of you.

**Interviewee:** yeah, yeah, yeah. I think that's something that I think could have been done differently. Like maybe even taking a little bit of time away from being a community and like maybe for meals you just go one-on-one with… or not one-on-one, you go on with your teams or something. Cause we're always like all together

**Investigator:** Or maybe one day a week.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, One day a week or one meal a week you just go outside and eat separately with your group or something. Which I mean, it's kind of weird cause it's a guy and a girl but I mean still, obviously we're just friends, you know, so. But yeah, that's something I feel…

**Investigator:** Yeah thank you. That's something that I hadn't thought of. There were a couple other things that I was keeping notes on. But I'm trying not to make judgments until after the whole training is over and I've talked with everyone and then analyzed everything. But, yeah, that's a good one that had skipped my notice.

**Interviewee:** Yeah, and like the guys, they always hang out together. And I wish they actually enforced that because they always tell us, oh there's a five foot rule, there's a gender disparity in a lot of countries that you're going to and yeah we understand that but they try to implement it but not really. But if they want to implement that I think they have to give us the opportunity where we can just get together as girls and really get together as guys. and the guys did it on their own because, you know they're more like that. But there were times when I was just like, man, the girls should just go and hang out. But then, when we were having the penguin circle, that was the one we went overtime, and so I wanted to mention it but we didn't have time. And then I was like, we're going to be busy for the rest of time. So, but I think that if we had more time to just get comfortable with being with the same gender because not everyone is always most comfortable being with the same gender. I grew up with mostly guys, my brother, my cousins, my church members, they were all guys. And so I naturally tend to just hang out with guys because that's just what I've grown up with. But like, because they keep trying to tell us your not supposed to be together but then they don't give us an actually opportunity for all the girls to be together. That's the first time when we had that conversation in the circle that we weren't separated by genders. So I think that could have really helped.

**Investigator:** Yeah, I heard a couple other people mentioning that today about how it was especially difficult for the girls to get together. And someone was mentioning that it's maybe because the guys are more at the same stage in life than the girls are. There's a larger…

**Interviewee:** Oh like age difference?

**Investigator:** Thank you.

APPENDIX N

RESULTS OF DEMOGRAPHIC & VALUES SURVEY AND FINAL VALUES SURVEY

| Participant | Age Range | Sex | Country of Origin | Ethnic/Cultural Background | Most recent occupation/ job | Student? | Public/ Private institution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Focus Group #2** | 40-44 | F | USA | Caucasian American | Sign Language Interpreter | No | |
| **Focus Group #3** | 25-29 | F | USA | Caucasian | Student | Yes | Private |
| **Interview #1** | 25-29 | F | USA | Caucasian | Nursing | No | |
| **Focus Group #2** | 25-29 | F | USA | Caucasian | School Nurse | No | |
| **Interview #2** | 18-24 | F | USA | Korea | | Yes | Private |
| **Focus Group #2** | 18-24 | M | USA | White | Camp Counselor | Yes | Private |
| **Focus Group #3** | 18-24 | M | USA | Caucasian | Actor | Yes | Private |
| **Focus Group #1** | 18-24 | M | USA | American/ Western | Nurse | No | |
| **Focus Group #1** | 30-34 | M | Switzerland | Swiss | Teacher | No | |
| **Focus Group #1** | 18-24 | M | USA | White | Bible Worker/Intern | No | |
| **Focus Group #2** | 18-24 | F | Austria | American/ Romanian | Volunteer at church in Austria | No | |
| **Focus Group #1** | 18-24 | F | Canada | | Lifeguard | Yes | Private |
| **Focus Group #3** | 18-24 | M | USA | USA | Student | Yes | Private |
| **Focus Group #1** | 18-24 | F | USA | USA/ German | Violin Teacher | Yes | Private |
| **Focus Group #1** | 18-24 | F | Republic of Georgia | Russian/ Ukrainian | Student/ Teacher | Yes | Public |

