

FAITH-BASED ORGANISATIONS IN
NEW ZEALAND:
AN EXPLORATION OF HOW FAITH AFFECTS FAITH-BASED
ORGANISATIONS' RELATIONSHIPS WITH DONORS

BY

JANE MCLOUGHLIN

A thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Development
Studies

Victoria University of Wellington

2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to acknowledge the faith-based organisations for participating in my research. I thank you for your openness and frankness when talking with me on the topic of faith. I have learnt a great deal and enjoyed listening about your development work. Without you this research would not be possible.

To my supervisor Dr Andrew McGregor, I thank you for your direction and advice throughout the writing of my thesis. Your comments have been instrumental in shaping the way I think about faith-based organisations and have contributed invaluable to the academic rigour of my research.

To my dear friend Alastair Pharo, thank you for your role as chief polemicist. As usual you have challenged my thoughts to an exacting level forcing me to articulate them clearly at every step.

To Hamish Clayton from Victoria University's Student Learning Support Service, I thank you for your assistance throughout my research with your patient proof-reading of my work.

To my friends and family, I thank you all for standing by me and listening to how my thesis was progressing. In particular, to Heather, Susann, Rebecca, Katie, Poly, Emma, Akuila, Eva, Eleanor, Emma-Jane, Donna, Alexa, Hannah, Shamus, Katie, Glenda, and Sheryl for your unrelenting optimism from day one that I would finish! Special thanks to Henry for giving me the space and support I needed to complete my thesis.

This research has been a huge learning experience for me. Thank you once again to everyone who has directly or indirectly contributed to my research. Any omissions or shortcomings are my responsibility alone.

ABSTRACT

Faith-based organisations (FBOs) constitute a significant part of the development industry, yet our knowledge of FBOs and the ways in which they operate, often within secular societies, is limited. This research focuses on one particular aspect of FBOs in New Zealand: that is how FBOs perceive their faith impacts on their donor relationships. The research is undertaken within the context of the call for more empirical studies on FBOs in order to understand what types of FBOs exist, what contexts they appear in, and how they approach development. To this end, I conducted 17 semi-structured interviews with FBOs based in New Zealand over September-October 2010 and critically analysed these interviews for what they revealed about FBOs-donor relationships. The findings of this research are that FBOs are compelled to undertake development work as a religious and moral duty, and that their faith identity sometimes translates into a unique form of development assistance. FBOs have advantages over secular organisations in their ability to mobilise resources from within their faith networks, particularly the ability to secure low cost labour. These networks can be viewed as part of a spiritual economy for FBOs. Some FBOs position their organisations to receive funding from both their spiritual economies and mainstream secular sources. These organisations have established separate development arms within their organisation devoid of any religious reference or content, yet retain a religious arm to promote their faith. Other organisations successfully secure secular donor funding by clearly demonstrating how their faith is incorporated within their development work. The majority of FBOs operate outside the mainstream development industry in New Zealand and are either self-funding or funded through their spiritual economies. My major finding is that FBOs' donors are not homogeneous groups; they hold a divergence of expectations which change the way FBOs position their development work in relation to their faith.

Keywords: faith-based organisations (FBOs); religion and development; donor relationships; spiritual economies.

CONTENTS PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
ABSTRACT	III
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	VI
LIST OF TABLES	VI
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH	1
RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES	3
CHAPTER OUTLINE	4
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
INTRODUCTION	6
HOW THE DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY VIEWS RELIGION	7
<i>How has Development Treated Religion?</i>	7
<i>Development: A Culture of Disbelief?</i>	10
EXPLORING A PLACE FOR RELIGION IN DEVELOPMENT	15
<i>A New Research Agenda</i>	16
<i>The 'Discovery' of Religion and Development – A Critical View</i>	18
FAITH-BASED ORGANISATIONS' DEVELOPMENT WORK	22
<i>The Salience of Faith-Based Organisations in Development</i>	23
<i>How Faith-Based Organisations are Studied</i>	24
CONCLUSION	29
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN	30
INTRODUCTION	30
METHODOLOGY	30
FAITH-BASED ORGANISATIONS IN NEW ZEALAND	33
<i>A Brief History of the Non-Profit Sector in New Zealand – International Development</i>	33
<i>Composition of the Non-Profit Sector in New Zealand – International Development</i>	34
METHODS	35
<i>The Sample</i>	35
<i>Institutional Types of Faith-Based Organisations</i>	38
<i>Semi-Structured Interviews</i>	42
<i>Interpreting the Research Information</i>	44
<i>Ethical Considerations</i>	46
<i>Limitations</i>	48

