"MCCers and Evangelical Perspectives of Development"

MCCers and Evangelicals:
Perspectives of Development

Kristen A. Grace, D. Merrill Ewert, and Paul R. Eberts

Not all religious intercultural workers are engaged in development practice. Yet religious workers act as models in communities they serve, and their leadership styles and implicit views of development influence community structures. Religious workers who do not see themselves as community developers may still supervise others more directly engaged in development work. In view of the church's growing involvement in community development around the world, religiously motivated people need to reflect upon what is being done and why. MCC's seventy-fifth anniversary provides a particularly appropriate forum for examining the relationship between worldview and practice.

This paper is part of an ongoing attempt to stimulate broader and deeper reflection on the worldviews of Christian intercultural workers and on how these views interact with principles of good development practice. In particular, this study compares the views of MCC volunteers to those of a broader subset of evangelicals involved in intercultural ministry.

Background studies

Religious beliefs and social outreach

Since Max Weber's classic study of the Protestant ethic, social scientists have focused more attention on the ways religious beliefs affect people's attitudes on non-religious matters. Robert Wuthnow and James Hunter argue that the divisions in American society today are fundamentally religious in character.[1] To understand contemporary cultural struggles, they suggest, one must first understand that the competing moral visions-including secular ones-are based in systems of faith which make claims to truth about the world. Religious beliefs shape

Kristen A. Grace is a research assistant in the Dept. of Education at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. D. Merrill Ewert is assistant professor of education at Cornell. Paul R. Eberts is professor of rural sociology at Cornell.

---

[1] Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1930; reprint, London: Allen & Unwin, 1956); Robert Wuthnow, *The Struggle for America's Soul: Evangelicals, Liberals and Secularism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdrnans, 1989); J. D. Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991) and *Before the Shooting Begins: Searching for Democracy in America's Culture War* (New York: The Free Press, 1994).

attitudes about the relationship between the self, others, and society. This suggests the utility of examining whether, how, and to what extent people's religious and secular belief systems relate to their community development orientations.

Evangelicals have long debated Christian responsibility in addressing social problems. Concerns with personal piety and spreading the gospel garner much attention and resources, while concerns with social justice are sometimes greeted with skepticism. Yost, for example, argues that development can hinder church growth.[2] In 1974, the Lausanne Covenant addressed the relationship between evangelism and social responsibility, noting that "in the church's mission of sacrificial service, evangelism is primary."[3]

"[Reaffirming] the primacy of evangelism does not solve the problem," argues theologian John Stott, "it leaves the relationship between evangelism and social responsibility still undefined."[4] In spite of the ongoing debate, evangelicals and other religious groups are more predisposed to engage in social outreach than non- religious groups.[5] Recently, some evangelicals have called for developing uniquely Christian approaches to relief and development.[6]

Mennonite relief and development predates that of most organized Christian efforts by nearly a quarter-century. Mennonites draw on Anabaptist theology and historical tradition which emphasize, among other things, community and discipleship.[7] Yet little is known about how Mennonite experiences and perspectives of relief and development compare with those of other religious intercultural workers.

Norman Kraus proposes several theological contrasts between Mennonites and evangelicals that may explain why the groups differ in their views of appropriate social outreach practice. The following table is adapted from his work "Evangelicalism: A Mennonite Critique."

---

[2] J. Yost, "Development Can Hinder Church Growth," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (Oct. 1984): 353-60.

[3] T. Sine, *The Church in Response to Human Need* (Monrovia, Cal.: MARC, 1983).

[4] J.R.W. Stott, *The Contemporary Christian: Applying God's Word to Today's World* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1992).

[5] R. Wuthnow, V. Hodgkinson and Associates, *Faith and Philanthropy: Exploring the Role of Religion in America's Voluntary Sector* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990).

[6] T. Guterbock and D. Baunach, "What Do Christians Expect from Christian Relief and Development?" (Center for Survey Research, University of Virgina, 1993); A. Sherman, "Global Revolutions and Christian Relief Development," *Stewardship Journal* 2.1 (1992).

[7] C.N. Kraus, "Evangelicalism: A Mennonite Critique" in D.W. Dayton and R.K. Johnston, eds., *The Variety of American Evangelicalism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991).

FIGURE 1
**Adaptation of N. Kraus's Comparison
of Anabaptist and Evangelical Traditions**

	Anabaptism	**Evangelicalism**
Historical context/ Relationship with Christian traditions	*Renaissance* New discovery of original Bible called for new reading of Scripture that would give true authority and relevance "False Church needs replacement"	*Revival* Renewal through appeals to 19th-century Protestant orthodoxy, appeal of biblical inerrancy "Spiritual dead church needs revival"
Witness in the world	*Prophetic* Heralds of a new social order	*Evangelistic* Pietistic, individualistic
Doctrinal approach	*Hermeneutic/Confessional* Concern with meaning and application, authenticated by a life of obedience and discipleship	*Apologetic/Polemical* Rational argument, logical persuasion, emphasis on right doctrine, verbal proclamation
Faith and the Church	*Social expression* Anticipatory expression of Kingdom of God Voluntary community of faithful obedience	*Spiritual expression* Spiritualization of the true church Faith is a reality within the heart of the individual
Church and nation	*Separation* Churches' false character lies in their link with the kingdom of the world Suspicious of theological movements that align themselves with national interests	*Alliance* God and country Spiritual renewal of nation through evangelism and moral reform; nation to be embodiment of salvific realm on earth Withdrawal from corrupt world
Political involvement	*Ethical witness* Separation of church and state but church to provide a relevant ethical witness as a community practicing non-conformism and non-resistance (pacifism)	*Reformism* Either: sectarian withdrawal from corrupt world Or: alliance of God and country
View of service	*Communalism* Social service as fundamental part of the gospel Fraternal sharing of goods, transnational community	*Individualism* Recovery of social service dimension but emphasis on salvation as purely spiritual and supernatural