| Participant | 1st time going on short-term mission trip? | Why go as missionary through AFM? |
|---|---|---|
| Focus Group #2 | Yes | Because I saw a need in the country I have chosen to work in and found that AMF is already there. |
| Focus Group #3 | Yes | I wanted to work in a Muslim country |
| Interview #1 | I have gone on a few 1-3 week mission trips but this is my first yearlong and my first with AFM | Their investment in and their security/provision for their missionaries. They were very honest with me during the application process. |
| Focus Group #2 | No | I have a real love for connecting with other cultures and sensed God's calling to make connections for Him. I am passionate about sharing the love HE has shown me! |
| Interview #2 | No | Because I believe in the importance of front-line missionaries and reaching unreached people groups |
| Focus Group #2 | Yes | Where God called |
| Focus Group #3 | No | I felt AFM takes missions more seriously than other organizations, which I seek. |
| Focus Group #1 | No | Because of what they stand for, their values. Because they have been the most eager to get me out into the field. |
| Focus Group #1 | Yes | I appreciate very much how they approach mission, their values, training, that's why AFM and not another organization. God was knocking several times on my door and lead me to the point I was ready to take the decision to go for a year overseas as a missionary |
| Focus Group #1 | Yes | My friend's testimony and God's leading |
| Focus Group #2 | Yes, but I already consider myself a missionary | God calls people to mission. I feel He called me too. I want God to work through me to reach people who have no access to the Truth. |
| Focus Group #1 | Yes | My friends went with AFM and from what heard from them as well as others, I decided that AFM sounded like a well-focused organization. I was impressed at the gentle, loving caring way their representatives came across. |
| Focus Group #3 | No | Focus on language, Focus on sharing Jesus |
| Focus Group #1 | No | I want to go to Thailand to teach at a music school, and I was highly recommended to go through AFM by several people |

| Focus Group #1 | No | They go to the unreached groups, show personal interest in each missionary, want to establish movements, not just members |
|---|---|---|

| Participant | What are AFM values? (Before) | What are AFM values? (After) |
|---|---|---|
| Focus Group #2 | I don't know :( | Transparency, cultural awareness, teamwork, obedience to God, humility, (there are definitely more, but I can't seem to think) |
| Focus Group #3 | Teamwork, Capability, Courage | Transparency, vulnerability, teamwork, reliance, integrity |
| Interview #1 | | — |
| Focus Group #2 | Reaching souls with the Gospel who are unreached, training missionaries/church planting movement, church planting and raising up local leadership | Teamwork, transparency, humility, mentorship (if that's a word), vulnerability, growth, multiplication, faithfulness |
| Interview #2 | To create movements | — |
| Focus Group #2 | Start movements that reflect Jesus | Relational healing |
| Focus Group #3 | Christ, Disciple-making, Church Planting | Openness, Vulnerability, Outreach, Contextual Culture, Relationships |
| Focus Group #1 | "Everything listed below" | Ambition, broad-mindedness, capability, cheerfulness, cleanliness,, courage, helpfulness, humility, imagination, independence, integrity, intellectuality, logic, obedience, politeness, reliance, responsibility, self-control, teamwork, transparency |
| Focus Group #1 | Preaching and displaying through life the gospel of Jesus to people who have never had the chance to hear of Jesus.  Create movements, Work where God is working - align to His will instead of vise versa, Teamwork | Reaching the unreached, transparency and vulnerability, integrity, relational healing, teamwork (both affirming and open communication when there are differences), immerse in the culture you live in, self-responsibility |
| Focus Group #1 | To reach the unreached people groups around the world to enrich people's lives.  Honesty, Hard labor, Christ-like living, Following Christ's example | — |
| Focus Group #2 | Spreading the gospel, starting movements and inviting people into the kingdom of God. | Transparency, teamwork, humility, obedience, responsibility, capability, reliance, movements |

| Focus Group #1 | Christ and sharing Him with the world. People and sharing the love of Christ | Discipleship, lost people, connecting with others, spiritual growth, love, cultural sensitivity |
| Focus Group #3 | Teamwork, creating a movement, humility and also realizing that mission is God's work and I must join Him (rather than being my work and Him joining me) | — |
| Focus Group #1 | To follow the example of Christ in every aspect of life, including his method of seeking out the unreached | Reaching the unreached, relational healing in JESUS, vulnerability, transparency, discipleship, humility, perseverance, personal interaction, friendship, cultural sensitivity |
| Focus Group #1 | Character, faithfulness, teamwork | Love in tangible things, unity, integrity, teamwork, transparency, obedience to God, disciple-making, broad-mindedness, humility |

| Participant | Top 7 values (Before) | Top 7 values (After) | Do you feel that any of you values have changed over the course of the training? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Focus Group #2 | Cheerfulness, Integrity, Intellectuality, Logic, Politeness, Responsibility, Self-control | Cheerfulness, humility, integrity, obedience, self-control, teamwork, transparency | I believe so, partially because I can't remember what exactly I put down the first time. Also, when presented, several of their values were impressed upon me as important, especially in missions. |
| Focus Group #3 | Broad-mindedness, Helpfulness, Humility, Integrity, Logic, Obedience, Responsibility | Broad-mindedness, cheerfulness, helpfulness, integrity, responsibility, teamwork, transparency | Some, teamwork wasn't as high a value as it is now. Crucible helped realize the importance and the pleasure that teams are |
| Interview #1 | Broad-mindedness, humility, Integrity, Reliance, Responsibility, Self-control, Teamwork | — | — |
| Focus Group #2 | Courage, Helpfulness, Humility, Imagination, Integrity, Teamwork, Transparency | Helpfulness, humility, integrity, obedience, responsibility, teamwork, transparency | Yes - I saw the value in teamwork much more than before. I said I valued teamwork but actually I valued independence more, |

