Concordia University - Portland
CU Commons

MA IDS Thesis Projects   Graduate Theses & Dissertations

2015

Models of Faith: The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in International Development

Mara Hochberg-Miller
Concordia University - Portland

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.cu-portland.edu/gradproj

Part of the International and Area Studies Commons, International Business Commons, Missions and World Christianity Commons, Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons, and the Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons

Models of Faith: The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in International Development

Mara Hochberg-Miller

Concordia University Portland

Presented to
The Graduate Program in College of Theology, Arts & Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of
M.A. in International Development and Service

Concordia University Portland
November 18, 2015

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Faith-based organizations make up a large percentage of organizations doing

development work both domestically and internationally. Faith-based development

organizations (FBDOs) can be successful because they have spiritual drive to work for

the social good, and large religious organizations to support them. However, not all

FBDOs practice good development, and in the past many of them have undertaken

development projects that proved to be damaging and detrimental to the host

communities. The purpose of this research is to explore how different FBDOs

conceptualize and operationalize their faith while doing development work abroad.

Through exploring different models of faith-based development and analyzing their

practices, this research can ultimately assist FBDOs in structuring their organizations so

they can become more effective development actors and ensure that their practices are

sustainable and culturally sensitive.

Keywords: faith-based development organizations (FBDOs), development, effectiveness,

cultural sensitivity, harmful practices, evangelism, secular

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of Issue

International development has been occurring for centuries, and has its origins in the colonial conquests undertaken by European countries in the 1500s. These early development initiatives often had religious roots, as the European countries undertaking them had deep ties to the Catholic Church (Bhalerao, n.d.). Since its origination, the types of development work, as well as the organizations partaking in development work, have diversified. In 2009, there were nearly two million non-profit organizations operating in the United States alone (Salamon, 2012). From 1997 to 2007 the revenue from private philanthropy increased by 64%, totaling $1.963 trillion in 2007 (Salamon, 2012). A substantial percentage of these organizations are faith-based, and that number continues to grow. It was reported that in 2005, faith-based organizations made up over 33% of all international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), and were responsible for over 50% of their revenue (King, 2011).

Because of this growing engagement with development, it becomes more important to assess the practices currently being utilized in the field. This includes organizational models being used, impact assessments, adherence to best practices, relationships with host communities, and much more. It is important to learn the lessons of what has been done well and what needs to be improved upon before more organizations join the work and expand the range of projects they undertake.

Background of the Problem: What is International Development?

The phrase "international development" has become a catch-all term referring to any activities that occur within developing nations. Traditionally, international

development was thought to be synonymous with economic development, which

contributed to the World Bank's classifications of low-income countries, middle-income

countries, and high-income countries (Nielsen, 2011). More recently, international

development is associated with human development, and the international efforts to

reduce poverty and improve health and education (Rosenkranz, 2011).

The term "development" was first used in President Truman's 1949 Inaugural

Address to sound "a bit original" (Rist, 2007, p. 485). In his speech, Truman associated

inadequate food, disease, and poverty with underdevelopment, and scientific

advancement, technical knowledge, and industrial progress with development (Haslam,

Schafer, & Beaudet, 2012). However, Rist (2007) pointed out that no one bothered to

actually define the buzzword, allowing the term to remain vague. While development was

generally intended to address poverty and improve standards of living for poor people

around the globe, it became a political tool with which the United States and Soviet

Union could widen their spheres of influence by winning over the developing world

(Rist, 2007). The Truman Doctrine reflected this; it became a US policy to provide

economic and military aid to Turkey, Greece, and other countries facing the threat of

Communism. Providing development aid was meant to entice the developing world to

remain capitalist (Rist, 2007).

Because of the vagueness of the term, many adjectives have since been added to

"development" to define it further, including "human," "social," "economic," and

"sustainable." Haslam, Schafer, and Beaudet (2012) wrote that the "different approaches

to defining 'development' reveal different aspects of the problem: the need to distinguish

between levels of industrialization, the need to consider different segments of the

population, the need to look specifically at poverty, and the need to consider development as an 'ideal' or aspiration for betterment" (p. 9). Development can be measured by economic growth, income inequality, rates of poverty, or countless other ways. In the late 1960s, scholars began considering development to include more than just economics. Dudley Seers believed that to have development it was necessary for people to have an income adequate for basic survival, employment, education, political participation, national autonomy, and to improve the distribution of income in a country (Haslam et al., 2012). Denis Goulet wrote that the development should promote life-sustenance—food, clothing, health, and shelter— as well as self-esteem and freedoms (Haslam et al., 2012).

Amartya Sen championed the idea that the goal of development should be an expansion of freedoms: having the capability to access health and welfare services, having political, civil, and economic rights, having the ability to feed oneself, and having the opportunity to pursue education (Haslam et al., 2012). In 1990, the Human Development Index (HDI) was developed by the United Nations Development Programme with input from Sen, ranking the levels of human development in a country based on three measures: lifespan at birth, standard of living measured by GDP per capita, and knowledge, which takes into account adult literacy rates and school enrollment ratios (Haslam et al., 2012). The HDI underwent a change in 2010 and now uses mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling to calculate knowledge, and Gross National Income (GNI) per capita to calculate standard of living (Nielsen, 2011; UNDP, n.d.).

The field of international development today typically includes such topics of study as building the physical infrastructure of a country, which includes roads, schools,

and medical centers, working with farmers to increase sustainable agriculture practices, running women's empowerment programs, protecting indigenous land rights, and much more. While humanitarian aid and emergency relief are often thought of as subsets of international development, they are intended to be short-term emergency solutions whereas international development is meant to be more long-term and sustainable (Rosenkranz, 2011). Humanitarian aid is most commonly associated with the services provided to refugees who may be fleeing violence or famine. Emergency relief typically occurs when a country is hit by a natural disaster, and people and agencies come in to assist with rescue, clean up, and rebuilding. Although humanitarian aid and emergency relief are also important aspects of development, they are generally not part of long-term development strategies, and will therefore not be included in the conceptualization of international development used in this research. For the purpose of this study, this paper will adopt Eade and Williams' definition of development, as "strengthening people's capacity to determine their own values and priorities, and to organize themselves to act on these" (as cited in Ver Beek, 2000, p. 32). This definition of development is appropriate for this research because it is free of neo-colonial implications that are often present in development discourse, and because religion and spirituality is so integral to peoples' actions and beliefs, often providing them with a sense of hope and agency.

Purpose of Study and Rationale

Despite the religious roots of development, religion has largely been left out of the academic discourse (Lunn, 2009; Ver Beek, 2000). Today, there are a myriad of organizations participating in development, including governments, international organizations (IOs) such as the United Nations and European Union, international non-

governmental organizations (INGOs) such as Oxfam or the International Committee of the Red Cross, smaller non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as Feeding America and Volunteer Match, as well as grassroots non-profit organizations that exist both domestically and internationally. Among these development organizations are also faith-based organizations working towards many of the same goals, such as World Vision, Catholic Charities, or Islamic Relief. As religion has increasingly become a dominant force in modern world politics, there has been a heightened interest in studying how religion interacts with development (Berger, 2003; Lunn, 2009). This research aims to contribute to this growing field.

Theoretical Framework: Research Question and Objectives

This study aims to analyze current models of faith-based development organizations and the practices they are using in the field of international development. The research will specifically target several main topics of how faith and development interact: how the organizations operationalize their faith, how the organizations view their moral obligation, what development practices are utilized by organizations, and what types of involvement the organizations have with the local community. Though developed independently, Goggin and Orth also suggest these areas as topics of interest within faith-based organizations (FBOs) (as cited in Sider & Unruh, 2004). Goggin and Orth write:

> "Organizational factors include the structural characteristics of the FBO itself. The administrative factor focuses on the mission, management, and staffing practices of the organization. Environmental factors include the physical characteristics of the facilities in which FBO services and programs are provided.

Funding factors concern the distribution of financial resources that FBOs receive

from secular and religious sources. Finally, the programmatic factors focus on

specific religious components of FBO activities/services and the extent to which

these components are mandatory or voluntary in nature" (as cited in Sider &

Unruh, 2004, p. 116).

Many of the areas that Goggin and Orth pinpoint appear in the survey designed for this

research. Once this data is collected, the practices will be tested against current standards

of best practice within the field of international development. Through addressing these

components, this research attempts to answer the question: How can faith-based

development organizations maintain the benefits of religion while ensuring that their

development practices are inclusive and respectful of other cultures and religions?

Additional Definitions

This research looks at organizations that have religious roots and are doing work

in the field of international development. There are many different studies of this nature,

and each seems to use a different terminology. Some studies use RO, or religious

organization, some use RNGO, for religious non-governmental organization, and many

others use FBO, to mean faith-based organization. This study adopts the term FBDO, or

faith-based development organization, to specify that the organization both has its roots

in a religion or faith and is involved in development work. While some may disagree, this

paper uses these terms synonymously.

Lunn (2009) pointed out the differences between religion and spirituality:

"Religion is often the source of spirituality but not all religious people are necessarily

spiritual, just as not all spiritual people are necessarily religious" (p. 937). She defined

religion as "an institutionalised system of beliefs and practices concerning the

supernatural realm; spirituality as the personal beliefs by which an individual relates to

and experiences the supernatural realm; and faith as the human trust or belief in a

transcendent reality (although the word faith is also applied in non-religious contexts)"

(Lunn, 2009, p. 937-38). Lunn's explanations will be used as the working definitions in

this paper. Additionally, Vincent, Parrott, and Peterson (2012) define religious

fundamentalism to be "an authoritarian set of beliefs that identify one set of religious

teachings as the fundamental truth," and religiosity to mean "the extent of religious

practice and the impact of religion on one's daily, secular life" (p. 4). These terms are

both relevant to this research.

To be as specific as possible, this paper adopts Berger's (2003) description of

RNGOs to be the working definition of FBDOs. Specifically, faith-based development

organizations are:

> "Formal organizations whose identity and mission are self-consciously derived
>
> from the teachings of one or more religious or spiritual traditions and which
>
> operates on a nonprofit, independent, voluntary basis to promote and realize
>
> collectively articulated ideas about the public good at the national or international
>
> level" (Berger, 2003, p. 16).

Finally, it is important to note that the concept of inclusivity is also an important

element of this research. Merriam-Webster defines inclusive as being open to everyone,

not limited to certain people (n.d). In the context of this research, inclusivity means that

organizations accept and serve people from all different social, religious, or ethnic

groups.

Taxonomies of Faith-Based Organizations

Several taxonomies of faith-based organizations have emerged due to the diversity of organizations that fall under the category of FBO. The phrase "faith-based organization" has come to be an all-encompassing term, and thereby does not adequately define what it means to be faith-based. Sider and Unruh (2004) put forward a six category typology of religious social service and educational organizations and programs. This typology broke down "faith-based" to mean faith-permeated, faith-centered, faith-affiliated, faith-background, faith-secular partnership, and secular. The typology is also divided into two sections, organizations and programs. Sider and Unruh (2004) wrote:

"This typology identifies the tangibly expressive ways that religion may be present in a community-serving organization or program… [It] does not fully reflect the ways in which personal convictions and religious values, like mercy and justice, motivate and give deeper meaning to service work, although this is an important dimension of faith" (p. 117).

While real organizations or programs may not fit perfectly into one of these six categories, this taxonomy helps to reveal an underlying pattern of religious characteristics.

Sider and Unruh (2004) identified faith-permeated organizations as the most religious of the six categories, while secular organizations are unsurprisingly the least religious. The authors give these descriptions of their typology ☐Sider & Unruh, 2004, p. 119-120):

Table 1

Faith-permeated Organizations	In faith-permeated organizations, the connection with religious faith is evident at all levels of mission, staffing, governance, and support. Faith-permeated programs extensively integrate explicitly religious content. The religious dimension is believed to be essential to the program's effectiveness, and therefore participation in religious elements is often required.
Faith-centered Organizations	Faith-centered organizations were founded for a religious purpose, remain strongly connected with the religious community through funding sources and affiliation, and require the governing board and most staff to share the organization's faith commitments. Faith-centered programs incorporate explicitly religious messages and activities but are designed so that participants can readily opt out of these activities and still expect the benefits of the program's services.
Faith-affiliated Organizations	Faith-affiliated organizations retain some of the influence of their religious founders (such as in their mission statement) but do not require staff to affirm religious beliefs or practices, with the possible exception of some board and executive leaders. Although faith-affiliated programs incorporate little or no explicitly religious content, they may affirm faith in a general way and make spiritual resources available to participants. Faith-affiliated programs may have the intent of conveying a religious message through nonverbal acts of compassion and care.
Faith-background Organizations	Faith-background organizations tend to look and act secular, although they may have a historical tie to a faith tradition. Although religious beliefs may motivate some personnel, faith commitments are not considered in the selection of the staff or board. Faith-background programs have no explicitly religious content aside from their possible location in a religious setting, and they do not expect religious experience to contribute to program outcomes.
Faith-secular Partnerships	Faith-secular partnerships present a special case in which a secular (or faith-background) entity joins with one or more congregations or other explicitly religious organizations. This type of organization is typically secular in its administration but relies on the religious partners for volunteer and in-kind support. Leaders and staff respect but do not necessarily share the faith of the religious partners. The programming typically has no explicitly religious content, although volunteers and staff may offer optional religious resources and activities; the faith of the religious partners is considered a program asset whether or not it is expressed explicitly.
Secular Organizations	Secular organizations have no reference to religion in their mission or founding history, and they regard it as improper to

	consider religious commitments as a factor in hiring and governance. Secular programs include no religious content.