Community development principles

Effective community development principles are generally associated with empowerment (of the individual or community) through participation in the decision-making, implementation, and benefits of a project.[8] David Korten has identified four generations of development practice. The first generation emphasized direct assistance provided by outside sources (the emergency relief model). Second-generation attempts focused on promotion of integrated community development projects. Given the failure of these two approaches to promote sustainable development, third-generation activities emphasized greater local networking to address related problems at a regional or national level. The fourth generation moved entirely from "doing for or with others" to "seeking justice with others." This generation sought the direct involvement of popular movements at national and international levels.

Most development agencies straddle more than one generational approach. However, a mismatch can occur when agencies employ language promoting sustainable development (a third-generation approach) while maintaining structures that encourage first- or second-generation strategies.

The benefits of increased participation in the development process are well known. Uphoff's analysis of a rural irrigation project in Sri Lanka underscores the central role of participation in development. Cornwall, Gujit, and Welboum document a shift in development theory and practice by citing the recent emergence of participatory methodologies: farming systems research and extension, farmer experimentation, participatory action research, rapid rural appraisal, and participatory rural appraisal.[9] This new paradigm is holistic, post-positivist, participatory , egalitarian, collaborative, and decentralized. It puts people first.[10]

Though not a panacea, participation may be a necessary if not sufficient condition for successful development.[11] Research shows that community development is related to the presence of social ties that unite people. Participation encourages the development of trust, which fosters the development of democratic structures.[12] Development workers must therefore be skilled intercultural facilitators, able to build relationships with and promote trust among local people.

Traditional approaches to development have attempted to compensate for a lack of knowledge, experience, technology, resources, or finances on the part of nations, communities, or individuals. Experts identify problems and develop solutions, often by providing training and

---

[8] R. Chambers, *Rural Development: Putting the Last First* (Essex: Longman, 1983); J. Cohen and N. Uphoff, "Participation's Place in Rural Development: Seeking Clarity through Specificity," in *World Development 8* (1980): 213-35; D. Korten, *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda* (West Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press, 1990); R. Tandon, "Social Transformation and Participatory Research," *Convergence* 21:2-3 (1988): 5-15; E. Nessman, *Peasant Mobilization* (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1981.); N. Uphoff, *Learning from Gal Oya: Possibilities for Participatory Development and Post-Newtonian Social Science* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

[9] A. Cornwall, I. Gujit, and A. Welboum, " Acknowledging Process: Challenges for Agricultural Research and Extension Methodology," in I. Scoones and J. Thompson, eds., *Beyond Farmer First: Rural People's Knowledge, Agricultural Research and Extension Practice* (London: Intermediate .Technology, 1994).

[10] J. Pretty and R. Chambers, "Turning the New Leaf: New Professionalism: Institutions, and Policies for Agriculture," in I. Scoones and J. Thompson, 181-82.

[11] Cohen and Uphoff.

[12] R.D. Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

materials. Unfortunately, however, this "quick fix" approach not only neglects local resources and ingenuity; it can often bring about dependency and erode the potential for sustainable development.[13] An alternative approach posits outside individuals or institutions as the facilitators of and catalysts for locally directed change. This community-based approach seeks to mobilize organized community responses to local problems while addressing the structural causes of poverty.

Conceptual framework

In addition to these affirmed principles of effective community development practice, this paper draws from a study by Ewert, Yaccino, and Yaccino in which the authors identified principles of good practice by inviting seventy-five "expert practitioners" to suggest and then evaluate a set of core principles of good development.[14] The sample affirmed the following criteria of good development practice:

- participation of people
- local ownership of the decision-making process
- the commitment of local resources
- the role of outside practitioners as facilitators of change
- a belief in people's capacity to effect change if given opportunities by their structural environments
- the value of indigenous knowledge
- the conception of development as a "process" and not a series of "projects."

These principles were accepted as nonnative in a further study of intercultural evangelical readers of *Evangelical Mission Quarterly* (EMQ). In this study Ewert, Clark, and Eberts found that the sample was divided; the majority favored an assistance-based approach to development in which outsiders mobilize resources for needy individuals.[15] A smaller group endorsed a more participatory approach in which outsiders facilitate community attempts to solve local problems. Figure 2 highlights how these approaches differ in their units of analysis, locus of control, role of the external agent, and community development workers' knowledge and skills.

---

[13] Chambers, Korten

[14] D.M. Ewert, D. Yaccino and T. Yaccino, "Cultural Diversity and Self-Sustaining Development: The Successful Facilitator". (paper presented at the Community Development Society annual conference, Charleston, South Carolina, 1993).

[15] D.M. Ewert, P. Clark and P. Eberts, "Between Two Paradigms: Evangelicals and Development." *Stewardship Journal* (Spring/Summer 1994).