| | | | before the training |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Interview #2** | Broad-mindedness, Capability, Cheerfulness, Humility, Independence, Politeness, Reliance | — | — |
| **Focus Group #2** | Ambition, Cheerfulness, Helpfulness, Intellectuality, Politeness, Self-control, Transparency | Cheerfulness, helpfulness, humility, imagination, integrity, responsibility, teamwork | Yes. I feel as though my paradigm of how I view the purpose of my life has changed. Being around others with paradigms different from mine has helped change mine. |
| **Focus Group #3** | Courage, Imagination, Integrity, Logic, Responsibility, Teamwork, Transparency | Broad-mindedness, courage, helpfulness, integrity, obedience, self-control, transparency | Somewhat. I feel that my attention to others and how they feel have been amplified by a strong margin. |
| **Focus Group #1** | Courage, Humility, Integrity, Intellectuality, Politeness, Self-control, Transparency | Cheerfulness, helpfulness, humility, integrity, reliance, teamwork, transparency | They haven't changed, but they have all gone to a much deeper level. |
| **Focus Group #1** | Broad-mindedness, Helpfulness, Humility, Integrity, Responsibility, Teamwork, Transparency | Cheerfulness, helpfulness, humility, integrity, responsibility, teamwork, transparency | Yes. Through the example of our teachers and through self-experience |
| **Focus Group #1** | Courage, Humility, Integrity, Logic, Politeness, Responsibility, Self-control | — | — |
| **Focus Group #2** | Cheerfulness, Helpfulness, Imagination, Reliance, Responsibility, Teamwork, Transparency | Ambition, humility, obedience, reliance, responsibility, teamwork, transparency | Yes, I feel very responsible for representing Christianity/Christ/AFM. Yes, I have seen and experienced teamwork in a wonderful way |

158

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Focus Group #1** | Cheerfulness, Cleanliness, Helpfulness, Humility, Integrity, Obedience, Teamwork | Broad-mindedness, cheerfulness, integrity, obedience, responsibility, teamwork, transparency/vulnerability | I wouldn't say my values have changed. They've just been shuffled. The way I prioritize my values has changed. |
| **Focus Group #3** | Cheerfulness, Humility, Integrity, Intellectuality, Obedience, Responsibility, Self-control | — | — |
| **Focus Group #1** | Cheerfulness, Helpfulness, Humility, Integrity, Obedience, Self-control, Transparency | Broad-mindedness, humility, integrity, obedience, reliance, teamwork, transparency | Yes. There were some values (new and old to me) discussed and brought out which I now see to be extremely more important than before |
| **Focus Group #1** | Cheerfulness, Helpfulness, Humility, Integrity, Reliance, Self-control, Transparency | Broad-mindedness, cheerfulness, humility, integrity, obedience, teamwork, transparency | Yes, I value teamwork more now, and broad-mindedness because I saw how your life is affected by them in positive ways. |

| Participant | During the training, were you most influence by the communication of values that was done: | What do you think was the best method AFM used to communicate core values? |
|---|---|---|
| **Focus Group #2** | Orally | The stories of their experiences that portrayed the values they were trying to instill. |
| **Focus Group #3** | Interactive activities | The trainers showed how the values worked and/or made us have to fight back against them with the values they wanted to instill |
| **Interview #1** | — | — |
| **Focus Group #2** | Interactive activities | The lectures were stellar, but it was the interactive activities/assignments (communal living and cooking, "crucible," penguin circles, games, journals, etc.) that brought it home |
| **Interview #2** | — | — |
| **Focus Group #2** | Orally | The discipleship class/The guest presenter's (previous training director) lecture |
| **Focus Group #3** | Interactive activities | Showing the core values and making us demonstrate them in our daily lives to know what they feel like to uphold. |
| **Focus** | #1 Interactive activities, #2 | By living the examples they teach. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Group #1** | Visually, #3 Orally | |
| **Focus Group #1** | Interactive activities = experiences, Other: Through repetition and implementation in our daily life here | Learning through experience and by example |
| **Focus Group #1** | — | — |
| **Focus Group #2** | Visually - the trainers live these values (most important!) Orally - they also talked about them (less important!) Interactive activities - They taught us how to apply the values (very important!) | AFM lives values - shows them and shows and teaches how to apply them |
| **Focus Group #1** | Other: They live what they preach. I guess that's what you call visual or experiential | The vulnerability and transparency of the trainers. Their willingness to be open and honest, and the way in which their lives reflected the material they were teaching. |
| **Focus Group #3** | — | — |
| **Focus Group #1** | #1 Interactive activities, #2 Visually | Interactive activities, role-playing, and personal stories and experiences |
| **Focus Group #1** | Other: leading by example, Interactive activities, Orally | Leading by example, practical activities |