Sider and Unruh (2004) pinpointed eight organizational characteristics and four program characteristics that help to determine which category an organization falls into. Organizational characteristics are made up of the mission statement, the history of the organization's founding, its religious affiliation, if the controlling board has a faith requirement for board members, if there is a faith requirement for senior management, what the affiliation and faith background of the staff is, sources from which the organizations receive support in terms of donors and volunteers, and finally what the personnel's religious practices are, such as if staff (not clients) participate together in religious activities. The four program characteristics include the religious environment or spaces in which programs occur, the content of the programs, the integration of religious components (if religion is explicit or implicit, if religious practices are mandatory or optional), and lastly the expected connection between religious content and desired outcome.

Thaut (2009), too, constructed a similar taxonomy of Christian organizations. She surveyed a variety of Christian humanitarian agencies, and identified three categories in which organizations fall: Accommodative-Humanitarianism, Synthesis Humanitarianism, and Evangelistic Humanitarianism. Accomodative-Humanitarianism, Thaut explained, is culturally Christian, "serv[ing] Christ by participating in secular culture…[It] has religious roots, but its operations are not designed to fulfill a religious agenda" (2009, p. 333). Synthesis Humanitarianism organizations align more closely with particular religious denominations, may have staff affirm their Christian faith, and are more likely to appeal to religious donors than Accomodative-Humanitarianism organizations.

Synthesis Humanitarian organizations believe that "there need be no barrier between believers and non-believers when the goal of service is the same," though they operate in a more religious manner (Thaut, 2009, p. 336). Evangelistic Humanitarianism's primary goal is "to meet the needs of and expand the fellowship of Christian believers" (Thaut, 2009, p. 341). Kniss and Campbell (2007) asserted that evangelical agencies "provide relief and development assistance largely with the goal of helping to extend the church, build up the community of Christians globally, and serve the spiritual needs of humanity" (as cited in Thaut, 2009, p. 342). Though not all Christian organizations fall perfectly within these categories either, these are general trends among Christian organizations that are worth noting.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Historical Background

The idea of international development has existed since the beginning of colonialism. Colonialism, also known as imperialism, was:

> "An era of European expansion that began in the sixteenth century, when first the Portuguese and the Spanish and then the English, French, and Dutch created empires of trade in the Americas and Asia and, to a lesser extent, Africa. African territory did not, for the most part, come under imperial control or witness colonization (outside of Algeria and South Africa) until the last quarter of the nineteenth century; some scholars target in particular the period from 1870 to 1914 as the era of 'high imperialism'" (Haslam et al., 2012, p. 31).

The term imperialism was first used to describe the British Empire, which was a political system where colonies were controlled by a central power in order to pursue economic

goals, such as "external investment and penetration of markets and source of raw materials" (Haslam et al., 2012, p. 31).

Colonialism first came about after the Kingdoms of Portugal and Spain had been established, following the re-conquering of the Iberian Peninsula from the Muslim Moors in the 13th century (Haslam et al., 2012). Driven by political-religious competition with the Muslims and the desire to expand trade and cut out the Muslim middlemen, the Spanish and Portuguese established overseas holdings, and were soon joined by the French, English, and Dutch (Haslam et al., 2012). Colonization was further fueled by the European rivalry to keep up with their neighbors in claiming territories, the Industrial Revolution which created the need for new markets, as well as the rumors of riches and natural resources present in other parts of the world (Haslam et al., 2102). During this "age of exploration," colonies were set up in areas that Europe had previously come into contact with through trade and travel along the Silk Road, as well as expanded to other locations. European powers established chartered companies, such as the Dutch East India Company and the British Hudson's Bay Company, to enlist private investments in the service of the empire (Haslam et al., 2012).

Many of these early endeavors had religious roots. During the Middle Ages, which lasted in Europe from the 5th century to the 15th century, the Catholic Church was one of the most powerful institutions and the Pope had political as well as religious authority (Bhalerao, n.d.). The Church dominated publishing, policy-making, legal proceedings, and even art. Despite conflicts with the Church, such as the Reformation, the Great Schism, and the founding of the Church of England, the Church remained a powerful institution in medieval Europe (Bhalerao, n.d.). The Pope claimed the power to

depose Catholic kings, and kings claimed 'divine right' for their position as head of

church and state.

When European kingdoms first started exploring and colonizing other parts of the

world, many were still formally tied to religious institutions, and this translated into their

objectives overseas. Lunn (2009) wrote, "In the European colonial era it was seen as the

Christian duty to civilise and convert 'backward' peoples; some of the repercussions of

this mindset are still visible today" (p. 945). Mission organizations were frequently used

to deliver services for the colonial powers and Christian missions have been particularly

active in the fields of health, education, and humanitarian aid over the last 600 years

(Lunn, 2009). Repercussions of the Christian and colonial influences can be seen by the

number of missionaries still present in colonized countries, and by traditional colonial

laws that exist to this day (Epprecht, 2012).

Religion in Academic Discourse

Despite the historical religious roots of development, it has been widely noted

that, "religion has been largely under-represented in both development literature and

practice" (Lunn, 2009, p. 939). Lunn (2009) gave several reasons for this. First, she

pointed to both modernization theory and its opposite, Marxism, as being anti-religion.

Modernization theory has the "explicit goal of economic growth, [which] was believed to

go hand in hand with secularisation" (Lunn, 2009, p. 939). This view saw religion as an

"impediment to economic advancement" and as a "traditional" value that was irrelevant

for modern societies (Lunn, 2009, p. 939). Marxism, on the other hand, rejected religion

as merely being the opiate of the masses, a "human invention created to make life more

bearable" (Lunn, 2009, p. 939). Additionally, Lunn (2009) cited the Western separation

of church and state as being a reason there had not been much written about religion and development. With religion being relegated to the private sphere, there was reticence to discuss religion publicly, even among scholars (Clarke, 2007). The non-Western scholars who have in fact included the subject of faith in cross-disciplinary writings have largely been sidelined (Lunn, 2009). In an analysis of the three leading development journals from 1985-2000, Ver Beek (2000) found that there were only scant references to religion or spirituality, and two of the journals did not even contain a single article examining the relationship between spirituality and development. Ver Beek (2000) posited that this may be because of a supposed 'awareness' of imposing one's religious views on another, but argued that this attitude actually implies one having a superior understanding of reality while the spirituality of another is something that is weak and needs to be protected.

Finally, there are a number of practical reasons why the topic of religion in development has been largely ignored. As suggested by Lunn (2009):

> "Ebaugh suggests that the study of the impacts of religion and spirituality may have been limited by a lack of data; Verhelst and Tyndale describe the difficulties in quantifying 'soft' measures and evaluating their impact on development. Ebaugh also suggests that US academics interested in religion have tended to publish in specialist journals for the study of religion rather than reach a wider audience by publishing in mainstream social science journals" (p. 940).

In short, the absence of religion in mainstream publications may have signaled to others that faith was not a legitimate subject of research.

Anti-Development Sentiments

Coupled with the many reasons why religion may have been missing from discussion on development, during the 1990s, there were emerging anti-development views (Lunn, 2009). Monsignor Ivan Illich was one of the first to speak out against development, stating that Westerners should only go to the developing world as receivers rather than givers, and pointing out the hypocrisy of those who try and 'help' despite recognizing the imbalance of power (Illich, 1968). He remarked that the damage that Westerners caused along the way was too high, and this was underscored by the fact that it was only the elite minority, not the impoverished masses, with whom volunteers could communicate anyway (Illich, 1968). Rist was also critical of development and saw development as a discourse that justified the expansion of capitalism while destroying the environment and transforming human resources into economic commodities (Haslam et al., 2012; Rist, 2007). Arturo Escobar, a postdevelopment thinker, viewed development as a Western idea that had been imposed on the non-Western world (Escobar, 1995).

However, post-modern conceptualizations grew out of these criticisms, which understood development "beyond the economic and technical to be more multidimensional, [being] more sensitive to the cultural context, including religion" (Lunn, 2009, p. 941). Since the beginning of the 21st century, religion and spirituality have started to be incorporated into mainstream development discourse (Hovland, 2008; Lunn, 2009). While it has not turned into a large movement yet, there is growing interest in the subject, and a "significant proportion of the academic literature on religion and development has emerged from non-Western scholars" (Lunn, 2009, p. 940-941).

Incorporating Religion

This shift to include religion in development discourse can also be seen in how development agencies deal with the topic of religion. Ver Beek (2000) studied the policies of large U.S. development agencies and found that there were no guidelines about dealing with religion, though there were extensive guidelines for other sensitive issues, such as gender, environment, violence, or indigenous populations. Rather, the agencies carefully worded policies to avoid the topic. Ver Beek (2000) pointed out the hypocrisy in this, because the agencies seemingly recognized that development policies should integrate factors that affect peoples' world-views, and created policies around other factors. Lunn (2009) noted that a shift occurred around the year 2000, and now development agencies:

> "Have started to realise that sustainable development can be achieved only if it incorporates cultural values and beliefs and that in many cases faith-based organisations are the most effective agencies to deliver development on the ground. Thus the UN, World Bank, IMF and some bilateral agencies have begun to engage with religious representatives and groups to understand how they can contribute to development" (p. 942).

This cooperation has led to several important initiatives.

First, the subject of religion became more prominent in the field of development with the creation of the World Faiths Development Dialogue by former World Bank president, James Wolfensohn, which brought international attention to the topic of faith and development (Clarke, 2007; James, 2011; Lunn, 2009). Secondly, the World Bank's Voices of the Poor project, which interviewed over 60,000 people from more than 60

countries, revealed that faith is an integral part of life for the poor, and that faith-based

organizations are considered important to them (Clarke, 2007; James, 2011; Lunn, 2009).

The Jubilee 2000 Campaign was promoted by religious organizations in an effort to

cancel the international debt of developing countries by the year 2000 (Berger, 2003;

King, 2011; Lunn, 2009). Furthermore, religious communities were also instrumental in

passing the Rome Statute, which created the International Criminal Court, designed to

prosecute genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression

(Berger, 2003). Interested in how religion interacted with development, the UK's

Department for International Development (DFID) funded a five-year research project at

Birmingham University looking at religion and development (James, 2011; Lunn, 2009;

Ter Haar & Ellis, 2006). In The Netherlands, the Dutch Ministry for Co-operation and

Development started a Religion and Development Knowledge Forum (Lunn, 2009; Ter

Haar & Ellis, 2006). These are all significant steps that have been taken in recent decades

that highlight the importance of religion in the field of development.

Religion and World Politics

While the Christian church played a big role in Europe in the past, in modern

history, Western countries have embraced secularism to different extents. However,

religion has in many places around the world started to become more present in politics

and international relations. For example, during the 1960s, Liberation Theology, which

was an offshoot from the Catholic Church, became very active in promoting land reform

issues in Latin America (Berger, 2003; Lunn, 2009). The Iranian Revolution in 1979

highlighted the entrance of radical Islam into world politics (Lunn, 2009; Ter Haar &

Ellis, 2006). The Catholic Church was a key force in transitioning Rhodesia to an

independent Zimbabwe in 1979-1980, as well as supporting Poland's Solidarity

movement to become a post-Soviet society in 1989 (Berger, 2003). With the economic

policies and Structural Adjustment Programs of the 1980s, religious organizations

stepped in and provided services in the absence of the state, or became contracted service

providers when states privatized social services (Lunn, 2009). In fact, in Uganda, as of

2009, it was estimated that religious organizations provided about half of primary health

services (Lunn, 2009); DFID estimates that FBOs provide about 50% of all health and

education services in sub-Saharan Africa (James, 2011). In the United States, the

Christian Right has become more and more influential in domestic politics and the

September 11, 2001 attacks and their aftermath created animosity between the mostly

Christian Western world and the Islamic world (Lunn, 2009).

Although bringing religion into discussions of development is a more recent

trend, it is important to remember that religious organizations have been doing work to

provide social services and promote social cohesion long before the concept of

development came around.