FIGURE 2
Two Approaches to Community Development

	Assistance-based approach	**Facilitative approach**
The task	Improvement	Transformation
Unit of analysis	Individual (or nation as single unit)	Community (or group as a collective unit)
Locus of control	External	Internal
Role of outside agent	Provide resources, training	Stimulate critical reflection
Knowledge & skills of worker	Technical knowledge	Building relationships

Both approaches have certain advantages. For example, the facilitative approach may help people gain new perspectives, but alone it will not teach skills such as welding, sewing, and auto mechanics. On the other hand, communities that identify their needs together and seek common solutions to problems are more likely to introduce changes that benefit a broader range of community members, meet less resistance to change, achieve greater sense of local ownership of the process, and be more sustainable.[16]

The MCC study utilized the same conceptual framework to relate the perspectives of MCC volunteers to nouns of accepted practice. This paper draws on the data generated by the study to compare and contrast the views of MCC volunteers with the previously sampled readers of *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* in order to answer the following research questions:

- What do MCC volunteers and evangelical intercultural workers think about social outreach and development? How are their views similar? Different?

- How might these views affect their approaches to community development?

Methodology

Instrument and response rate

---

[16] Korten.

A sixteen-page questionnaire was mailed to 2,500 randomly selected subscribers to *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (EMQ) and to all current MCC volunteers (685), regardless of their assignment. EMQ is a practitioners' journal affiliated with the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association and the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association. EMQ readers are typically involved in full-time Christian ministries overseas, serve as mission administrators or instructors in theological or mission-training institutions, or are missionaries on home or study leave. MCC volunteers, on the other hand, are more likely to be engaged in short- term missions work with a more explicit development focus.

The questionnaire mailed to EMQ readers, "Christians in a Needy World: Your Response," received a 48. 7% return rate, high for an international survey. Another 57 questionnaires received after the initial analysis (which are therefore not included in this analysis) brought the total response rate to 51%. MCCers received a modified version of the same questionnaire, entitled "MCCers and Development: Values and Beliefs." This survey had a 67% rate of return.

Analysis

The comparison of MCC volunteers and EMQ readers involved two steps. The first compared the two groups as a whole. This comparison provides a general summary of similarities and differences in the background characteristics, beliefs about development, and motivations of each group.[17] In the second phase, the research examined differences within each group according to the two community development approaches described above. In order to measure these two approaches, over forty statements regarding community development theories and practice were submitted to factor analysis. Through this statistical procedure, two "factors" representing different approaches to community development were identified and made into scales (see Tables 5 and 6). As a result, the social background, personality, and secular and religious beliefs of those favoring either approach to community development could then be identified and compared across samples. Given the anticipated differences in the backgrounds of the two groups, this process examined whether the differences in their approaches to development remained once background characteristics were held constant.

Findings

1. Similarities and differences between MCC and EMQ respondents

General characteristics

As expected, the MCC volunteers differed from the readers of EMQ in several ways. (See Table 1.) Both samples were predominantly composed of U.S.-and Canadian citizens (88% EMQ respondents and 93% MCC volunteers) who identified themselves as white (95% and 96%, respectively). EMQ respondents were much older than the MCC volunteers. Half of the MCC volunteers were under age 35, and a third were under 30. Among EMQ respondents the reverse is true, with 63% over age 40 and a quarter of the sample over 55. Only 5% of this sample were

---

[17] In order to test for statistical significance in response patterns, the means were compared using a two-sample t-test.

under 30. MCC volunteers were also less likely to see themselves on career tracks. Sixteen percent of these respondents, compared to 88% of the EMQ sample, saw themselves as engaged in career rather than short-term work. Similarly, the education levels of the two groups varied. Sixty-five percent of the EMQ respondents held graduate or professional degrees, while only 35% of the MCC sample have achieved such educational levels.

        The two groups differed in their level of involvement in community or economic development. Fifty-eight percent of the EMQ sample worked "in the field." Of this group, only 2% described themselves as "development workers." The majority of the sample (57% of those in the field or 37% of the total sample) described themselves as "religious workers." By contrast, 73% of the MCC sample worked "in the field." Of this group, 35% identified themselves as development workers. Less than 3% of MCCers working in the field (or 2% of the total sample) identified themselves primarily as religious workers. Finally, all respondents were asked whether they were involved in community or economic development work. Less than a third (28%) of the EMQ respondents stated that they were involved in development, while 61% of the MCC sample indicated that they were.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Background Characteristics of EMQ and MCC Samples

Background Characteristics	EMQ	MCC
U.S. & Canadian citizens	88%	93%
Ethnicity: White	95%	96%
Male respondents	82%	46%
Age: Under 30	5%	32%
Age: Over 55	25%	13%
Missionary/Preacher's kids	15%	12%
International travel by age 16	28%	37%
Graduate degree	65%	35%
Career track	88%	16%
Working in field	58%	73%
Development worker (asked of those in field)	2%	35%
Involved in community/economic development work (all)	28%	61%

Christian involvement in community development

When asked about motivations for Christians to be involved in development work, the two groups varied significantly according to two-sample t-tests. Table 2 shows that both groups agreed most strongly with the statement that "Christians should be involved in community development in order to follow Christ's example."[18] MCC volunteers agreed more strongly with the various motivations for Christians to be involved in community development work than did the EMQ sample. Though respondents were not specifically asked to rank the motivations, Table 2 lists each statement according to the mean response it received.

---

[18] MCC respondents had a mean response of 4.62 on a 5-point Likert scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) and EMQ respondents had a mean of 4.35. None of the other statements had a mean response of over 4.0 for the EMQ sample, while all but three of the eight statements received mean responses over 4.0 in the MCC sample.