REFERENCES

About Us. (2015). *Adventist Frontier Missions*. Retrieved from http://www.afmonline.org/about-us/

AFM Church-Planting Model. (2015). *Adventist Frontier Missions*. Retrieved from http://www.afmonline.org/about-us/the-church-planting-cycle/

Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 847-858.

Armitage, C. J. & Conner, M. (1999). The theory of planned behavior: Assessment of predictive validity and 'perceived control.' *British Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(1), 35-54. doi: 10.1348/014466699164022

Barker, R. T. & Gower, K. (2010). Strategic application of storytelling in organizations: Toward effective communication in a diverse world. *Journal of Business Communication, 47*(3), 295-312. doi: 10.1177/0021943610369782

Barker, R. T., Rimler, G. W., Moreno, E. & Kaplan, T. E. (2004). Family business members' narrative perceptions: Values, succession, and commitment. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 34*(4), 291-320.

Bauer, T. N., Brodner, T., Erdogan, B. Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(3), 707-721. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.707

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers . *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544-559. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/2

Bourne, H. & Jenkins, M. (2013). Organizational values: A dynamic perspective. *Organization studies, 34*(4), 495-514. doi: 10.1177/0170840612467155

Brinol, P., McCaslin, M. J., & Petty, R. E. (2012). Self-generated persuasion: Effects of the target and direction of arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*, 925-940.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015). Job openings and labor turnover survey. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/jlt/news.htm.

Burmann, C., Hegner, S., & Riley, N. (2009). Towards an identity-based branding. *Marketing Theory, 9*(1), 113-118. doi: 10.1177/1470593108100065

Cable, D. M. & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology, 54*(1), 1-23.

Cacioppo, J. T. & Petty, R. E. (1984). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion in *Advances in Consumer Research, 11*, 674-675.

Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 730-743.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *The Academy of Management Review, 14*(3), 333-349. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1989.4279063

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Domke, D., Perlmutter, D., & Spratt, M. (2002). The primes of our times? An examination of the 'power' of visual images. *Journalism, 3*(2), pp. 131-159. doi: 10.1177/146488490200300211

Eden, D. & Kinnar, J. (1991). Modeling Galatea: Boosting self-efficacy to increase volunteering. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(6), pp. 770-780.

Edwards, J.R. & Cable, D. M. (2009). The Value of Value Congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(3), 654-677. doi: 10.1037/a0014891

Fitzgerald, G. A. & Desjardins, N. M. (2004). Organizational values and their relation to organizational performance outcomes. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 12*(3), 121-145.

Fulk, J. & Boyd, B. (1991). Emerging theories of communication in organizations. *Journal of Management, 17*(2), 407-446. doi: 10.1177/014920639101700207

Gruys, M. L., Stewart, S. M., Goodstein, J., Bing, M. N., & Wicks, A. C. (2008). Values enactment in organizations: A multi-level examination. *Journal of Management, 34*(4), 806-843. doi: 10.1177/0149206308318610

Hart, Z. P. (2012). Message content and sources during organizational socialization. *Journal of Business Communication*, *49*(3), 191-209. doi:10.1177/0021943612446731

Heiss, S. N. & Carmack, H. J. (2011). Knock, knock; who's there?: Making sense of organizational entrance through humor. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*(1), 106-132. doi: 10.1177/0893318911414914

Hess, J. A. (1993). Assimilating newcomers into an organization: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *21*(2), 189-210.

Hooper, M. J. & Pye, T. (2002). Company culture: The relationship of organizational values to business excellence. *Journal of Human Values, 8*(1), 27-43. doi: 10.1177/097168580200800104

Karacaer, S., Gohar, R., Aygun, M., & Sayin, C. (2009). Effects of personal values on auditor's ethical decisions: A comparison of Pakistani and Turkish professional auditors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88(1)*, 53-64.