Religious Approaches to Service and Development

Each of the world's major religions provides teachings for how their followers

should act in the service of others. Believers of Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and

Buddhism may partake in international development work as a way to actualize their

religious beliefs.

Christian philosophies of service stem from the Gospel, which dictates that

Christians should "serve others as Jesus commanded: 'He (the Lord) has sent me to

proclaim liberty to captives, sight to the blind, to the let the oppressed go free (Lk 4:18)"

(Laverly, 2007, p. 3). Additionally, "mainline Protestant practical theology also draws on the traditional notion of faithful individuals providing charity to those in need, as typified in the parable of the Good Samaritan" (Schneider, Wittberg, Unruh, Sinha & Belcher, 2011, p. 412). Moreover, in Catholic philosophy, "the idea that one would save one's own soul by tending to the needs of the poor and sick has its roots in the 'Last Judgment' scene of Matthew 25 – 'Whatsoever you did to the least of my brothers, you did to me'" (Schneider, et al., 2011, p. 417). Christians are taught that they are supposed to act in the way that Jesus did: "To believe in Jesus as a Christian is to serve Jesus by serving people" (Kwang-sun Suh, 2004, p. 282). For many Christians, service to others demonstrates their obedience to God.

In the Jewish teachings of Pirkei Avot, there is a saying "The world rests upon three things; Torah, avodah (worship), and gemilut hasadim (acts of loving kindness)" (Paasche-Orlow, 2001). Additionally, *tzedakah* and *tikkun olam* are also at the core of Jewish philosophy. Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization, described *tzedakah* like this:

> "Tzedakah is fundamental to Judaism... Tzedakah is not a choice. It is one of the 613 mitzvot, or obligations, we live by… The root of the Hebrew word is tzedek—justice, or righteousness. In the Bible, tzedakah means 'righteous behavior.' We do not give to charity out of kindness alone. We perform acts of tzedakah as we seek to create a just world" (2012).

Similarly, Rosenthal (2005) depicted *tikkun olam* as "the actions of humans [to] repair the flaws in the universe… [Tikkun olam] summons us to Jewish ethical duty" (p. 236). Furthermore, Arthur Green explained that *tikkun olam* has come to imply "activism for

political and social change" because it includes "the relief of human suffering, the

achievement of peace and mutual respect among peoples, and the protection of the planet

from destruction" (as cited in Rosenthal, 2005, p. 236). Jews are taught to be "'concerned

with the welfare including the feeding, housing, and health of all' and… pursue justice,

close gaps in learning and opportunity, and protect resources and natural order" in order

to fulfill the duty of *gemilut chasadim, tzedakah,* and *tikkun olam* (Rosenthal, 2005, p.

236).

In Islam, *zakat*, or charity, is one of the five pillars. As noted by Kersten (2004),

"All five pillars are regarded as both acts of worship and moral imperatives" (p. 365). Of

the five pillars, *zakat* is most explicitly about social justice. *Zakat* can function similarly

to a taxation system, but "became not only a tool for the redistribution of wealth but also

as a means to safeguard the psychological integrity of both giver and recipient. Islam

discourages begging, and through *zakat* the poor are spared this humiliation" (Kersten,

2004, p. 367). Emphasis is placed on the motivations for service, and it is seen as a

greater service if one donates in secret, so that people are not motivated by recognition.

Lunn wrote that "Within Islam, there have been donors of *waqfs* (charitable endowments)

for many centuries and these funds have been used to build schools, hospitals and

universities" (2009, p. 943).

There has also been a more recent movement in Islam called "pious

neoliberalism," spearheaded by Egyptian Amr Khaled. The term pious neoliberalism not

only questions the idea that the modern market economy promotes secularism and

democracy, but also undermines the idea of jihadist globalism, that rising religiosity is an

alternative to neoliberalist globalization (Atia, 2012). Pious neoliberalism urges Muslims

to take the initiative and do things for the benefit of the community, using "*zakat* and

sadaqa to fund development projects rather than as a form of charity" (Atia, 2012, p.

815). Even within these development projects, religious motivations are deeply

embedded.

In traditional Buddhist thought, some teachings tend to focus on meditation as an

individual path to enlightenment while others prioritize making merit by doing things to

benefit society as a key part of the journey towards enlightenment. Wisdom (*panna*),

compassion (*karuna*), and loving-kindness (*metta*) are all attributes that are necessary to

create a balanced life (Butt, 2004). However, there is also a contemporary movement

called Socially Engaged Buddhism, where Buddhists are encouraged to participate in

projects that benefit society, and to do development work in a Buddhist way. Clarke

(2011) wrote that similar to how Buddhists follow the "Middle Path" to reach

enlightenment, living a life that is neither indulgent nor austere, to do development in a

Buddhist way means that some material goods are necessary to satisfy essential needs,

defined as food, clothing, shelter, and medicine, so long as people do not become

attached to these goods and pursue modern consumption. Buddhist development

emphasizes the spiritual growth that must accompany economic pursuits (Lapthananon,

2012). Overcoming poverty is possible by reducing desires for material goods rather than

by increased economic production.

Benefits of Religion and Development

Growing interest in the topic of religion and development has led to some

important studies in the field, although there are still gaps in the knowledge and research.

Kniss and Campbell (1997) were among the first to conduct research in this field,

studying 63 American FBOs that engaged in emergency relief and long-term economic

development projects internationally. They found that overall there was very little

difference between program sizes or activity among different religious groups, although

there were differences in the religious terminology used in mission statements, program

descriptions, and public justification of their actions. Kniss and Campbell (1997)

surmised that evangelist organizations faced different ideological tasks in the

justifications of their activities than mainstream Protestant groups, and Protestant and

ecumenical organizations were the most likely to differentiate their programs between

creating religious church extension programs and secular relief and development

programs.

　　　Many scholars agree on the positive effects that religious-based development can

potentially have. For example, Berger (2003) cited the World Conference on Religion

and Peace in her assertion that:

> "Religious communities are, without question, the largest and best-organized civil
>
> institutions in the world today, claiming the allegiance of billions of believers, and
>
> bridging the divides of race, class, and nationality. They are uniquely equipped to
>
> meet the challenges of our time: resolving conflicts, caring for the sick and needy,
>
> promoting peaceful co-existence among all peoples" (p. 17).

Ver Beek (2000) noted the motivating factor that spirituality can provide, as he found in

his research of indigenous groups in Honduras demanding rights and improvements in

their living conditions.

　　　Several other researchers elaborate on the benefits religious development can

have. King (2011) and James (2011) agreed with Berger and Ver Beek that there are

benefits to gain from mixing faith with development. King (2011) not only wrote of the advantages of the influence of religion on development, but also asserted that the two cannot be separated: "Even as World Vision [a Christian development organization] fluently speaks the common language of development among its peers, its religious identity cannot be fully assessed apart from wider debates within American evangelism, missiology, philanthropy, and global Christianity" (p. 23). For World Vision, and many other organizations, their identity cannot be dissected into distinct parts.

James (2007) identified ten areas in particular where FBDOs may have an advantage over secular development organizations, including their ability to reach the poorest people, having morally motivated volunteers, tapping into the religiosity of developing communities, and being more financially efficient for developing states because much of the funding comes from external sources. James (2007) explained that the line between meeting people's needs holistically and proselytizing is not always clear, and that it is ultimately up to each FBDO to reconcile what their faith identity means and how it affects their work. Both King (2011) and James (2011) advocated for the need to understand *how* organizations are religious, not just if they are religious or not, which is a topic of agreement for many scholars of faith-based development.

Jacquet and Walton (2013) highlighted an example where faith-based organizations succeeded in crossing religious lines in order to provide disaster relief after Cyclone Nargis hit Myanmar in May 2008. Myanmar is a primarily Buddhist country and the extensive networks of monasteries were used as temporary shelters and points of aid distribution, oftentimes being the only structures left standing in the areas after the cyclone hit (Jacquet & Walton, 2013). The government of Myanmar did not allow

foreign aid organizations to enter the country after the cyclone, and they did not allow

citizen access to affected areas. However, Christian and Muslim relief organizations were

able to channel aid into the country through the monasteries because Buddhist religious

charity is protected from interference by the authorities (Jacquet & Walton, 2013).

Additionally, soldiers would allow monk-led relief groups through closed roads, giving

them access to remote areas that needed assistance. This case demonstrates the positive

outcomes that are possible through religious involvement in development.

Another example which underscores this point is the development relationship

Turkey has had with Somalia. While many countries have ceased development work with

Somalia due to security concerns, Turkey began partnering with Somalia during the 2011

famine despite the fact that Somalia repeatedly tops the list of failed states, (Harper,

2012). Turkey has shown Somalia that they will "be there" despite security concerns, and

in 2011 sent $93.4 million in aid (Hasimi, 2014; Tank, 2013). This sustained presence,

coupled with the fact that both Turkey and Somalia are Muslim countries, has laid the

groundwork for a successful development relationship (Ali, 2011; Aynte, 2012). Because

of their shared faith, there is not the same suspicion and mistrust that can exist between

other development actors. Adding to the fact that Turkey and Somalia have a common

religious background, Turkey has adopted a holistic approach to the development work

being done. TIKA, the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency, has undertaken

humanitarian work, built infrastructure (roads, hospitals, schools) and transportation,

engaged with businesses, provided clean water, and enhanced state representation (Tank,

2013). Turkey has shown Somalia that they care about their fellow Muslims, and have

therefore had a mostly successful relationship.

        Ter Haar and Ellis (2006) identified several potential areas of development where

religion could play a beneficial role, including conflicts and peacebuilding, and health

and education. Many other scholars agree with Ter Haar and Ellis (2006) in their

assertion that some areas of development would benefit greatly from further integration

of faith and development, including Lunn (2009), Clarke (2007), Ver Beek (2000) and

Marshall and Keough (2004). Lunn (2009) historically traced the growing relationship

between religion and development in areas of academia, policy, and NGOs, and broke

down religion's interaction with development into three categories: religious

organizations, religious values, and religious world-views. While Lunn (2009)

acknowledged the negative and destructive effects that religion has had on development,

she chose to focus on the positive values it can have, arguing that religion should have a

broader conceptualization than the duality of church and state common in Western

mindsets. Lunn (2009) stated that faith and spirituality should play an important role in

the future of development, specifically in ensuring that development is appropriate and

sustainable; ultimately, she argued in favor of greater participation in development by

religious organizations.

        Marshall and Keough (2004) also advocated for "broader and stronger

partnerships" between faith-based organizations and development organizations (p. 272).

They argued for greater integration between faith and development because faith can

potentially drive the heart and soul of development work. However, while they advocated

for better integration, they also urged all development actors to remain open to change

(Marshall & Keough, 2004). Marshall and Keough (2004) described the current mixing

of faith and development to be "fragile and intermittent at best, critical and

confrontational at worst," primarily because faith-based organizations have been

concerned with spiritual well-being of developing communities while other development

efforts have been more concerned with material goods (p. 1).

Critiques of Religion and Development

Marshall and Keough (2004) are not alone in pointing out potential problems that

can occur when faith and development conflict. James (2011) wrote of the many

detrimental outcomes of the work that FBDOs have undertaken internationally. He

asserted that FBDOs have been paternalistic, discriminatory, supportive of dictatorships

and conservative political institutions, and even controlling of resources to manipulate

people to convert to another faith (James, 2011).

Berger (2003) also elaborated on problems that can be associated with religious

non-governmental organizations (RNGOs), such as importing their own values, which

Ter and Ellis (2006) echoed. Ter Haar and Ellis (2006) also pointed to the cultural

dimensions that differing religious backgrounds have on developing communities.

Specifically, Europeans consider the separation of church and state to be an integral part

of their society, but in Africa "religion is central to people's world-views" (Ter Harr &

Ellis, 2006, p. 365). Ver Beek (2000) asserted that this is the case in much of the global

South as well. Development that has occurred in Africa can therefore be at odds with

their religious traditions and understanding of the world; for example, in many traditional

African religions, the pursuit of balance with the spirit world is important while the

Christian missionaries in Africa may believe that inner personal change is the key to

transformation in society (Ter Haar & Ellis, 2006, p. 355). Spirituality is a central aspect

of peoples' understanding of the world and their place in it (Ver Beek, 2000).