CHAPTER 4	HOW FAITH INFLUENCES DEVELOPMENT WORK	50
INTRODUCTION		50
RELIGIOUS MOTIVATIONS FOR UNDERTAKING DEVELOPMENT WORK		51
<i>Non-Intentional Development</i>		51
<i>Intentional Development</i>		53
<i>Development Work – A Religious Duty</i>		54
ORGANISATIONAL PRACTICE AND TENSIONS		59
<i>Religious Identity and Propagation of Faith</i>		59
<i>Development with a Religious Flavour</i>		64
CONCLUSION		68
CHAPTER 5	HOW FAITH AFFECTS DONOR RELATIONSHIPS	70
INTRODUCTION		70
<i>A Brief Overview of Major Funding Sources</i>		71
SPIRITUAL ECONOMIES		74
<i>Religious Networks as Donors</i>		74
<i>Religious Workers and Wages</i>		78
SPIRITUAL BARRIERS		82
<i>Secular Culture in New Zealand</i>		82
<i>Negotiating Religiosity within a Secular Development Framework</i>		87
CONCLUSION		92
CHAPTER 6	CONCLUSION	94
RESPONDING TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS		94
<i>FBOs’ Treatment of Religion in their Development Work</i>		94
<i>Spiritual Economies</i>		95
<i>Secular Tensions</i>		96
<i>Spiritual Economies versus Secular Tensions</i>		97
FUTURE DIRECTIONS		98
REFERENCES		100
APPENDICES.....		111
APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW GUIDE.....		111
APPENDIX II: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET		112
APPENDIX II: CONSENT FORM		113

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CID	Council for International Development
CORSO	Council of Organisations for Relief and Service Overseas
DFID	Department for International Development
FBO	Faith-based organisations
KI	Key informant
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development
RaD	Religion and development programme
UN	United Nations
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Example of types of organisations from the Charities Commission database, p.39

Table 2: Institutional types of FBOs in New Zealand, p.40

Table 3: FBOs' funding sources, p.72

Introduction to the Research

The development industry has sidelined issues of religion and faith since its inception after World War II (Goulet 1980, Wilber & Jameson 1980, Ver Beek 2000). Several academics have argued that by ignoring religion, development experts are missing an integral part of how development recipients “understand the world, make decisions, and take action” (Ver Beek, 2000, p.31). To address this, development should draw its goals “from within the value system to which living communities still adhere” (Goulet, 1980, p.485). The failure to take religion seriously may result in a rejection by development recipients of development itself. As Thomas (2004) asserts, there appears to be a search in recipient countries for an authentic development paradigm based on their values rather than those imposed by development experts. Academics have criticised development experts for acting as “one eyed giants” that lack wisdom and “act as if man could live by bread alone, as if human destiny could be stripped to its material dimensions alone” (Goulet, 1980, p.4).

In the last decade, a research agenda within development studies has emerged on religion and development, responding to the call to consider spiritual elements in development work. This research agenda is not limited to academia, but is actively promoted by government development donors in countries such as Sweden, and multilateral institutions such as the World Bank. This research spans a wide variety of related issues including: why the development industry has ignored religion; how religion could be incorporated into development work; and the advantages and disadvantages pertaining to the development work of faith-based organisations. I give an account of each of these topics in what follows.

Firstly, the development industry is reflecting on why it has ignored religion until recently. These reflections are centered on deconstructing the secular nature of the

development industry and exploring how secularism has influenced how the development industry views the relationship between religion and development. A ‘culture of disbelief’ is said to have been maintained by the development industry, rendering development as a secular and supposedly neutral process (Giri, Harskamp, & Salemink, 2005).

Next, various donors and academics have begun to explore ways in which there is congruence between the objectives of religion and development. There have been a number of criticisms made by academics regarding this new research. Giri et al. (2005) and Tyndale (2006) remind researchers that there is a fine line between using religion instrumentally for the development industry’s predetermined outcomes and harnessing the value of religion in its own right. Some academics have called for more ethnographical studies of religion to use recipients’ understanding of the world as a point of departure for development (ter Haar 2009, Bradley 2009b).