The second ranking motivation for Christians to be involved in community development work for the EMQ respondents was shared between "earning the right to be heard" and "relieving suffering is a religious duty." Within the MCC sample, earning the right to be heard received the least favorable rating, 2.74, a negative response. Their next lowest response, "to strengthen the Church," received a mean response of 3.74. MCCers were much more likely than EMQ respondents to agree strongly with the following statements: Christians should be involved in community development in order to: "find Christ in an act of compassion," "build the Kingdom of God on earth," "improve society," and "proclaim the Good News."

The two groups did not show significant difference in their responses to the statement that Christians should be involved in community development in order to relieve suffering. However, the EMQ sample gave this the second highest rating, while the MCC volunteers ranked it sixth. Overall, MCCers appeared to affirm that development work has intrinsic Christian worth, while EMQ respondents were more prone to support development activities if these contributed positively to evangelistic goals.

TABLE 2
Why Christians Should Be Involved in Community Development: Comparison of Mean and Rank Scores

Reasons to be Involved	EMQ		MCC	
	mean	rank	mean	rank
Follow Christ's example	4.35	1	4.62	1
Earn the right to be heard (gain credibility)	3.96	2	2.76	8
Relieve suffering	**3.96**	2	**3.91**	6
Build the Kingdom of God on earth	3.88	4	4.21	3
Improve society	3.77	5	4.17	4
Proclaim the Good News	3.53	6	4.09	5
Find Christ in an act of compassion	3.42	7	4.31	2
Strengthen the church	3.33	8	3.74	7

Values with significant differences are reported in regular type. Values that do not show statistically significant differences at the .05 level according to a two-sample t-test are in bold.

Causes of Poverty

Community development strategies are based on different assumptions regarding the nature of poverty and reflect different theories about the ways in which poverty can be eliminated. The questionnaire examined some of these assumptions by asking respondents how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statement regarding twelve possible causes of poverty. Some of these could be individually ascribed, while others were more structural in nature. The MCC and EMQ samples showed statistically significant differences in ten out of the twelve of these causes. (See Table 3.)

TABLE 3

Comparison of Mean and Rank Responses
To Questions on Causes of Poverty

Causes of Poverty	EMQ		MCC	
	Mean	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
Corrupt governments	**4.23**	1	**4.15**	2
Injustice within each country	4.02	2	4.19	1
Lack of Christian values	3.97	3	2.41	11
Lack of means to generate income	3.77	4	3.98	3
Lack of entrepreneurial spirit	3.56	5	2.43	10
Lack of capital investment	**3.56**	5	**3.45**	8
Human ignorance	3.43	7	2.67	9
Human rights violations	3.42	8	3.60	6
Racism	3.29	9	3.58	7
Dependency	3.14	10	3.70	5
Multinational corporations	2.74	11	3.85	4
Laziness	2.47	12	1.73	12

Values with significant differences are reported in regular type. Values that do not show statistically significant differences at the .05 level according to a two-sample t-test are in bold.

Four questions measured individual causes of poverty: lack of Christian values, lack of entrepreneurial spirit, human ignorance, and laziness. EMQ respondents agreed or were neutral (3.0 or above) with all of these causes but one-laziness-which received a mean of 2.47. Lack of Christian values received the third highest mean of all the causes at 3.97.

MCC volunteers, on the other hand, disagreed with the four individual causes of poverty, giving them the lowest means of the entire set of questions. None of the four statements received a mean response approaching 3.0, and the mean score for laziness was 1.73. MCCers were also significantly more likely to see multinational corporations as a cause of poverty in the Third World. The MCCers' mean score of 3.85 for this statement, much higher that the EMQ respondents' mean score of 2.74, suggests that the two groups differ significantly in their views of social structure and poverty.

Theories of development

Intercultural workers hold theories of development, which may or may not be articulated or even acknowledged. Table 4 presents the attitudes of MCC volunteers and EMQ readers regarding seven theories of development.

TABLE 4
**Comparison of Means and Rank Responses
to Questions on Development Theory**

Theories of Development	**EMQ**		**MCC**	
	Mean	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
Development occurs when communities adopt organized responses to common problems	4.02	1	4.19	1
Continual training of the poor is essential to the development process	3.98	2	3.61	4
Development usually requires change in unjust structures	3.54	3	3.94	2
Development occurs when donors invest in building poor countries' infrastructure	3.43	4	2.87	5
Development occurs when poor people learn to reflect on their situation	3.38	5	3.63	3
Transfer of technology is the fastest way to accelerate development	2.61	6	2.26	7
Development is fostered by structural change achieved through class struggle	2.10	7	2.33	6

Differences in reported means are statistically significant at .05 according to two-sample t-test.

The differences between the mean responses for each of the statements were statistically significant. Both groups agreed that development occurs when "communities adopt organized responses to common problems" (4.29 MCC, 4.02 EMQ). However, the EMQ sample viewed continual training of the poor and investment in infrastructure more positively than the MCC sample did. The latter emphasized changing unjust structures and having poor people reflect on their situation. Both groups disagreed that "transfer of technology is the fastest way to accelerate development" and that "development is fostered by structural change achieved through class struggle." Nonetheless, MCCers were less predisposed against structural change involving class struggle than the EMQ sample. MCCers were also more critical of the transfer of technology than the EMQ respondents.