Kim, T., Cable, D. M., & Kim, S. (2005). Socialization tactics, employee proactivity, and person-organization fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(2), 232-241. doi: 10:1037/0021-9010.90.2.232

Klein, H. J. & Weaver, N. A. (2000). The effectiveness of an organizational-level orientation training program in the socialization of new hires. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(1), 47-66. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00193.x

Kramer, M. W., Meisenbach, R. J., & Hansen, G. J. (2013) Communication, uncertainty, and volunteer membership. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 41*(1), 13-39. doi: 10.1080/00909882.2012.750002

Lohndorf, B. & Diamantopoulos, A. (2014). Internal branding: Social identity and social exchange perspectives on turning employees into brand champions. *Journal of Service Research, 17*(3), 310-325. doi: 10.1177/1094670514522098

Manohar, S. S. & Pandit, S. (2013). Core values and beliefs: A study of leading innovative organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*(4), 667-680. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1926-5

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice 13*(6), 522-526. doi: 10.1093/fampra/13.6.522

McDonald, P. & Gandz, J. (1992). Getting value from shared values. *Organizational Dynamics, 20*(3), 64-77. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(92)90025-I

McGrath, V. (2009). Reviewing the evidence on how adult students learn: An examination of Knowles' Model of Andragogy. *Adult Learner: The Irish Journal of Adult and Community Education*, 99-110.

McKeever, B. S. & Pettijohn, S. L. (2014) The Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2014: Public Charities, Giving, and Volunteering. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/413277-The-Nonprofit-Sector-in-Brief--.PDF

Mignerey, J. T., Rubin, R. B., & Gorden, W. I. (1995). Organizational entry: An investigation of newcomer communication behavior and uncertainty. *Communication Research, 22*(1), 54-85. doi: 10.1177/009365095022001003

Missionaries. (2015). *Adventist Frontier Missions*. Retrieved from http://www.afmonline.org/missionaries/

Murray, S. R. & Peyrefitte, J. (2007). Knowledge type and communication media choice in the knowledge transfer process. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *19*(1) 111-133.

Owen, K. O. & Dietz, A. S. (2012). Understanding organizational reality: Concepts for the change leader. *SAGE Open, 2*(4), 1-14. doi: 10.1177/2158244012461922

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods (3$^{rd}$ ed).* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Peng, S., Pandey, S. & Pandey, S. K. (2015). Is there a nonprofit advantage? Examining the impact of institutional context on individual-organizational value congruence. *Public Administration Review, 75*(4), 585-596.

Quinones, M. A. (1995). Pretraining context effects: Training assignment as feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(2), 226-238.

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. (3$^{rd}$ ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Saks, A. M. & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*(2), 234-279. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1997.1614

Saks, A. M., Uggerslev, K. L. & Fassina, N. E. (2007). Socialization tactics and newcomer adjustment: A meta-analytic review and test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*(3), 413-446. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.12.004

Schein, E. H. (1984). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. *Sloan Management Review, 25*(2). 3-16.

Schutt, R. K. (2012). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. & Morley, D. D. (1989). Adhering to organizational culture: What does it mean? Why does it matter? *Group & Organization Management*, *14*(4) 483-500. doi: 10.1177/105960118901400408

Sirianni, N. J., Bitner, M. J., Brown, S. W., & Mandel, N. (2013). Branded service encounters: Strategically aligning employee behavior with the brand positioning. *Journal of Marketing, 77*(6), 108-123.

Stohl, C. (1986). The role of memorable messages in the process of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly, 34*(4), 231-249.

Stormer, F. & Devine, K. (2008). Acting at work: Facades of conformity in academia. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 17*(2), 112-134. doi: 10.1177/1056492607310983

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Student & Short Term Missions Training. (2015). *Adventist Frontier Missions*. Retrieved from http://www.afmonline.org/afm-training/training-options/student-short-term-training/

Training FAQs. (2015). *Adventist Frontier Missions*. Retrieved from http://www.afmonline.org/afm-training/training-faqs/

Training Philosophy. (2015). *Adventist Frontier Missions*. Retrieved from http://www.afmonline.org/afm-training/meet-afm-training/afm-training-philosophy/

Waldeck, J. H., Seibold, D. R., & Flanagin, A. J. (2004). Organizational assimilation and communication technology use. *Communication monographs, 71*(2), 161-183. doi: 10.1080/0363775042331302497

Wentzel, D. (2009). The effect of employee behavior on brand personality impressions and brand attitudes. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *37*(3), 359-374. doi: 10.1007/s11747-009-0140-6

Wesson, M. J. & Gorgus, C. I. (2005). Shaking hands with a computer: An examination of two methods of organizational newcomer orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 1018-1036. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1018

Wiethoff, C. (2004). Motivation to learn and diversity training: Application of the theory of planned behavior. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*(3), 263-278. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.1103