Lastly, despite the silence from the development industry on religion, FBOs are undertaking a significant amount of development work, and are prominent development organisations. Due to a knowledge gap on FBOs, researchers are mapping what these organisations are doing and how they operate, and exploring how faith manifests within FBOs and their work (Berger 2003, Clarke 2006, Ebaugh, Chafetz & Pipes 2006, Hefferan & Fogarty 2010). Researchers are developing typologies of FBOs to show their differences and to explore whether their faith provides them with an advantage for development activities that require sensitivity to religion (Bradley 2009b, Thaut, 2009). Some critics have asserted that FBOs are being co-opted into the secular development framework, rendering them “Oxfam with hymns” (Thomas, 2004), suggesting that an expression of their faith is being excluded from their development work.

My research responds to the knowledge gap within development studies on FBOs, particularly FBOs based in New Zealand. My research allows FBOs to describe how their faith manifests in their development work and how they negotiate their faith with their donors. I also analyse and interpret these descriptions. By focussing on FBOs’

donor relationships, this research will contribute to an understanding of where New Zealand FBOs receive donor support from and whether faith impacts on their ability to source donor support. As such my research topic looks at how the faith of an FBO enables or constrains donor relationships.

This research will provide both faith-based and secular donors with an increased understanding of what kinds of FBOs exist in New Zealand, how their faith manifests in their work, and what kind of issues they perceive exist concerning their current donor funding. This will aid donors in their decisions on how to engage with FBOs and will help FBOs on the issues to consider when engaging with donors.

Research Aim and Objectives

The aim of the research is:

To analyse how the faith of faith-based organisations (FBOs) enables or constrains donor relationships.

Objectives of the research are:

- to identify funding arrangements of FBOs
- to identify how important FBOs' faith is to their organisational identities;
- to investigate how faith manifests in FBOs' development work; and
- to explore how FBOs negotiate their faith in their work and with donors.

The central research question is:

Do FBOs believe that their faith enables or constrains donor relationships?

The subsequent research questions are:

1. What FBO-donor relationships exist in New Zealand?
2. How do FBOs perceive that faith influences their development work?
3. How do FBOs perceive that faith affects their relationships with development donors?

Chapter Outline

This thesis contains seven chapters including this introduction.

Chapter Two, the literature review, outlines major themes in the literature concerning religion and development. Key themes include:

How religion has been treated within the development industry – I discuss how religion has largely been sidelined by the development industry.

An emerging research agenda exploring a place for religion in development – I outline the key research themes being undertaken and highlight the key critiques of this research.

Defining FBOs and their development work – I outline the growing salience of FBOs in development work. I then present an overview of different typologies of FBOs in order to demonstrate the variety of ways faith manifests within them.

Chapter Three outlines the research design adopted for this thesis. I describe how I chose a methodology based on a phenomenological approach. I provide a brief overview of the New Zealand context for development organisations in which the FBOs are placed. I then identify the various institutional types of FBOs. This in part provides results for research question one. I then describe the research methods adopted for operationalising the methodology, including selecting a sample set; semi-structured interviews; ethical considerations; and limitations arising from the research.

Chapter Four focuses on research question two. In this chapter I explore the FBOs' faith motivations for undertaking development work. I also explore how they treat faith in their work. This chapter enables a better understanding of whether faith creates a 'niche' for the FBOs' development work.

Chapter Five focuses on research question one and three. In this chapter I explore the FBOs' major funding sources and the FBOs' perceptions that their faith affects their donor relationships. In regards to faith as enabling donor relationships, I explore the religious expectations of donors on FBOs. I investigate the perception of the FBOs that secularism results in funding constraints for them.

Chapter Six concludes the thesis by presenting a summary of the main research findings, recaps the main points from the critical discussion, and addresses the aims of the research. It also provides suggestions for future research into religion and development.

Introduction

A number of key themes appear in the literature. The first is that there has been limited research in development studies on the relationship between religion and development. The perception held by many development theorists that religion and development are separate concerns convinced many that it was safe or even necessary to sideline religion for effective development work to occur. I will outline the key criticisms made against the development industry for sidelining religion. Next, I will outline the key reflections within the development industry on why it has ignored religion, centering around the influence of secularism on development theory.

One of the key lessons of this theme is that issues of spirituality are important to development recipients and that development theorists should take this seriously in their development work. Exploring this theme provided a starting point for my research as it enabled me to consider whether FBOs offer a valid alternative to the mainly secular development industry. Furthermore, I considered whether the secular development industry affects the way the FBOs treat religion in their work and whether FBOs face any funding constraints from secular donors due to their religious affiliation.