2. *Facilitative and assistance-based development approaches*

As described earlier, this study probed for differences in approaches to community development within each sample. The researchers created two scales to measure assistance-based and facilitative approaches to development. These scales then served as dependent variables to identify patterns in background, personality, or beliefs within each sample that were characteristics of those favoring either approach.[19]

Assistance-based development

The first scale reflects assistance-based approaches. It focuses on traditional development strategies, affirming that "The transfer of technology is the fastest way to accelerate development;" "very poor people need outside help to better their lives;" and that "good community development workers must be good talkers and persuaders." Assistance-based approaches have a more economic and individualistic conception of development as indicated by the first, and most favorable response, "Individual investment incentives encourage economic growth." Also tapped in this scale is a conviction that "development agencies should concentrate greater effort on training community leaders in the agency's administrative techniques. " Table 5 shows the mean responses of EMQ and MCC respondents to the items in the scale of assistance-based community development. Although both groups show varying amounts of support for the different items in the scale, EMQ respondents consistently rated these statements higher than did the MCC respondents.[20]

---

[19] The scales of community development have greater reliability within the Mennonite sample. While each item of the scales had high inter-item correlation in both samples, the patterns of variation in responses to the scaled items were stronger among the Mennonite population than the EMQ sample. This indicates that thinking about development has evolved along more similar lines among MCC volunteers than it has among the readers of *Evangelical Missions Quarterly.*

[20] The differences between the means is statistically significant at the 0.05 level in each case, except for the item concerning training in the agency's administrative techniques.

TABLE 5
Mean Responses to Items in the Scale of Assistance-based Development

Items in the assistance-based development scale	EMQ	MCC
Individual investment incentives encourage economic growth	3.85	3.38
Very poor people need outside help to better their lives	3.55	3.15
Good community development workers must be good talkers and good persuaders	3.10	2.48
Development agencies should concentrate greater effort on training community leaders in the agency's administrative techniques	**3.08**	**3.08**
Development programs often fail because they move too slowly	2.90	2.33
The transfer of technology is the fastest way to accelerate development	2.61	2.26

Values with significant differences are reported in regular type. Values that do not show statistically significant differences at the .05 level according to a two-sample t-test are in bold.

Facilitative development

The second scale (see Table 6) measures a set of beliefs in development processes that are locally generated and facilitated, but not directed or imposed by outsiders.

TABLE 6
Mean Responses to Items in the Scale of Facilitative Development

Items in the Facilitative Development Scale	EMQ	MCC
The ability to build relationships with people is the most important skill for a development worker	4.21	4.36
Christian relief and development agencies should speak out on human rights	3.79	4.38
Local people should be given the opportunity to see a program from beginning to end-even if it fails	3.56	3.86
Poor people usually have answers to the problems that affect them	2.74	3.49

Differences in reported means are statistically significant at .05 according to two-sample t-tests.

This approach affirms that "building relationships is the most important skill of a development worker," that "local people should see a program from beginning to end even if it fails," that "poor people usually have answers to the problems that affect them," and that "Christian relief and development agencies should speak out on human rights." MCC volunteers scored significantly higher than EMQ respondents on this 20-point scale. Fifty-five percent had a total of up to 16 out of 20 and 20% scored 18 or above, indicating they strongly agreed with almost all the items. In the EMQ sample 55% scored 14 or less, and only 5% gave these items a cumulative score of 17 or more.

Background characteristics and development approaches

Regression analysis enabled us to ask whether the differences in backgrounds and perspectives of people in the two sample affected their responses to the two approaches to community development. Table 7 presents the relationships between background characteristics, personality qualities, and motivational influences of EMQ and MCC respondents and these two approaches.

TABLE 7
**Comparison of Background Characteristics of Those Favoring
Assistance-based and Facilitative Development Approaches**

Background Characteristics, Personality, and Motivations	EMQ		MCC	
	Assist	**Facil**	**Assist**	**Facil**
Age	**	--		--
Family income above average at age 16			**	
Prior exposure to poverty as motivating factor		**	--	****
Trust others		**		****
People-oriented (stop & talk even when in hurry)		**		****
Task-oriented (complete project even if late on other things)	****			
Submit to authority (even when wrong)			**	
Perform before an audience	**			

Positive relationships that are statistically significant at .05 or less are indicated with an *; those that are significant at .00 or less are indicated with a double **. Negative relationships are reported as "-" and "- - ", respectively.

        Age is clearly a predictor of community development orientation in the EMQ sample, as older respondents were more likely to agree with assistance-based approaches. Age and facilitative development had a negative relationship, indicating that the younger respondents were more likely to agree with this approach. Among MCC volunteers, age was only an indicator that one is less likely to agree with a facilitative approach. Both samples show that respondents who were "people-oriented," had a high sense of trust in others, and cited prior exposure to poverty as a motivating influence for their current work were more likely to adopt a facilitative perspective. This pattern was stronger for MCC volunteers than for EMQ respondents. Also in the MCC sample, a lack of exposure to poverty, coupled with a higher-than-average family income at age 16 and a predisposition to submit to authority, were all

associated with the assistance-based approach. For the EMQ sample, respondents who agreed with such approaches were more likely to be task-oriented and to feel comfortable performing in front of an audience, perhaps showing an affinity for the perceived role of community development workers as persuaders.

Religious beliefs and development approaches

The EMQ sample had more items testing religious beliefs remaining significant than did the MCC sample (see Table 8). In both samples, respondents who agreed that development work "earns you the right to be heard" were more likely to favor assistance-based approaches. On the other hand, those who saw development work as strengthening the church were more likely to agree with facilitative approaches. EMQ respondents with a facilitative orientation were more likely to agree that relieving suffering is a religious duty and therefore a reason to engage in community development work. Those who favored an assistance-based approach were more likely to agree that churches should benefit their own members first when they do such work.