Clarke (2007) compared the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) to the American trend towards right-wing religious organizations, and pointed to several decisions that allowed the mixing of church and state in American foreign development projects. For example, The Welfare Reform Act of 1996 made it easier for FBOs to receive government funding, even in cases where organizations would only hire people of the same faith or where social services were provided but in religious contexts. The 2001 Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Act reinforced this decision, as did Executive Order 13198, which established new Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (CFBCIs) in several federal departments, as well as Executive Order 13280, which created a new CFBCI in the US Agency for International Development (USAID) (Clarke, 2007). Finally, the 2004 ruling on "Participation by Religious Orders in USAID Programs" allowed USAID to fund organizations "which combine development or humanitarian activities with 'inherently religious activities' such as worship, religious instruction or proselytisation" (Clarke, 2007, p. 82). Clarke (2007) was critical of these actions, and explained some of the hurdles that DFID comes across when trying to partner with FBOs, such as the potential for them to blur the line between the needy and those that share the same faith, as well as that some FBOs lack the technical expertise needed in development projects.

Hovland (2008) also identified different problems that can arise from mixing faith with development, although she, like Clarke (2007), advocated for greater integration. Hovland (2008) used a case study of the Norwegian Mission Society, a Protestant evangelist development organization, to look at how FBDOs operationalize their beliefs as religious organizations. The Norwegian Mission Society received government funding

for their development projects and thus were required to explicitly distinguish between their missionary evangelism and the secular development work they were doing (Hovland, 2008). Hovland found that in practice the development activities of the organization were not really separate and recommended that there needed to be a more constructive approach to funding faith-based organizations than separating between religious activities and secular activities. Hovland (2008) challenged the idea that faith-based development and secular development are virtual opposites.

Falk (2013) used a case study of relief efforts in Thailand after the 2004 Boxing Day tsunami to demonstrate additional problems that can arise from faith-based development. Many of the relief organizations that went to Thailand to provide assistance were Christian organizations, and while some came to provide aid, others came with the intention of converting the majority Buddhist population. Phang Nga province, one of Thailand's most affected areas, had 110 Buddhist monasteries and temples which were used as temporary housing for refugees and volunteers, aid distribution centers, places for people to seek spiritual healing or share information about missing family members, and as morgues where monks would perform traditional cremation ceremonies. There were only two Christian churches in Phang Nga prior to the tsunami. However, by 2007, there were more than 20 churches (Falk, 2013). Some Christian groups offered money or material goods to locals outright if they converted to Christianity, while other groups provided unconditional aid to people only later to pressure recipients to convert (Falk, 2013). Conversions included publicly renouncing one's Buddhist faith, handing over household Buddha statues, and forbidding people from participating in communal gatherings held at the Buddhist temples. Falk (2103) was very critical of these kinds of

actions taken by Christian organizations given that the locals were especially vulnerable, as many had recently lost family members and material possessions in the tsunami and were struggling to earn a living.

The case of how religious institutions have affected society in South Africa also demonstrates that religious involvement is not always a positive thing. During the equality movement, some conservative churches "used scripture to justify the apartheid split," although other churches and church officials played a "hugely symbolic role…in the struggle against apartheid" (Thoreson, 2008, p. 687). Today, the current issue with religious entanglement in South African society is primarily related to sexual prejudice and the acceptance of the LBGT community. Same-sex sexuality is criminalized in most African countries by laws inherited from the colonial period (Epprecht, 2012). Homophobia in Africa stems from both these laws and the Christian missionaries who came to colonize the continent, and are perpetuated by "strong anti-Western sentiments and rapid urbanization to changing family structures, [as well as]…the rapid growth of Islam and evangelical forms of Christianity, both espousing conservative views on family values and marriage" (Passop, 2012, p. 8). Currently, opposition to same-sex marriage in South Africa, as well as many other places in the world, comes from conservative church groups (Thoreson, 2008), and studies in South Africa have shown that "religious fundamentalism has been consistently associated with sexual prejudice and hostility toward gay men and lesbians" (Vincent et al., 2012, p. 4).

Finally, Jeavons (2004) is also critical of the role faith can play in development, but he differs from many other faith-based development scholars in suggesting caution when it comes to the increased mixing of church and state. He stated that trying to divide

money between the religious aspects of an organization, the secular services that a

religious organization may provide, and who operates each of the pieces, is too unclear

and complicated to differentiate between. However, he too, declared a need for more

research into the area of how organizations define themselves to be faith-based, and what

that actually means to the operations of that organization (Jeavons, 2004). Finally,

Jeavons discussed the idea of how different religions approach service work, and pointed

out that some religions such as Judaism and Buddhism perform service work as part of

their religious beliefs, but the services would have no religious trappings or identification,

unlike Christian-based organizations (2004, p. 142). Berger (2003) agreed with this,

explaining that Christian NGOs focus on charity and "emphasize concepts of 'God' and

'faith,'" while Jewish organizations, "make few references to God or religion, focusing

instead on the social justice teachings of the Torah as the basis for their advocacy-

oriented missions" (p. 34).

Best Practices in Development

There has been an increasing amount of scholarship suggesting best practices to

follow when working in the field, which is important because of the many past failures of

development. While some practitioners identify best practices for their specific niche

within the larger field of development, most of the advice presented is easily transferable

from one sector to another. However, there are some scholars who argue that best

practices do not and cannot exist because each practice needs to be so tailored to the

exact region and context in which development is occurring (Elyachar, 2006; Feek,

2007). Despite this, there are some important factors that should be recognized as

necessary in creating development projects that are inclusive, comprehensive, and

conscientious.

Stephens (n.d.) explored the phenomenon of youth volunteers serving abroad

within the education sector, and concluded that these programs spread the same

Westernization, paternalism, and universalism as other development sectors, but on a

much more dramatic scale. He suggested that rather than sending the message that

development education is an appropriate role for untrained Western youth, the focus

should be on creating teaching colleges in the developing world to train teachers from

those countries, and requiring volunteers to have knowledge and experience in the field in

order for them to volunteer. Stephens (n.d.) suggested three particular changes that

should be made: 1) volunteers should focus on infrastructure development in order to

create a more sustainable education system, 2) programs should promote cultural

exchange rather than aid, and 3) there should be longer time commitments required of the

volunteers.

Stephens is not alone in advocating for a cultural exchange model rather than an

aid model for international engagement. Hartman, Paris, and Blache-Cohen (2012)

designed the idea of Fair-Trade Learning, which they describe as:

> "Engaging only in community-driven development, in which community leaders
>
> and organizations help decide the terms of foreign student projects in their
>
> communities; encouraging and opening classes for local students to audit, free of
>
> charge; offering fair compensation to all of those who make study and volunteer
>
> abroad programs possible, including guides, drivers, homestay families, cooks,
>
> and community organizations; and working to offer partially or fully subsidized

opportunities for individuals in our communities abroad to engage in service-

learning programs in the United States" (p. 7).

Hartman et al. (2014) believe that volunteer tourism leads to new forms of colonialism

and dependency and can contribute to exploitation of the host communities. The authors

advocate that programs should be designed with a dual purpose, keeping in mind both

student and community outcomes, without one being prioritized over the other. There

must be reciprocity of exchange (benefits, resources, actions), reciprocity of influence on

the program, and reciprocity in the outcomes generated by the program (Hartman, Paris,

& Blache-Cohen, 2014). Programs must also have community voice and direction, be

sustainable for both the community and the students, and have transparency in decision

making and fund expenditures (Hartman et al., 2014). Furthermore, attention must be

paid to reducing the environmental footprint of the program, making sure the program is

sustainable within the local economy and social dynamics, and that there is deliberate

diversity, intercultural contact, and time for reflection (Hartman et al., 2014).

Hammersley (2013) wrote several guidelines for community-based service-

learning (CBSL), which are very similar to Hartman et al's guidelines for fair-trade

learning. Hammersley discussed the history of colonialism that is still present in modern-

day service-learning opportunities, as can be demonstrated by the research bias towards

student goals rather than community outcomes in service-learning projects. Hammersley

(2013) asserted that CBSL should be based on mutual respect, understanding, and joint

participation and negotiation. This model should guide project monitoring and evaluation,

rather than through the typical approach of charity. The mentality behind international

service-learning should be that participants go to learn rather than go to help, with a focus

on mutual learning rather than difference making (Hammersley, 2013).

Just as mutual respect, transparency, sustainability, and community input and

direction are among the best practices for international student learning programs, so are

they for development projects on a larger scale. According to the United Nations,

principles for addressing human security issues include sustainability and participatory

implementation (UNTFHS, 2009). Sustainability means that initiatives are

institutionalized, that there is community ownership of the programs, and that there are

uninterrupted funding sources. To have participatory implementation, the affected

community must critique the program design, allowing space for local knowledge and

traditional practices to inform the development efforts (UNFTHS, 2009). Having a cross-

community committee to oversee implementation and mobilize local resources to carry it

out will help build the foundation for further engagement and build additional networks

for collaboration. Additionally, all development intervention plans should be people-

centered, multi-sectoral, comprehensive, context-specific, and prevention-oriented

(UNTFHS, 2009).

UN-Habitat maintains a Best Practices Database which tracks programs using

innovative and thoughtful development strategies, and categorizes them into "Good

Practices," "Best Practices," and "Award-Winning Practices" (Varney & van Vliet,

2005). Varney and van Vliet (2005) analyzed the best practices listed in the 'Children and

Youth' category of development projects, and revealed trends common among best

practice organizations. They found that the majority of organizations labeled 'best

practice' used community-based approaches, and maintained partnerships with a variety

of stakeholders (Varney & van Vliet, 2005). Interestingly, Varney and van Vliet (2005) also noticed that some of the best practice organizations expanded their operations to other locations, though all within the same geographic context, despite the fact that many of the organizations never mentioned any monitoring and evaluation techniques that they utilized. Monitoring and evaluation are considered necessary components of best practices by many scholars (Hammersley, 2013; Hartman et al., 2014).

In looking at development monks in rural Thailand, Lapthanon (2012) found that monks utilized many of these same concepts in leading development projects in their rural communities. Development monks simultaneously work to address the spiritual needs of their communities alongside the need for material development, and focus on the basic needs of the community to increase the standard of living. These needs include public utilities and a clean water supply, household and community hygienic standards and the construction of privy toilets, agricultural production for household consumption, building local roads, and promoting both religious and secular education (Lapthanon, 2012). Some of the ideals that the monks promote are not having a superior attitude than the villagers and respecting villagers' ideas and decisions, promoting the self-reliance of the villagers and encouraging local people to exercise their own potential and capability, integrating local participation in every stage of the process, and working together as a community to enable the villagers to participate in and manage the activities on their own (Lapthanon, 2012). These ideals reflect common best practices that can be extrapolated and applied to other development initiatives.

Similar to how development monks utilize self-help and basic needs approaches, Decker, McInerney-Lankford, and Sage (2005) promoted using a human rights

framework when working towards development. The human rights framework ensures

equality and non-discrimination while working to expand choices, opportunities, and

freedoms within the context of development (Decker, McInerney-Lankford & Sage,

2005). The authors argued that by explicitly stating an organization's values, people

could work towards increasing the transparency and accountability of their development

projects:

> "All development policies prioritize and advance certain values. A human rights
>
> based approach to development, itself self-consciously value-driven, requires that
>
> those values be made explicit. Making the values driving development practice
>
> explicit could arguably increase the transparency and accountability of the
>
> development process" (Decker et al., 2005, p. 22).

While being honest and forthcoming about the values and intentions of a development

organization is one element of a best practice, Decker at al. (2005) wrote that the second

aspect of best practice is to follow the no-harm principle. Development practices cannot

support trade-offs that damage or disadvantage a certain population or infringe upon

peoples' rights.

While there is a wealth of scholarship advocating for certain ideals to be included

among best practices, there are also those who question if best practices can exist. Feek

(2007) noted that a best practice in one place may not be a good practice in another place,

and questioned why something should be called a "best practice" if it cannot be

replicated. Elyachar (2006) agreed, arguing that contexts are always changing, and

research, comparison, and reformulation is always occurring, so there is no static state of

being for a best practice to exist in. That said, Elyachar (2006) recognized that

organizations which are inclusive of civil society and accountable to their funders are

employing good practices. However, Feek (2007) suggested that the phrase "best

practice" implies uniformity, when, in fact, more diversity among development ideas and

practices is needed.

To address this issue with the transferability of best practices, Ellerman (1999)

wrote that the solution is to test all best practices locally. Local adaptation, he stated,

means that the best practice is reinvented for the local context, and can therefore be

applicable to the situation (Ellerman, 1999). If organizations want to share best practices

with each other, they also need to share the source of that knowledge, which encourages

cross-cultural learning and local experimentation. Devil's advocacy and active learning

methodology are also key ways to ensure that development agencies are learning

organizations rather than top-down systems of information delivery (Ellerman, 1999).

While each of these scholars took varying approaches to defining what best

practices are, if they exist, and how they can be achieved, there is some general

consensus of the organizational qualities necessary to have conscientious development.