The next key theme is the emerging research agenda on how religion can be incorporated into development work. There is an interest within the research on identifying links between religion and development in order to see how they may fit together. I identify the donors and academics that are part of this new research agenda. I end this section with an overview of the key criticisms of this new research agenda in order to provide an understanding of the difficulties involved in incorporating religion into development work. One of the key lessons from this theme is the distinction between using religion instrumentally for development's predetermined outcomes and harnessing the value of

religion in its own right. The literature provided a background to my research comparing how FBOs attempt to incorporate religion into their development work and the advantages and disadvantages of doing so, and secondly for understanding whether FBOs are working towards their own predetermined religious outcomes.

For the last key theme of my literature review, I consider the literature specifically about FBOs in development. The concept of FBOs is employed often in the literature; and various academics have attempted to pinpoint what this term actually refers to. FBOs have been classified in order to understand how their faith manifests itself within their organisations, rendering them distinct to various levels from secular organisations. However, little empirical research on FBOs has been undertaken to confirm what types of FBOs may exist in different contexts. Key lessons from this theme are that FBOs may have advantages and disadvantages in comparison to secular organisations when accessing donor funding. FBOs are able to mobilise their extensive faith networks as a source of support for their development work, but if operating in a secular development framework, some academics argue FBOs are compromised if they seek secular donor funding. This theme has led me to consider the landscape of FBOs in New Zealand and how the religious make-up of their donors impacts on their development work.

How the Development Industry Views Religion

How has Development Treated Religion?

Since its inception, the development industry has sidelined religion as irrelevant and even inhibiting development. There was sparse discussion of religion within development discourse from the 1950s onwards. I will provide a survey of this discussion in the literature below.

Religion first appeared in development discourse in the 1950s when modernisation theory, with its focus on economic growth, was at its height. In the 1950s and 1960s, religion was looked to for how it might contribute or not to economic growth and

material prosperity. Within modernisation theory, religion in developing countries was conceived as antithetical or unnecessary to development, as it was part of ‘traditional’ society that the eventual modernisation of society would usurp. Only a very small part of the literature focussed on how certain religious values and organisations, particularly those exhibited by developed countries, might contribute to economic growth, for example (Lewis 1955, Berger 1984). Thus, when the literature did discuss religion, it did so by positing an instrumental use of religion for economic growth.

It was not until the early 1980s that the development industry was criticised by a small number of academics for sidelining religion. The prominent development journal *World Development* published an entire issue on religion and development. In this issue, Denis Goulet likens development experts who consider “non-scientific modes of rationality retrograde” to “one eyed giants” that lack wisdom and “act as if man could live by bread alone, as if human destiny could be stripped to its material dimensions alone” (1980, p. 481). Wilber and Jameson (1980) posit that this sidelining of religion was unwise, arguing that religion is integral in underpinning the way society functions. Both Goulet and Wilber and Jameson argue that religious values should be considered the starting point of what constitutes development for a society. For Goulet and Wilber and Jameson, development should not use religion in an instrumental way to further development’s goals. Doing so, they argue, runs the risk of undermining religion, which could result in a backlash against development. Goulet argues that,

traditional values (including religious beliefs and practices) harbour within them a latent dynamism which, when properly respected can serve as the springboard for modes of development which are more human than those drawn from outside paradigms. When development builds from indigenous values it exacts lower social costs and imposes less human suffering and cultural destruction than when it copies outside models. This is so because indigenously-rooted values are the matrix whence people derive meaning in their lives, a sense of identity and cultural integrity, and the experience of continuity with their environment and their past even in the midst of change. A non-instrumental treatment of values draws its development goals from within the value system to which living communities still adhere. (p. 485).

This call to take religion seriously can be understood in the context of emerging development theories of the time, including participatory development and alternative development (Chambers, 1983). Other academics such as Crocker (1991) explored whether a development ethic to guide development should be based on the values of donors or recipients. These theories sought to refocus the imbalance of power relations in development from donors to recipients, so that recipients could be involved in the construction and critique of development discourse.