TABLE 8
Comparison of Religious Beliefs held by People Favoring
Assistance-based and Facilitative Development Approaches

Religious Beliefs	EMQ		MCC	
	Assist	**Facil**	**Assist**	**Facil**
Theological conservatism		--		
Development work earns you the right to be heard	**		****	
Development work strengthens the church		****		****
Relieving suffering is a religious duty		****		
In community development work, churches should benefit own members first	**			

Positive relationships that are statistically significant at .05 or less are indicated with an *; those that are significant at .00 or less are indicated with a double **. Negative relationships are reported as "-" and "- -", respectively.

Secular beliefs and development approaches

The final Table compares the secular beliefs of EMQ and MCC respondents who favored either community development approach. Political liberalism is associated with facilitative development approaches in each sample, while a belief in individual causes of poverty is strongly affirmed by those favoring the assistance-based approach.

TABLE 9
Comparison of Secular Beliefs Held by People Favoring
Assistance-based and Facilitative Development Approaches

Secular Beliefs	EMQ		MCC	
	Assist	**Facil**	**Assist**	**Facil**
Political conservatism		----		----
Individual causes of poverty	****	--	****	
Structural causes of poverty	**	****	**	
Economic growth involves collective sacrifice	****	**		
Growth is not good if it increases income differences	****			
Nature is to be used for our pleasure	**			
Would benefit from training in development		****		
Assistance-based development scale	■	****	■	----
Facilitative development scale	****	■	----	■

Positive relationships that are statistically significant at .05 or less are indicated with an *; those that are significant at .00 or less are indicated with a double **. Negative relationships are reported as "-" and "- -", respectively.

     In the EMQ sample, respondents of both orientations affirmed structural causes of poverty, but those who favored facilitative community development did so more strongly. This group also negated individual causes of poverty. The EMQ sample also affirmed certain beliefs about economic growth. According to those who favored assistance-based development, economic growth involves collective sacrifice and is not good if it increases income differences. This group also agreed that nature is to be used for our pleasure.

     Only the EMQ readers who supported facilitative approaches strongly agreed that they would benefit from training in development. For the EMQ sample, the different approaches to development are not mutually exclusive. Those who agreed strongly with one were also likely to agree with the other. The reverse is true for the MCC volunteers who, if they were likely to agree with one approach, were also likely to disagree with the other.

Discussion

MCC volunteers and EMQ readers differ significantly in their backgrounds, motivations, views of poverty, and attitudes regarding appropriate community development theories and strategies. MCC volunteers are younger, more likely to be involved in development work, and have shorter assignments than their EMQ counterparts. They express stronger agreement with religiously based motivations for Christians to be involved in community development work, while EMQ respondents are more likely to support such work if it expands opportunities for evangelism. MCC volunteers are less likely to believe that poverty is caused by individual failure and are more likely to identify structural causes. Both groups strongly support the idea that communities are strengthened when they adopt organized responses to common problems, but they emphasize different ways of stimulating this process. MCC volunteers are more likely to favor structural change and the promotion of critical reflection, while EMQ respondents are more likely to support training and investment in infrastructure.

MCC volunteers are more likely to hold a facilitative conception of development practice. Unlike EMQ readers, who if they were likely to agree with assistance-based development were also likely to agree with facilitative approaches, MCC respondents found the two approaches to be in opposition. The characteristics of those who favor one approach over the other differ significantly. There are more similarities between the respondents in each sample who hold facilitative approaches. In both groups, respondents who favored this orientation tended to be younger, less conservative politically, and maintain that prior exposure to poverty motivates their current work. They also tended to be people- oriented, to trust others, and to see development as strengthening the church.

The profile of those who favor assistance-based development is less clear. Both MCC respondents and EMQ readers with this orientation strongly affirmed individual over structural causes of poverty. They also supported the statement that Christians should be involved in community development in order to earn the right to be heard. Apart from these key characteristics, those who endorsed this approach in each sample had slightly different background, personality, and belief characteristics. Overall, if salient characteristics are combined from both groups, the average respondent who supports an assistance-based approach would tend to be older, to be task-oriented, to submit to authority, but to take individual risks (performing before an audience), to have less exposure to or experience with poverty, and to believe that church-based development work should benefit members first.

These findings suggest that the differences in community development orientation between the two groups may be related to their different theological traditions as outlined by Kraus. The precise nature of the relationship between theological tradition and development practice lies beyond the scope of this paper. However, the empirical verification of divergent motivations for development work, views of poverty, and approaches to development practice can help explain how theology might shape development practice. The following dichotomies could steer initial avenues of inquiry.

Intrinsic versus instrumental motivation

Mennonite theology is more predisposed to consider social action as intrinsically worthwhile evangelism; evangelical theology tends to make a distinction between social action and

evangelism. Both Mennonite volunteers and EMQ readers agree most strongly that Christians should be involved in community development because in doing so they are following Christ's example. But when responses to other Christian motivations are considered, it appears that what it means to follow Christ's example may differ for each group. EMQ respondents see development as a means to "earn the right to be heard" and to relieve suffering. Development, therefore, serves a very instrumental purpose. MCC volunteers appear to see development activities as an expression of their own faith, with the more abstract or ideal motivations of "building the Kingdom of God on earth" and "finding Christ in an act of compassion."