These qualities include community participation, financial transparency, program and

environmental sustainability, a system of accountability, emphasis on local partnerships,

and monitoring and evaluation techniques (Decker et al., 2005; Hartman et al., 2014;

Hammersley, 2013; Stephens, n.d.) Each of these qualities should operate using a cultural

exchange model of development rather than the international aid model. The typical

international aid model reinforces colonial beliefs of superiority, where one country is

dominant and is so-called 'helping' the other, while the cultural exchange model focuses

on leveling the playing field so that each actor can be considered equal partners (Hartman

et al., 2014; Hammersley, 2013; Stephens, n.d.). If international development

organizations integrate these lessons and so-called 'best practices' into their frameworks,

the legitimacy of the work they are doing should improve.

The Research Gap

Currently, there is growing interest in and research on exploring how different

faiths interact with international development; however, many scholars suggest further

research is needed on what it means to be a faith-based development organization (James,

2011; Jeavons, 2004; King, 2011). Previous studies largely looked at whether

organizations had religious roots or not, or what some of the differences between faiths

were, but with all of the research that has been conducted on the topic, there is still little

known about the organizational practices of FBDOs and how those might influence their

impact on global communities. Because there has been an incredible proliferation of

NGOs in the last 40 years (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2015), this

information becomes vital to the expansion of the field of faith-based development. King

(2011) reported that in 2005 "six of the 10 largest American international non-

governmental organizations (INGOs) were Christian organizations; religious

organizations now make up over 33 percent of all INGOs and comprise almost 50 percent

of real revenue" (p. 21). Research into this topic can enhance the knowledge of which

practices may be detrimental to host communities, and which could benefit the

organizations and people receiving their services.

Chapter 3: Methods

Research Question

The question that this research attempts to answer is: How can faith-based development organizations maintain the benefits of religion while ensuring that their development practices are inclusive and respectful of other cultures and religions? It is important to identify development projects that utilize religion in both beneficial and harmful ways in order to learn what the positive and negative effects of these projects are. This information will help FBDOs organize themselves so that they can best capitalize on the value of faith while ideally mitigating the negative effects that religious organizations have had on development in the past. This study will analyze existing models of faith-based development and suggest recommendations for other FBDOs.

Research Design

This research is exploratory and non-experimental. This study consisted of two parts: an initial survey and a follow-up interview. Two representatives from each organization worked together to complete both the survey and the interview. The initial survey addressed four main topics in regards to development. The first topic addressed different ways FBDOs operationalize their faith. This included hiring employees of a certain faith, aiming to serve a specific population based on their faith, or conducting projects to serve a religious purpose. The second dimension was an organization's moral code: how the organization views their obligation to help. This moral dimension may help distinguish faith-based development organizations from secular development organizations and explored whether organizations go to communities where they are invited to help or where they feel obligated to help, what they consider their moral

obligation to be, and how their moral codes are translated into the programs they operate. The third topic covered in the survey was focused on the development practices utilized by the organization, the content of the programs, and the spaces within which they occur. Finally, the last area the survey addressed was community involvement in the management and goals of the FBDO. This section considered any community partners FBDOs have and whether they make efforts to hire locally within the communities in which they are working.

The follow-up interview was conducted to clarify any questions that the survey may have brought up, tailor questions more specifically to a certain organization, and to give an opportunity for responses from one organization to help identify potential questions to ask another. Additionally, there were several new questions asked of all organizations in the follow-up interview. Some of these questions addressed organizational features that relate to the ideals or best practices common in development work, and some of the questions were more reflective, big picture questions about how that organization and other organizations can contribute to good development work, including what good development looks like.

The initial survey contained a mixture of closed and open-ended questions. This design was chosen in order to gather both quantitative and qualitative responses from the participating FBDOs. It was important to this research to make sure that equivalent information was being collected from each participant so that the organizations could be compared, while at the same time allow each FBDO to fully explain how they specifically operationalize their religious identity. The survey was uniform so as to ensure that the same information was being collected from all participating organizations.

The follow-up interview was designed in a more qualitative way. Given that the faith-based components of an organization can manifest itself in countless ways and be difficult to verbalize, making these qualitative responses was crucial to the research.

Once information was gathered via the surveys and interviews, the data collected was tested against a rubric of commonly accepted best practices in the field of international development. Scholars and ideas cited in the Literature Review were used to compile a list of best practices, which served as a litmus test for participating organizations. These best practices were community participation, financial transparency, program sustainability, a system of accountability, emphasis on local partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation techniques.

Sampling Method

This research used purposive sampling methods, which were neither random nor representative. This was done in order to specifically highlight different types of faith-based development models. The goal of this purposive sampling was to have representations of organizations from various religious backgrounds, of different sizes, working in different regions, and doing different kinds of development work. As it would be nearly impossible to have a representative sample of this kind, this research aimed to select organizations in order to represent the general kinds of organizations and practices being utilized. Approximately 15 organizations were contacted to participate in this study, representing the Christian, Jewish, Buddhist, and Muslim faiths. Two of these organizations agreed to participate; one Christian organization and one Jewish organization. To strengthen the validity of the study, two representatives from each of the participating organizations completed the survey and interview together. This was to

ensure that the information presented was accurate and unbiased, rather than one person's

opinion.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher identified organizations that fit the profile desired and contacted

them requesting participation. A formal letter of invitation was emailed to all

organizations, fully explaining the research and what participation would entail. If an

organization decided they wanted to participate, two representatives from the

organization would sign consent forms, before they were emailed the survey. The two

representatives would complete the survey together, and then return it to the researcher.

After analysis of the survey responses, the researcher scheduled a time to conduct the

follow-up interview over Skype. Both representatives from the organization participated

in the interview as well. There was no compensation for FBDOs who participated in this

study, though the FBDOs who did participate will receive the results of the study, once

published, so that they can determine areas of success or improvement.

Data Analysis

Responses from each participating organization were compiled into case studies,

which can be found in Chapter 4. These responses were tested against commonly

accepted best practices in the field of international development, taken from scholars

discussed in the Literature Review. Testing was not numerical, but rather a content

analysis of whether the organizational practices of the participating FBDOs lined up with

the ideals for development organizations. In this way, the development best practices

serve as a litmus test to determine whether or not the organization is engaging in "good"

development, "bad" development, or somewhere in between.

Ethical Considerations and Safeguards

This study only included FBDOs who willingly provided information about their organizations and signed a consent form. The names of the organizations have been coded so that they will remain confidential. However, there are some ethical considerations to be made. First, unbiased analysis and reporting is key to this study, in order to accurately assess organizational characteristics. The findings of this research will identify organizational practices of FBDOs, which may or may not be in line with current development ideals and best practices. The names of the organizations are not disclosed in order to ensure that the findings of this research will not discredit any of the organizations. Research findings will be shared with the organizations to provide constructive feedback about the cultural sensitivity of their development practices.

Chapter 4: Findings

Case Study 1

Case Study 1 (CS1) is an organization that has been working in Ecuador since the 1960s. CS1 only works in Ecuador and identifies as a Roman Catholic organization. Their annual budget is in the $1 million- $5 million range and they receive the majority of their funding from private donations, foundation grants, and churches or other faith organizations. CS1's target population is working children along with their entire families. Their goal is to empower people by teaching them ten values, which can enable people to make the changes in their lives necessary to overcome poverty. These values include family, religion, education, health, housing, recreation, personal formation, loyalty, economy, and work. One representative writes, "For instance —economy—We save so we can build a house and live as God wants us to live. Una casa digna (A decent

house)" (personal communication, August 7, 2015). CS1 provides numerous resources and services for families to get out of poverty. They run a daycare, have adult and special education classes, and a kitchen that serves three meals a day, six days a week. On their campuses are medical and dental offices, a library, and a school where the working children receive an education as well as vocational training in topics such as baking, carpentry, cosmetology, auto-mechanics, and industrial sewing. There is also a *minga* program, which is typical in Ecuador, where members of their community help each other build their houses. In this way, CS1 feels that the principles of their faith are reflected in the programs that it operates.

CS1 is an independent NGO with religious roots. However, being faith-based affects the operations of their organization in that their development work is inspired by a specific religious purpose. CS1's programs are available to people of all faiths or no faith, although there is a specific religious component to them. The programs have both religious and secular aspects; students are required to attend a religion class, though they are also taught math, history, art, and other secular subjects. While the religion class is part of the required curriculum, students and their families can choose whether or not they want to attend mass or other religious activities. Although the expression of Catholicism is dominant within CS1's spaces, they also allow for the expression of other religions. CS1's space itself is secular: generally comprised of a school, offices, locker room style bathrooms and showers, an outdoor play space, and a kitchen and mess hall, which is also where mass is held. Also on their properties are several industrial workshops where they run different enterprises to generate income and train older students in vocational skills.

CS1 is a Catholic organization working in a majority Catholic country. It makes an effort to hire staff locally, and there is community involvement in determining which direction the organization takes. Though the organization's founders are American clergy, most of the organization's directors come from the local community. Leaders of the movement have emerged from CS1's target population. Member families of CS1 invite other families to join the organization and the organization also goes out into the community to help others, connecting with and inviting new people to join. They also have other organizations within the local community that CS1 works with, such as clinics and hospitals, and other Catholic-oriented organizations.

CS1 reports that they try to be as transparent as possible. Each year CS1 hires an independent company to do an audit and publish it for internal use. They have a bookkeeping office, and the information is especially important for funding coming from the United States. The information is not posted publicly on their website or in other forums, though it would be disclosed upon request. CS1 also undertakes program evaluation and strategic planning. Approximately eight years ago CS1 had an impact study done, which looked at the work the organization has done since it was founded 42 years previously. The impact study revealed that approximately 30,000 people had been lifted out of poverty due to the programs that CS1 was running. It was recommended to CS1 that they do impact studies every ten years, and so in another two years they will consider conducting another study.

CS1 plans to remain in Ecuador for as long as they can afford to do so; there are no plans to transition from the community. However, they are currently facing challenges as their founding priest ages. Funding sources from the United States are hesitant to

continue funding until a successor is found, even though CS1's management is very team based and will be able to continue functioning once the founder leaves. CS1 has struggled with funding for a while, but believes that God is looking out for them:

> "You can't just talk about God's going to take care of it, you've got to have a plan, got to have a budget. But 50 years later and God has proven he wants it to go. We can't just leave it to God, he's got his place, but we are doing our part. We are trying to work with God" (personal communication, October 31, 2015).

In addition to God, CS1 attributes their success to the fact that they run a values program that includes the whole family, rather than a charity program, and that other organizations could do better by implementing this kind of model as well. They believe that people in need should make changes in their lives so that they will not need to ask for help again. This is the underlying philosophy of CS1's program. From the organizational perspective, CS1 believes that organizations should not just hand out material goods without requiring something from those receiving the services. Organizations should require that people go to school or get a job, or do something themselves to stop the cycle of poverty. One representative from CS1 says that other organizations are "not empowering the person from within to make changes in his or her life to get out and be equals someday" (personal communication, October 31, 2015). CS1 says that 'good' development is self-determination:

> "Give people self determination and self respect, confidence to do what they are doing, in order to achieve salvation not only for themselves and the people around them. Keep it simple like that and you've got it made, and you don't have to

worry about impact studies and results and so forth" (personal communication,

October 31, 2015).

CS1 also suggests that by working with whole families, rather than with just one

segment such as women or children, they are able to reinforce their values holistically. If

they just worked with women or children specifically, everything would be undone when

participants return home. Another representative from CS1 says that their "emphasis is on

the family being loyal to each other within the family and then the family of families

supporting each other because its pretty hard to make [these life] changes" (personal

communication, October 31, 2015).

Finally, as a faith-based organization, CS1 sometimes comes up against issues

that might be contrary to their faith. One theoretical example is that if the government

stipulated that all schools must provide condoms, they would not provide condoms. CS1

does teach sexual education, and hopes to teach their students to respect each other and

develop their consciences to make good choices about sex. Another area where this

contradiction occurs is from funding sources. Some grants do or do not want recipients to

do or teach certain things, and so CS1 does not accept money from these sources.

Case Study 2

Case Study 2 (CS2) is a Jewish organization that works in various countries

around the globe. The organization has been running for 30 years, and they primarily do

work in advocacy and human rights. CS2's budget is over $50 million, and they receive

funding from private donations, foundation grants, and faith organizations. CS2 has

several focus areas with different target populations. CS2 aims to work with the most

marginalized people of the developing world, including indigenous populations, farmers,

women and girls, and LGBT individuals. Their goal is to end poverty and realize human

rights. CS2 does this by making grants to grassroots organizations, regional

organizations, and national organizations, which they assist with strategic planning,

capacity building, and growing the human rights movement. By supporting partners

doing advocacy work, CS2 works to document human rights abuses, hold those in power

accountable, and fight discriminatory laws that are passed.