Orthopraxy versus orthodoxy

Kraus suggests that a possible distinction between the Anabaptist versus the evangelical traditions is a focus on orthopraxy (right action) over orthodoxy (right thinking). Evangelicals have a greater concern for verbal proclamation of the Gospel and sharing the faith, while Mennonites, he argues, focus on living a life of obedience in accordance with the teachings of Jesus. Development efforts themselves, even sharing a cup of cold water, can thus be a proclamation of the Good News. If this is so, development must be done well to reflect its underlying Christian motivation. An emphasis on action leads to concerns about sustainability and empowerment that do not necessarily follow from a concern with verbal proclamation.

Communal versus individual emphasis

Mennonite theology emphasizes a life of Christian obedience in a community of the faithful. MCC volunteers demonstrated this focus by affirming a more facilitative approach to development, one which focuses on building community and challenging social structures. The facilitative approach is based on egalitarian notions of working together to solve common problems. An egalitarian approach is consistent with the communalism in the Anabaptist tradition.
        Evangelical theology, by contrast, tends to emphasize individual salvation and spiritual growth. This theological tradition may therefore have greater affinity with an assistance-based approach that emphasizes individual improvement through skills-oriented training. Such an approach has a more hierarchical premise; that is, those who have more resources deliver a portion of these resources to those in need. Unfortunately, this approach can create dependency and sharpen differences within target populations, making it even more difficult to promote sustainable community development.

Conclusion

Both Anabaptists and evangelicals could benefit from a careful consideration of how the emphases of their respective theological traditions promote or constrain community development. Unexamined assumptions about Christian witness can lead to bad development practice. This suggests that individuals engaged in religious intercultural ministry, and the organizations they work for, should be concerned with developing a clear theology that guides why and how they do development so that both word and deed promote a consistent witness.[21]

Responses

Response by Karen Klassen Harder, Chair of the Global Studies Department and Assistant Professor of Economics, Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas.

In a research methods class, students explore the benefits and challenges associated with applying various types of research methodologies. The papers presented today have offered an excellent demonstration of such variation of
research method. Each research approach has its place and each can help organizations evaluate what they do and how they do it.

      At one end of the methodological continuum are the fascinating vignettes described by Frances O'Gorman and Paul Hiebert in their papers. That kind of storytelling is, as we experienced, compelling. The teller paints a picture that contains a bright collage of ideas and facts. We are drawn to the account because we learn of real people in real situations. But the downside methodologically is that it is not systematic. The event in the story can never be exactly repeated, and few of the requirements of the "scientific" approach to information collection are realized.

      In the middle of the continuum stands the study presented by Thomas Jeavons. He gathered his information using a case study methodology, which benefits from a more systematic way of collecting information. The analysis becomes somewhat more focused, without losing all of the richness of the stories themselves.

      Finally, on the opposite end of the continuum, is the methodology used in Merrill Ewert's research. Here we see an example of a purer form of quantitative research. Certainly, Ewert's data do not embody any story qualities and can, at best, reflect only a narrow slice of reality. Yet the advantage of this approach is that substantially the same type of analysis could be performed again and again, in different circumstances, allowing for excellent comparative insights on isolated points of study.

Common themes

The first theme common to both Jeavons and Ewert is effectiveness-the degree to which a program actually carries out its mission. An organization's stated purpose for existence lacks real meaning unless its mission can be effectively carried out. Organizations functioning in the private sector have always had the benefits of immediate feedback on their products' effectiveness (at least as indicated by their success in the competitive market). When market sales figures reflect customer displeasure with product quality and desirability, the organization responds by making the necessary changes to improve its bottom line, or by closing its doors to business. Apart from such market-determined feedback, how can voluntary organizations ensure their relevance and effectiveness?

      A second theme is efficiency .In the marketplace, efficiency is a requirement forced on all participants who want to stay in business. By contrast, organizations outside of the market system (many voluntary agencies operating with donated funds fall into this category) are not

necessarily forced to be resource efficient. They can, if they choose, sidestep efficient solutions by simply directing more and more resources towards the problem until it is solved. With that approach they do get the job done, but at an unnecessarily high resource cost-a cost which is "hidden," unless one considers the alternative uses for which those resources are no longer available.

Without the test of the marketplace, external evaluation can playa valuable role in monitoring both the effectiveness and efficiency of religious service organizations. Historically, within the nonprofit sector, church and secular organizations have not been forced to-and typically have not chosen to-subject themselves to the test of external evaluation. But times have changed, and it is now recognized to be in the best interest of both the nonprofit organization and its constituencies to be more systematically self-reflective, to participate in peer agency evaluations, and in some cases to be evaluated by an external accrediting organization. (Or maybe once every seventy-five years it can hold a conference!)

The frustration which develops for organizations which do systematically study their own performance is that the process consumes scarce organizational resources which are badly needed elsewhere. Potential long-run benefits of evaluation must be weighed against actual immediate needs in the short run. Still, I am a strong supporter of assessment and believe that it is good stewardship for religious service organizations to examine their performance regularly. When appropriately motivated people use empirical analysis to answer good questions, research is worth doing.

Presented in these papers are two different starting points for this sort of research. Jeavons has organizations as his focus, while Ewert's study is based on individuals working within organizations. In spite of this difference, both researchers come face to face with the same methodological problem: how to measure the degree of effectiveness/efficiency.

Both researchers utilize "experts" from within the community of service organizations to identify and define effective practice. Recall that Jeavons asked peer organizations to judge each other in terms of "the quantity, quality, and significance" of services they provide and the integrity, power, and clarity of
witness. By contrast, Ewert asked "expert-practitioners" with significant field experience to identify and rank the principles of good development practice.

In each approach, insiders determined what was good and who was doing it. I like such a community-oriented model of mutual accountability in which peer organizations and individuals help evaluate each other's operations. Yet a note of caution is warranted. Organizations and individuals anticipating an extended period of cooperation may find it difficult-and perhaps not in their best short- term interests-to be brutally frank to the extent necessary for true accountability. If so, the status quo might never be sufficiently challenged for the necessary radical changes to be flagged.

Ewert's study

I commend MCC for supporting part of Ewert's study. Much useful information was generated that I hope can be fed back into the organization. Some of the information is surprising. Other findings reinforce what we already know-for example, that MCCers are highly motivated individuals, as reflected in their nearly unheard-of sixty-seven percent survey return rate!

One technical concern arises regarding the analysis section. For methodological reasons, I question the validity of comparative differences between the Evangelical sample and the MCC population. Still, standing alone, Ewert's descriptive information about the MCC group can be extremely useful as the organization goes about its important task of self -assessment. For example, is MCC comfortable with its workers' responses to questions about development approaches and about the role of technology, or about their opinions of structural injustice where they work? What if worker responses to those questions contradict what MCC assumes to be its mission? This sort of study helps identify-and, indeed, helps force an organization to face up to-dissonances between its ideals and practices.

Research findings can be very useful in modifying an agency's program direction or in restructuring its use of its human resources (worker recruitment, training, and orientation). Additionally, one might decide to use such findings to review the functional relationships of those within the agency. For example, does the field worker inform the organization, or does s/he reflect the desires of the organization? These are challenging issues to ponder, and at stake is the very effectiveness of the organization itself.

Finally, to the extent that such research findings demonstrate substantial harmony between an organization's stated mission statement and its practices, programs, and worker attitudes, one can begin to see the "incarnation" (to use Jeavons's terminology) of the organization's values. That is, the organization can rest assured that "it is where it wants to be."

Response by Robert Fugere, Executive Director, International Development (ICFID), Toronto, Ontario.

In responding to Thomas Jeavons's paper I wish first to agree that it is indeed very useful to look at the behavior *inside* organizations to see how their "operative values" match up with their stated "espoused" values. This is of course particularly true for Christian organizations. One area where Mennonite Central Committee policy is leading is in acknowledging the impact of staff travelling on family life. MCC has a policy that after three years, frequently travelling staff may have a family member accompany them on one trip. We at ICFID have tried to adopt a similar policy.

Two aspects, however, I find missing in Jeavons's presentation. The first is the lack of any serious analysis of the relative power relationships that influence different staff members. While each employee's contribution might well be valued within an organization, there are often built-in differences between managers and employees that constrain the free flow of feedback within it. Any hierarchical organization will necessarily have these power differences, but some agencies have found creative ways of minimizing role definitions.

Second, in the case of development agencies like MCC and ICFID, it is not enough to look only at the organization's inner behavior. The specific ingredients of its development mission also need to be incarnated. To some extent Jeavons deals with this in his comments on fundraising and organization structure, but I would like to suggest two elements from our experience at ICFID that may also be relevant to MCC. Both are issues of social justice but go beyond simple equity concerns to impact the organization's very effectiveness.

The first element is the direct involvement of Southern partners in organization decision-making. One of the main things we have learned from many years of development is that active and direct participation of beneficiaries in decisions affecting them is a key to sustainable development. Since 1980 ICFID's Board has enjoyed the presence of three Southern members serving together with twelve representatives from the Canadian churches. Originally this was an experiment in equity and power-sharing, and it has certainly been valued by both our Southern partners and the Canadian churches on that basis. But beyond equity, this one structural change has made ICFID a much more effective, cutting-edge development agency.

Southern members are able to interpret what is going on in their own countries and regions directly to our Board and to offer well-informed leadership and policy direction. They have represented ICFID in policy-making forums, such as the recent Canadian Foreign Policy Review, where our Latin American partners presented ICFID's brief. Drawing on ICFID's experience, other bodies have adopted this practice of sharing their decision-making power about both projects and policies with Southern representatives.

Of course, this presence is not without its problems, particularly when hard questions are raised about a partner's program or, for that matter, about our churches' engagement with their own constituency. Nevertheless, in the two evaluations our Board has made of this power-sharing, members have reaffirmed its importance for both equity and effectiveness.

The second element, that of modeling what we preach, concerns the role of women in key offices of our organizations. When I began working with ICFID in 1980, there was only one woman among the fifteen Board members. For the next six years, it never occurred to me that this gender imbalance had anything to do with a recurring deadlock on the Board about many

major issues. It was only when circumstances led to the resignation or absence of three key men in 1987 and 1988, and their replacement by women, that our Board discussion took on a whole new openness and creativity. Since its inception in 1974, ICFID had acknowledged the key contribution that women make to development in the Third World, but it was only with this experience at our Board level that I came to see how much more effective a gender-balanced Board could be in sorting out tricky policy issues.

Neither of these changes in ICFID 's own structure - the presence of Southern Board members and stronger presence of women - by itself became a panacea. However, our experience suggests these two structural changes have enhanced our effectiveness as a Christian development organization.