   CS2 is an independent NGO with religious roots; they are not directly connected

with a specific synagogue or denomination. Being faith-based affects the operations of

their organization only in that their development work is inspired by a specific religious

purpose. While they use Jewish values to motivate supporters, the grants they make are to

secular organizations. CS2 is tolerant of expressions of other religious faiths within their

human rights work, and they aim to assist people of all faiths or no faith.

   Considering their moral obligation when it comes to international development,

representatives from CS2 write:

> "We draw a great deal of inspiration from Jewish historical text and contemporary
>
> thought, including the idea that we are not obliged to finish the task but that we
>
> cannot desist from it. In short, we feel a moral obligation to this work and to take
>
> care of the stranger as we were once strangers as well. It is important to us that
>
> Jews are active in work and communities that extend beyond traditional
>
> paradigms of local communities and the Middle East" (personal communication,
>
> October 15, 2015).

CS2 believes that the principles of Judaism are reflected in the programs that they run.

Judaism is not only reflected in their mission statement: its commitment to social justice

is the driving force behind all of CS2's goals. Representatives from CS2 explain, "We know that every human is inspired in the image of the divine and [so] we feel a moral obligation to ensuring universal human rights for all citizens of the world" (personal communication, October 15, 2015).

CS2 is a Jewish organization, and as such, it does not match the majority faith in any of the countries in which it works. They hire local consultants within the countries where they work, and they do not make any stipulation that their staff must also be Jewish. In fact, many who work for CS2 are not Jewish. The local consultants serve as experts when planning projects and oversee all of the in-country operations. CS2 also partners with many local organizations and these local partners facilitate the community outreach. When designing a strategy for a particular country, local partners are invited, as are other local organizations and other international organizations working in that country, and they collaborate to create and critique the plan. This process facilitates input and advice from locals and others experienced in the field.

CS2 makes efforts to ensure that their operations are transparent. They post their 990 tax form on their website, along with other financial documents. Additionally, CS2 publishes an annual report, which focuses on their changes and growth from year to year. CS2 undertakes extensive program monitoring and evaluation and has an entire Strategic Learning and Research Evaluation division. Country Strategies outline the overall vision of what CS2 wants to achieve in a country as a whole and this vision is broken down into benchmarks and three-year outcomes. Benchmarks measure how grantees are part of the human rights movement, if they are engaging in real advocacy, and how they are taking

part in capacity building. CS2 describes these types of indicators as cutting edge, as

measuring rights can be difficult, and something they will be using more of in the future.

CS2 offers several types of grants, including project grants, capacity building

grants, and general operating support. A typical grant cycle lasts about five years, which

includes time for strategic planning and preparation. While some development

organizations view success as being able to transition out of their operations because they

are no longer needed, CS2 reevaluates and renews grants that they believe are still

furthering their mission, and works to build regional partnerships among organizations

with similar goals. When CS2 decides that the work a partner organization is doing no

longer falls within their strategic vision of alleviating poverty and strengthening human

rights, they develop a phase-out plan and tries to match that organization with other

potential funders.

A representative from CS2 believes that there are three key aspects to "good"

development: that it is locally led, has a serious commitment to evaluation, and is given

enough time to make a difference. The representative says that too often development is:

> "Top-down, Global North-Global South, it's just not a solidarity approach…
>
> Second is a serious commitment to learn about evaluation… [We need to]
>
> measure in a way that makes sense…in terms of learning from what we did well,
>
> [meaning] learning directly from what our partners did well, in order to replicate
>
> it, not do it again, share it on, decide that we want to continue funding it, that's a
>
> really important part of the work. And then the third thing is the timeline… it's
>
> just abominable that we think problems that were created for hundreds of years
>
> which we can attribute to colonialism, to slavery, to all these huge ills of our

society, that we are going to solve in six months just by tossing some money on it.

Those three do wrap up together really well, having it locally rooted, having the

monitoring and evaluation, and having the time to give to watch that happen”

(personal communication, November 3, 2015).

These are key areas in which CS2 believes that other faith-based and development

organizations could improve upon. While interfaith dialogue can be important and

worthwhile, it sometimes lacks the actual action necessary in making peoples’ lives

better. However, CS2 recognizes the importance of the faith leaders in using their

authority to put issues on a national agenda, or represent a larger group when advocating

for some cause.

Finally, CS2 has come across several areas where they have received pushback

from their faith community. In particular, in promoting labor rights for sex workers, other

Jewish organizations have differing views on how to approach sex work. Despite this

lack of consensus among Jewish organizations, CS2 enjoys broad support for the work

that they are doing and have been doing for the past 30 years.

<div align="center">

Chapter 5: Discussion

</div>

Discussion

Colonialism. Both CS1 and CS2 are working in countries from which they did

not originate. This fact alone is potentially reminiscent of colonialism. It is possible that

missionary structures abroad may never be able to shed their colonial past, as may be the

case for CS1. Even though CS2 is working in formerly colonized areas, as an

organization they are mindful of this colonial history and actively work against neo-

colonial pressures, which take the form of human rights abuses, corrupt officials, or

oppressive legislation. Although some may see all cases of development work occurring in other countries as continued neo-colonial presence (Escobar, 1995; Rist, 2007), others may view it less harmfully as an effect of globalization. The latter could argue that the fate of humanity is intertwined, and this necessitates working in other places (Buttimer, 1990), having nothing to do with colonialism. Regardless of these arguments, CS1 and CS2 are working against structures of racism, poverty, and marginalization.

Charity v. Conditional Aid. CS1 spoke about how they are not a charity program; instead, they believe that those receiving their services should have a part in the outcome. In order to be part of their program, CS1 requires that families adopt their ten values. This model is reminiscent of conditional aid, which some purport is a neo-colonialist structure (Finkelman, 2005). However, not all conditional assistance needs to be neo-colonial. Most relationships include some give and take from both sides; what makes the difference is the attitude with which the relationship is approached. All partnerships include compromise and teamwork, whereas neo-colonialism may come into play when there is an imbalanced power structure between two partners.

CS1 views itself as a partnership rather than a charity, as they require that their clients make certain changes in their lives in return. In most charities, there is a unidirectional course of activity, which may be akin to neo-colonial power structures. CS1 believes that simple charity will not produce sustainable results in order to make a lasting and tangible difference in the lives of others and that partnership is needed to accomplish this. However, representatives from CS1 also mourn the decline of charity, which they define as doing good for the sake of goodness, rather than expecting anything from it.

Transparency. Transparency is one of the fundamental best practices in development, as well as most if not all government operations, business practices, and nonprofit administration. Transparency commonly refers to financial dealings, but can include much more than that. Transparency can also mean being open about why certain decisions are made or not, and is sometimes used as a synonym for accountability. Accountability can refer to financial operations as well, such as how an organization is accountable for their donors' money. However, accountability can also include how staff is held responsible for the work they are supposed to do, how the organization can be held responsible for any negative impacts they have on a community, or what happens if an organization fails to deliver goods or services that it promised. At its core, transparency and accountability are about openness and responsibility, having clear and direct communication between an organization, its partners, the community it works in, and the general public.

Although transparency was only briefly touched on in the two case studies, the responses given reveal much about how the organizations operate. While both organizations claim to be fully transparent, the actions of CS2 show a broader commitment to transparency than the actions of CS1. In publishing financial documents online, CS2 opens itself up to public scrutiny of their actions. While CS1 does undertake annual audits, the resulting information is kept internally, though it would be distributed upon request. A representative from CS1 suggests that the information would not be understood by the general pubic if published, but this could potentially be viewed as a paternalistic response. Taking the initiative to be transparent can show commitment to donors, partners, and the population that they aim to serve. Openly publishing financial

documents and other information relevant to the organization would help CS1 in the efforts to be transparent, so long as the information does not jeopardize the work they are doing.

Local partners and input. Both CS1 and CS2 are very good about involving the local community in determining which direction the organization takes. Whereas CS1's founders were Western missionaries, today a substantial portion of their directors and management come from the community they are working in. Local leaders have emerged from CS1's target population. CS2 takes a different approach to incorporating local input. There are generally three tiers of partnerships in CS2's structure. The global office is headquartered in the West and primarily staffed by Westerners. In the middle level are local experts from each country CS2 operates in. Those local consultants facilitate the work with grassroots organizations, community members, and local officials. When creating Country Strategies, the process takes a bottom-up approach, with local partners working on a plan that is later submitted to CS2. However, because of its organizational structure, CS2 is much more removed from the local population than CS1. This could mean that information potentially gets distorted as it moves along the various organizational tiers. That said, both of these approaches take care to involve local partners and the community in their activities.

Monitoring and evaluation. Both CS1 and CS2 have monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place, although CS2's evaluation measures seem more sophisticated. CS1 did not fully explain their measures in detail, though they pointed to an impact report undertaken eight years ago as a reference. The impact report is key and should be used as a guide for future work. While the evaluators recommended that CS1 have a full impact

report done every ten years, it would be beneficial to do smaller scale program evaluation

more regularly than that, possibly every year or two. CS1 does report that they do

program evaluation regularly, and their directors are currently working on a four-year

strategic plan, which includes analysis of their programming. These regular program

evaluations should help CS1 determine metrics including which workshops produce the

most marketable skills, better ways to market the products produced by the children

thereby potentially earning them more income, and how families view the impact of

cleanliness and hygiene on their lives.

CS2 advocates for the importance of monitoring and evaluation not only for their

activities, but for virtually all development work performed. With in-depth benchmarks

and outcomes, CS2 works to capture data about freedom levels, rights, and social

prejudice. One example of a CS2 benchmark is how many police in a certain community

have been trained in LGBT friendly policing practices. Furthermore, CS2's commitment

to evaluation can be seen by the creation of their Strategic Learning and Research

Evaluation division.

Social pressure to participate in religious activities. CS1 faces the issue of

social pressure to participate in religious activities; this issue does not apply to CS2 due

to the secular nature of their operations. CS1 reports that some of their religious

activities, such as religion class, are required, while some of them, such as mass, are not.

One representative from CS1 explained that everyone is welcome to attend religious

activities, but it is not an obligation. Although 74% of people in Ecuador are Catholic

(Central Intelligence Agency, 2012), social pressure that may exist to join in the religious

activities is something of which to be aware. Being of a different faith background could

potentially lead some clients to feel isolated or pressured to join in as well, even though there is no outright stipulation that they must do so. While CS1 approaches this issue in a way that works for both their religious mission and the dominant culture in which they work, social pressure is an issue that its leadership should be mindful of, even if they may view the social pressure to participate as a good thing.

Issues contrary to faith. As faith-based development organizations, both CS1 and CS2 have run into issues that cause some religious conflict. This dilemma might be expected of any religious organization, as most religions lack total consensus on certain issues. Indeed, this lack of consensus can be demonstrated by the countless sects, denominations, or religious movements that exist. In addition to the examples of religious contradiction given in the case studies, another dilemma that CS1 discussed was applying for funding which excludes faith organizations from being recipients. FBDOs can offer secular programs, just as secular organizations may sometimes include faith aspects to their activities. This issue of how to fund faith-based organizations is something to which many scholars suggest more comprehensive approaches (Hovland, 2008; Jeavons, 2004; Sider & Unruh, 2004).

Funding. Both CS1 and CS2 have similar funding sources, though the amount of funding from each type of source may vary. While CS1 operates with a budget between $1 million and $5 million, CS2's budget exceeds $50 million. This large gap is reflected in the scope of work undertaken by each organization. Both organizations receive most of their funding from private donations, foundation grants, or faith organizations. This may be typical of the funding sources for other FBDOs, though conclusions cannot be drawn from these limited examples. However, it is interesting to note that neither organization

receives governmental funding, either from their home country or the country in which they are working.

Program Sustainability. CS1 and CS2 approach program sustainability in very different manners. CS1 intends to remain in Ecuador as long as it is financially feasible for them. They have never truly been financially stable, but remain committed to their efforts despite financial adversity. CS1 does not consider sustainability to mean that they transition out of the country and locals take over, as the operation is already largely run by local directors. CS2, on the other hand, is not formally running projects that either would or would not be sustainable. Rather, they are building a movement towards human rights, and creating local and regional partnerships in the areas which they work. Not all of CS2's partnerships are sustainable, and some of them are not meant to be. If CS2's goals continue to align with their partners' goals, the relationship will be sustained, and if the goals of the two organizations cease to align, CS2 will work with their partners to transition out of the partnership and connect them with other potential partners.

Analysis

This research attempted to address the question: How can faith-based development organizations maintain the benefits of religion while ensuring that their development practices are inclusive and respectful of other cultures and religions? The results of this research fail to adequately address or answer this question. This may be due in part to research design, as the research sought to gather information about current models, rather than put together a new model to exemplify how this could be done. This could also be due to the fact that only two FBDOs agreed to participate in the research, which significantly limited the amount of information and analysis that could be done on

the topic. Without assessing a myriad of models, it is impossible to judge which does a

better job than others in addressing inclusive and respectful practices.

Despite the fact that this research question cannot be answered, there were several

key issues that this research did bring up. First, the survey included questions about

which populations the FBDOs aimed to target and how the operationalization of that faith

affects the functioning of the FBDO. These questions explore the overall purpose of the

FBDO. The purpose of some FBDOs is to grow their community of believers, which may

be inherently disrespectful of other cultures and beliefs. However, other FBDOs may

seek to show the good of their religion implicitly through the caring and compassionate

work they do, rather than explicitly through overt proselytizing or conversions.

Secondly, questions about the faith content of programming and whether

participation is required or optional speak to the issue of inclusivity. Inclusivity can be a

very nuanced concept, as even evangelical organizations want to be inclusive of non-

believers and those of other faiths, though this is in order to bring them into their faith

circles. Other FBDOs may be inclusive of other faiths and beliefs and not aim to have a

religious impact on those they are serving. At its core, the concept of inclusivity is about

the intention with which a FBDO is trying to involve people.

To refer to the religious taxonomies presented earlier in Table 1, CS1 seems to fit

best within Sider and Unruh's (2004) definition of a faith-centered organization, and

somewhere in between Thaut's (2009) categories of Synthesis Humanitarianism and

Evangelistic Humanitarianism. CS2, on the other hand, seems to be a faith-background

organization, while Thaut's (2009) taxonomy does not apply, as it is not a Christian

organization. These taxonomies and their application to the two case studies demonstrate why the term 'faith-based organization' is inadequate in many situations.

Limitations

This study was limited in scope first and foremost because there are endless ideas and examples of what faith-based development is, can, and should be. While the two case studies included cannot accurately represent what all FBDOs look like or are doing, they do demonstrate two examples of models currently being used by faith organizations. Initially, it was hoped that there would be four or five participating organizations to use as case studies, though only two organizations consented to participate in the research. Overall, there were about fifteen organizations contacted for participation, chosen specifically for the faiths and organizational models they represent. It would have been ideal, and the study was intended, to also include a Buddhist organization, an evangelical Christian organization, and an Islamic organization. When doing this type of research in the future, it would be beneficial to brainstorm a broader list of potential organizations because of the low number of organizations that consented to participate. While no comprehensive list of FBOs either in the United States or the world was identified, it was not effective to target organizations already known to the researcher.

There are several factors that could threaten the internal and external validity of this study. First, there is a selection bias among organizations solicited for participation. The two organizations that consented to be included could somehow be different from other FBDOs. Additionally, the validity of this study depends on the accuracy of information provided by the FBDOs in the survey and interview. Organizations have incentive to make their work look good, but, ideally, this will be mitigated to an extent by

testing results against commonly accepted best practices. Furthermore, even though two representatives were used to limit personal bias and opinion, it is impossible to capture a truly objective picture of an organization.

Another weakness is that the survey used was created specifically for this research and has not been tested or extensively peer-reviewed. Moreover, because most variables of each of the organizations differed so greatly from each other, it is hard to compare them based solely on the fact that they are both faith-based. This is telling of the fact that there is great diversity among faith-based organizations. It is also possible that the survey results do not capture the information intended.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Conclusions

This research attempted to address the question: How can faith-based development organizations maintain the benefits of religion while ensuring that their development practices are inclusive and respectful of other cultures and religions? Even though it failed in its attempt to answer the question, valuable information can be gleaned from it. First, it echoes the need for a more comprehensive classification system of organizations than the term 'faith-based' can represent. While Thaut (2009) suggested a three category classification system for Christian organizations, and Sider and Unruh (2004) proposed a six category typology that can be applied to faith organizations doing international development work, some sort of taxonomy will serve to broaden understanding of what faith means and how it is utilized, as well as possibly clarifying the funding process of said organizations.

Secondly, this research asserts the value in testing current development practices against best practices in the field. Although the specifics would vary from one organization to another and from one community to another, the best practices discussed help to ensure balance, input, and openness between two partners. These best practices include transparency, monitoring and evaluation, having local partners and input, and sustainability in terms of local ownership and long-term effects on the community. Though not included in this research, environmental sustainability is also considered a best practice. It would be beneficial to have more specific definitions of these concepts and more nuanced ways of assessing if organizations put them into practice.

Recommendations for Further Research

While this research could not adequately answer its primary research question, more inquiry into this topic would be valuable. Working with this research design specifically, it would be useful to include several more questions in the survey and interview. First, if there are religious requirements of an organization, such as CS1's religion class, is the intention of this class to educate or to convert? Secondly, it would be beneficial to expand more on community involvement in organizational direction. Is the community surveyed on a regular basis, are focus groups held, or is there a suggestion box? Furthermore, in gathering information about other organizations that the FBDO partners with, it would be revealing to ask why the organization chose their different partners. Do they intentionally partner with other faith organizations locally to serve a specific purpose, are there a variety of potential partners available to them within the communities they are working, and what benefits do they gain by these partnerships? Finally, in regards to issues that may arise that are contrary to the faith of the

organization, do those choices end up hurting the people they serve, or helping them? What impact does it have on the target population?

In addition to improving this study, research into other aspects of how faith interacts with development would have a significant impact on the field. The field of international development is growing and faith organizations facilitate a substantial amount of the work being done. As their impact continues to grow, further research on the topic will become even more critical. In particular, it is important to identify more comprehensive ways to fund faith-based development. The distinction between faith-based and secular development is too vague, as many FBDOs offer secular development services and some secular development organizations incorporate faith aspects in the work. This is also a research area identified by several other scholars (Hovland, 2008; Jeavons, 2004; Sider & Unruh, 2004).

While research into more in-depth funding options may be the most immediate issue in the field of faith-based development, there are countless other interesting questions that warrant further research. Such topics include if faith-based development has different outcomes from secular development or if making religious participation mandatory in faith-based development has a different effect than if it is optional. Using Sider and Unruh's (2004) taxonomy, it would be interesting to explore whether one type of faith organization has different outcomes or better results than another type. Furthermore, another research topic could be to explore whether a multi-tiered system like that of CS2 is less religiously discriminatory than other organizational models because it potentially allows for more space between the religious background and the population they aim to serve. Additionally, researching how monitoring and evaluation

can be improved to make FBDOs more aware of their biases, problems, and successes

would be key, as would exploring whether employees at FBDOs have different

qualifications than employees at secular development organizations given that FBDOs

might take the faith-background of an employee into consideration. It could also be

interesting to research if the faith of an employee makes a difference in outcome for both

faith-based and secular development organizations. These are several examples of the

countless areas for further research.

References

Ali, A. (2011). Turkey's Foray into Africa: A New Humanitarian Power. *Insight*

    Turkey, *13*(4), 65-73.

Atia, M. (2012). "A way to paradise": Pious neoliberalism, Islam, and faith-based

    development. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers.* 102(4). 808-

    827. Doi:10.1080/00045608.2011.627046

Aynte, A. (2012). Turkey's increasing role in Somalia: an emerging donor. *Turkish*

    Weekly, *29*, 2012.

Berger, J. (2003). Religious nongovernmental organizations: An exploratory

    analysis. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit*

    Organizations, *14*(1), 15-39.

Bhalerao, R. (n.d.). *Conflict between church and state in medieval Europe*. Informally

    published manuscript, History, University of Pune, Pune, India. Retrieved from

    http://www.academia.edu/8384384/Conflict_between_church_and_state_in_medi

    eval_Europe

Butt, J. (2004). Buddhism. In L. Chisholm (Ed.), *Visions of Service*. New York: The

    International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership.

Buttimer, A. (1990). Geography, Humanism, and Global Concern. *Annals of the*

    Association of American Geographers, 80(1), 1-33.

Central Intelligence Agency. (2012). *The world factbook: Ecuador*. Retrieved from

    https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ec.html

Clarke, G. (2007). Agents of transformation? Donors, faith-based organisations and international development. *Third World Quarterly*, *28*(1), 77–96. doi:10.1080/01436590601081880

Clarke, M. (2011). Buddhism: A middle way for development. In *Development and Religion: Theology and Practice*. Northhampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Decker, K., McInerney-Lankford, S., & Sage, C. (2005). Human Rights and Equitable Development:" Ideals", Issues and Implications.

Ellerman, D. P. (1999). Global institutions: Transforming international development agencies into learning organizations. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *13*(1), 25-35.

Elyachar, J. (2006). Best practices: Research, finance, and NGOs in Cairo. *American Ethnologist*, *33*(3), 413-426.

Epprecht, M. (2012). Sexual minorities, human rights and public health strategies in Africa. *African Affairs, 111*(443), 223-243. doi:10.1093/afraf/ads019

Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Falk, M. L. (2013). Thai Buddhists' encounters with international relief work in post-tsunami Thailand. In *Buddhism, International Relief Work, and Civil Society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Feek, W. (2007). Best of practices?. *Development in practice*, *17*(4-5), 653-655.

Finkelman, P. (Ed.). (2005). Colonialism and Neocolonialism. In *Encyclopedia of the New American Nation* (1st ed.). Charles Scribners & Sons.

Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc, (2012). *Why we give.*
What is tzedakah?. Retrieved from website:
http://www.hadassah.org/site/c.7gLFKYMJLnI2F/b.6036381/k.C1EE/Why_We_
Give_What_is_Tzedakah.htm

Hammersley, L. (2013). Community-based service-learning: Partnerships of reciprocal
exchange? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 14*(3), 171-184.

Harper, M. (2012). Getting Somalia Wrong. *E-International Relations.* Retrieved from
http://www.e-ir.info/2012/05/09/getting-somalia-wrong/

Hartman, E., Paris, C., & Blache-Cohen, B. (2012). Tourism and transparency -
Navigating ethical risks in volunteerism with fair trade learning. *Africa Insight,*
42(2), 157-168.

Hartman, E., Paris, C., & Blache-Cohen, B. (2014). Fair trade learning: Ethical standards
for community-engaged international volunteer tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality*
Research, 14(1-2), 108-116. doi:10.1177/1467358414529443

Haşimi, C. (2014). Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy and Development
Cooperation. *Insight Turkey*, *16*(1), 127-145.

Haslam, P. A., Schafer, J., & Beaudet, P. (2012). *Introduction to International*
Development: Approaches, Actors and Issues (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hovland, I. (2008). Who's afraid of religion? Tensions between "mission" and
"development" in the Norwegian Mission Society. In G. Clarke & M. Jennings
(Eds.), *Development, Civil Society and Faith-Based Organizations: Bridging the*
Sacred and the Secular (pp. 171-186). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Illich, I. (1968, April 20). *To Hell with Good Intentions*. Lecture presented at Conference

    on InterAmerican Student Projects, Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Inclusive. (n.d.). Retrieved December 19, 2015, from http://www.merriam-

    webster.com/dictionary/inclusive

Jacquet, C., & Walton, M. (2013). Buddhism and relief in Myanmar: Reflections on relief

    as a practice of *dāna*. In *Buddhism, International Relief Work, and Civil Society*.

    New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

James, R. (2011). Handle with care: Engaging with faith-based organisations in

    development. *Development in Practice*, *21*(1), 109–117.

    doi:10.1080/09614524.2011.530231

Jeavons, T. H. (2004). Religious and faith-based organizations: Do we know one when

    we see one? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *33*(1), 140–145.

    doi:10.1177/0899764003257499

Kersten, C. (2004). Islam. In L. Chisholm (Ed.), *Visions of Service,* New York: The

    International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership.

King, D. P. (2011). World Vision: Religious identity in the discourse and practice of

    global relief and development. *Review of Faith & International Affairs.* 9(3). 21-

    28. Doi:10.1080/15570274.2011.597212

Kniss, F. & Campbell, D. (1997). The effect of religious orientation on international

    relief and development organizations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*.

    36(1), 93-103.

Kwang-sun Suh, D. (2004). Christianity. In L. Chisholm (Ed.), *Visions of Service*. New

    York: The International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership.

Lapthananon, P. (2012). Approach, Strategies and Activities of Development Monks in

    Isan. In *Development monks in Northeast Thailand* (pp. 130-179). Melbourne:

    Trans Pacific Press.

Lavery, S. (2007). Christian service learning – does it make a difference? *Journal of*

    Religious Education, *55*(1). Retrieved from

    http://researchonline.nd.edu.au/edu_article/12

Lunn, J. (2009). The role of religion, spirituality and faith in development: A critical

    theory approach. *Third World Quarterly*, *30*(5), 937–951.

    doi:10.1080/01436590902959180

Marshall, K., & Keough, L. (2004). *Mind, heart and soul in the fight against poverty*.

    Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

National Center for Charitable Statistics. (2015). *IRS Ruling Date*. Retrieved from

    http://nccsweb.urban.org/tablewiz/showreport.php

Nielsen, L. (2011). Classifications of Countries Based on Their Level of Development:

    How it is Done and How it Could be Done. *IMF Working Paper: Strategy, Policy,*

    and Review Department, 1-45. Retrieved from

    https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2011/wp1131.pdf

Paasche-Orlow, S. (2001). Acts of loving-kindness. *MyJewishLearning*, Retrieved from

    http://www.myjewishlearning.com/practices/Ethics/Caring_For_Others/Social_W

    elfare/Defining_Service.shtml?p=1

PASSOP: People Against Suffering Oppression and Poverty. (2012). A dream deferred:

    Is the equality clause in the South African Constitution's Bill of Rights (1996)

    just a far-off hope for LGBTI asylum seekers and refugees? In *LGBTI Refugee*

Support and Advocacy Project: PASSOP Report. Open Society Foundation for

  South Africa.

Rist, G. (2007). Development as a buzzword. *Development in Practice, 17*(4-5), 485-491.

  doi:10.1080/09614520701469328

Rosenkranz, R. (2011). Global development: What you need to know. *devex: Do Good.*

  Do It Well. Retrieved from https://www.devex.com/news/global-development-

  what-you-need-to-know-74999

Rosenthal, G. S. (2005). Tikkun ha- Olam: The Metamorphosis of a Concept. *The*

  Journal of Religion, *85*(2), 214–240. doi:10.1086/427314

Salamon, L. (2012). *America's nonprofit sector: A primer* (3rd ed.). New York:

  Foundation Center.

Schneider, J. A., Wittberg, P., Unruh, H., Sinha, J., & Belcher, J. (2011). Comparing

  practical theology across religions and denominations. *Review of Religious*

  Research, *52*(4), 405–426. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23055569

Sider, R., & Unruh, H. (2004). Typology of religious characteristics of social service and

  educational organizations and programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*

  Quarterly, 33(1), 109-134. doi:10.1177/0899764003257494

Stephens, N. (n.d.). "If You Have Come to Help Me, You Are Wasting Your Time":

  Youth Volunteers in International Development Education. Retrieved from

  http://www.macalester.edu/educationreform/publicintellectualessay/new

  pies/Nate_s_PIE.pdf

Tank, P. (2013). Turkey's new humanitarian approach in Somalia. *The Norwegian*

  Peacebuilding Resource Centre (NOREF) Policy Brief.

Ter Haar, G., & Ellis, S. (2006). The role of religion in development: Towards a new

 relationship between the European Union and Africa. *European Journal of*

 Development Research, *18*(3), 351–367. doi:10.1080/09578810600893403

Thaut, L. C. (2009). The Role of Faith in Christian Faith-Based Humanitarian Agencies:

 Constructing the Taxonomy. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and*

 Nonprofit Organizations, *20*(4), 319–350. Retrieved from

 http://www.jstor.org/stable/27928181

Thoreson, R. R. (2008). Somewhere over the rainbow nation: Gay, lesbian, and bisexual

 activism in South Africa. *African Studies Companion Online, 34*(3), 678-697.

 doi:10.1080/03057070802259969

United Nations Development Programme [UNDP]. (n.d.). Human development index

 (HDI). In *Human development reports*. Retrieved from

 http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi

United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security [UNTFHS]. (2009). How to

 Operationalise the Human Security Concept. In *Human Security in Theory and*

 Practice. United Nations, Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs,

 Human Security Unit.

Varney, D., & van Vliet, W. (2005). Local Environmental Initiatives Oriented to Children

 and Youth: A Review of UN-Habitat Best Practices. *Children Youth and*

 Environments, *15*(2), 41-52.

Ver Beek, K. A. (2000). Spirituality: a development taboo. *Development in*

 practice, *10*(1), 31-43.

Vincent, W., Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2012). Effects of traditional gender role

norms and religious fundamentalism on self-identified heterosexual men's

attitudes, anger, and aggression toward gay men and lesbians. *Psychol Men Masc,

12*(4), 383-400. doi:10.1037/a0023807

Appendix 1: Letter of Invitation

Date, 2015

Dear Name of Organization:

My name is Mara Hochberg-Miller and I am a student at Concordia University in Portland, Oregon working towards a Masters degree in International Development and Service. I'm writing today to request your participation in research I am doing for my thesis.

My Masters thesis is called "Models of Faith: The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in International Development" and it explores several case studies of different faith-based development organizations (FBDOs) representing different faiths and working in different areas of the world. It aims to answer the question *how can faith-based development organizations maintain the benefits of religion while ensuring that their development practices are inclusive and respectful of other cultures and religions?* I will share all findings with participating organizations.

This study will look at four main aspects of faith-based organizations:

· How the organization operationalizes its faith: how they were founded, who they employ, and whom they aim to serve.
· How the organization views their moral obligation: if they go into specific communities where they feel they have an obligation to help, what they consider that obligation to be, and how their morals translate into the programs they deliver.
· The development programs: whether the programs are religious or secular in tone, and the spaces in which they occur.
· Host communities: any local partners the organization might have, whether there is community involvement in determining the direction the organization takes, and whether the organization hires locally within the community.

By exploring these different models of faith-based development, analyzing whether practices adhere to ideals accepted in the field of international development, and sharing the successes and challenges of existing FBDOs, my hope it that this research can ultimately assist FBDOs in the field to become even more effective, sustainable, and culturally sensitive development actors.

The first stage of my research is a brief survey for participating organizations. Next, there is a semi-structured follow-up interview to clarify answers and offer additional information. It is requested that two people be involved in both of these stages to help ensure that the information gathered is representative of the organization and not solely one person's opinion. I will also request the opportunity to review an annual report from participating organizations, if available. The name of participating organizations will remain anonymous. Prior to beginning the survey, participants will be required to sign privacy and consent forms.

I have contacted your organization because I believe learning about your practices in international development will greatly add to my overall research. I hope that you will consider participating! If you have any questions about my study or any part of the research process, please do not hesitate to let me know. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mara Hochberg-Miller
Concordia University-Portland
marashira@gmail.com

Appendix 2: Survey

Models of Faith: The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in International
Development
Questionnaire
Researcher: Mara Hochberg-Miller
marashira@gmail.com

Definitions: These are the definitions I will be using in my study. Please keep these definitions in mind as you answer the survey questions below:
1. Development: International development is often measured using levels of economic advancement. However, it can also be measured in terms of human development (e.g. education, lifespan, standard of living), the physical infrastructure of a country, or as an expansion of freedoms.
2. Faith-based: Organizations or programs which have roots in a specific religious or spiritual faith, whether or not their programs are also religious.
3. Secular: Organizations or programs that have no religious roots or components
4. Country of Interest: Your organization may work in one country or several countries. If the latter is the case, country of interest refers to the previously discussed example we will be using for this case study.

Background Information
1. Name of organization (for my use only): _____
2. Location of organization's headquarters: _____
3. Country of Interest (for purposes of this survey): _____
4. What region(s) of the world does your organization work in? Please select all that apply.
    a. Africa
    b. Asia and the Pacific
    c. Central America
    d. Europe
    e. Middle East
    f. North America
    g. South America
5. In what type of international development work does your organization invest or directly facilitate? Please select all that apply.
    a. Building infrastructure (e.g. houses, roads, medical centers, etc.)
    b. Health and wellness
    c. Teaching
    d. Community organizing
    e. Providing food assistance
    f. Addressing human rights and empowerment
    g. Sustainable agriculture
    h. Building faith communities
    i. Other: _____

6. What target population does your organization work with? Please select all that apply.
    a. Children
    b. Adults
    c. Women and girls
    d. Men and boys
    e. LGBTQ
    f. Seniors
    g. Farmers
    h. Other: _____

7. What is the size of your organization?
    a. Number of staff globally: _____
    b. Number of staff in country of interest: _____
    c. Number of countries in which your organization works: _____
    d. Number of volunteers globally (if known): _____
    e. Number of volunteers in country of interest: _____

8. What is the annual budget for your organization?
    a. $0-$20,999
    b. $21,000-$99,999
    c. $100,000-$500,999
    d. $500,000-$1 million
    e. $1 million- $5 million
    f. $6 million- $15 million
    g. $16 million- $49 million
    h. $50 million+

9. From which sources does your organization receive funding? Please select all that apply.
    a. US Government
    b. Private donations
    c. UN Agencies
    d. State government of host country
    e. Church or other faith organization
    f. Foundation grants
    g. Other: _____

10. In what year was your organization founded? _____

11. How long has your organization been operating in your country of interest?__

12. Does your organization identify as a faith-based organization?
    a. Yes, we currently identify as a faith-based organization
    b. We were founded as a faith-based organization but we now we identify as a secular organization [Skip to end of survey]
    c. No, we are not a faith-based organization [Skip to end of survey]
    d. Other: _____

13. If Yes, with what faith background is your organization associated with?
    a. Buddhism
    b. Christianity
        i. Which denomination? _____

   c. Judaism
   d. Islam
   e. Other: _____
14. If Yes, how is your organization tied to a faith community? Please select all that apply.
   a. We are a stand-alone NGO with religious roots
   b. We are directly connected with a specific church/faith organization
   c. The majority of our funding comes from a specific religious organization
   d. Other: _____

Operationalization of Faith
1. How does being a faith-based organization affect the functioning of your organization? Please select all that apply.
   a. We only hire employees of a certain faith
   b. We aim to serve a specific faith population
   c. Our development work is inspired by a specific religious purpose
   d. Our development work serves a specific religious purpose (e.g. evangelism)
   e. Our programs are only open to people of a certain faith
   f. Our development projects are available to people of all faiths/no faith, although there is a religious component to them
   g. We offer secular programs open to people of all faiths/no faith
   h. Other: _____

Morals: How your organization views your obligation to help
1. How does your organization decide where to work?
   a. We only go into communities where we are invited to work
   b. We go to communities in which we have connections and assess their need for assistance
   c. We go to communities where we feel obligated to help
   d. Other: _____
2. What does your organization consider its moral obligation to be when considering international development? (free response)
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
3. Do you feel that your faith's moral codes and principles are reflected in the programs your organization operates? How so? (free response)
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Development practices:
1. How do you classify the international development programs run by your organization?
   a. The programs are wholly faith-based
   b. The programs are wholly secular
   c. The programs have both faith and secular components
   d. Other:_____
2. Please explain your response to the question above:

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

3. If programs have a faith component, are clients required to participate in them?
   a. Yes, everyone is required to participate in faith activities (e.g. mass, classes)
   b. No, but we encourage everyone to participate
   c. No, clients may learn about religious activities, but it is solely their choice on whether or not to attend
   d. Other: _____
4. Please explain.

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

5. In what types of spaces do your international development projects operate? Please select all that apply.
   a. Our religious programs occur in religious buildings, such as a church or mosque
   b. Our secular programs are held in secular spaces, such as a community center or school
   c. Our programs are secular but happen to be held in religious spaces
   d. Our programs are religious but are held in secular communal spaces
6. If applicable, how does your organization facilitate secular development projects? Please select all that apply.
   a. Religious expression is not allowed in our secular space
   b. The expression of a particular religion is allowed in our space
   c. Expressions of any religious denomination are allowed in our space
   d. We do not offer secular development projects
   e. Other: _____

Community
1. Does the faith of your organization match the majority faith of the area you are serving in your country of interest?

      a. Yes
      b. No
      c. Other/Explanation: _____

2. Is there an effort to hire local staff within the community?
      a. Yes
      b. No
      c. Other/Explanation: _____

3. What kind of community involvement (if any) is there in determining what direction the organization takes?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Are there other organizations with whom you work in the local community?
      a. Yes
      b. No

5. If so, please share examples.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. What kind of community outreach do you facilitate locally? For example, do you reach out to community members to participate in your programs or are they referred to you by someone else?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix 3: Interview Questions

<u>Follow-up Interview Questions:</u> (varied some between organizations)

1. What steps towards transparency does your organization take? For example, are all financial documents posted online, or do you publish an annual report?

2. What kinds of program monitoring and evaluation mechanisms do you have in place, if any, within the organization? How do you determine success, measure community impact, or assess your programs?

3. Is your intention to remain in the communities you work in indefinitely, or do you plan to stay only for a set amount of time?

4. If you intend to transition out of a community, how do you ensure that your programs are sustainable after your departure, or are they meant to be?

5. What do you think "good" international development looks like?

6. How do you think other faith-based international development organizations could improve or engage in "good" international development?

7. How does your organization handle issues, opinions, and program needs that might be contradictory to principles and practices of your faith? For example, promoting condom usage as HIV prevention, or teaching about family planning.