Goulet (1980) and Wilber and Jameson's (1980) call to take religion seriously as a starting point for development was ignored by most academics and donors in the development industry. In 2000, 20 years after *World Development's* issue on religion, Ver Beek (2000) undertook a review of major development journals from 1982 to 1998 and found that these journals contained little to no reference to religion. Others too have reviewed development literature and found that there was little reference to religion in United Nations (UN) documents and development studies guidebooks (Selinger 2004, Tomalin 2006). Given this gap in development, Ver Beek challenges the development industry to explain why religion was considered 'taboo'. Like Goulet and Wilber and Jameson, Ver Beek argues that the neglect of religion is unacceptable:

the result of this silence is a failure to explore and understand an integral aspect of how Southern people [development recipients] understand the world, make decisions, and take action. This failure reduces the effectiveness of development research and interventions. The failure to recognise the centrality of their spirituality ultimately robs the poor of opportunities to tap into whatever strength, power, and hope that this dimension gives them and deprives them of opportunities to reflect on and control how their development and spirituality shape each other (pp. 31-32).

Ver Beek offers four reasons to account for the neglect of religion in development studies: a fear of the perceived or actual imposition of an outsider's perspective; a bias towards a materialistic/scientific perspective due to the dichotomising of the spiritual/religious from the materialistic/scientific; a fear of conflict; and a lack of precedent or models. Religion has slowly been taken on board in development discourse. Since the 2000s and the literature has grown slowly. Some academics have responded to

Ver Beek's challenge and have begun to take a self-reflective look at development studies to explore further why the development industry has ignored religion.

Development: A Culture of Disbelief?

Modernisation theory is predicated on the assumption of secularisation: the belief that religion will become less prevalent in society as it modernises (Selinger 2004, Haynes 2007). Berger defined secularisation as "a process in which religion diminishes in importance both in society and in the consciousness of individuals" (as cited in Deneulin & Rakodi, 2010, p.11). The idea that secularisation would be inevitable due to the modernisation of society was taken on board by social scientists, resulting in the sidelining of religion in sociology during most of the twentieth century. As Hadden argues, "the idea of secularization became sacralised" (as cited in Ebaugh, 2002, p.387). Thus, development was shaped, Deneulin and Rakodi (2010) argue, by "a perception of religion as irrelevant to modern societies and a constraint on progress" (p.3).

Western society's particular experience of secularisation has coloured understanding of what secularism is. This experience where the "social and scientific spheres progressively emancipating themselves from the prism of religious institutions and norms" (Casanova 2004 as cited in Deneulin & Rakodi, 2010, p.16), has been termed a type of secularisation called "differentiation" by Casanova (1994). This differentiation led to the privatisation of religion in the West epitomised in the church-state dichotomy (Deneulin & Rakodi, 2010). Religion in this sense is understood as being privatised, thus pertaining to the private concerns of individuals, as opposed to the public. The separation of church and state in the West can be considered crucial in shaping the development industry's treatment of religion (Selinger 2004, Marshall & Van Saanen 2007). Development studies has used this Western model of secularisation, that is, ascribing a place for religious institutions in terms of state-religion relationships, as a normative model for its development work.

The literature suggests however, that the secularisation thesis has now become discredited due to the evidence to the contrary in most countries of the world – religion is not in fact fading out as predicted (Holloway & Valins, 2002). Adherence to various religions has increased across the world (Alkire, 2006). Organised religion is taking more of a role in commenting on the public sphere, and is becoming more involved in politics, particularly in developing countries (Habermas 2005, Haynes 2007). Identity politics and religious nationalism has been seen in various parts of the developing world such as South Asia, Indonesia and the Middle East. For Casanova (1994),

Religious institutions and organisations refuse to restrict themselves to the pastoral care of individual souls and continue to raise questions about the interconnection of private and public morality and to challenge the claims of the subsystems, particularly states and markets, to be exempt from extraneous normative considerations. (as cited in Deneulin & Rakodi, 2010, p.12).

This brings into question whether the church/state dichotomy is relevant for developing countries, and highlights a gap in development literature regarding religion in the public sphere (Selinger, 2004).

The ‘culture of disbelief’ exhibited in the development industry is said to manifest by the positioning of development as a secular and neutral process (Giri et al., 2005). This idea of neutrality, or objectivity, has its basis in logical-positivism – the view that social science could be objective and value-free (Lunn, 2009). This supposed objectivity of development underscores an in-built bias which views development as something science-based and therefore superior to a religious worldview (Ufford & Schoffeleers 1988, Ver Beek 2000). Like Goulet (1980), Giri et al., (2005) argue that this rationalist approach, denying the spiritual side to reality, is counterproductive. Such an approach will be experienced by intended recipients of development not as a neutral, non-religious point of view, but as a rival religious claim. This could serve to undermine the development project as argued by Williams and Demerath (1998) and Thomas (2004).

As outlined earlier, Wilber and Jameson (1980) argue that religion is the moral base of society, and therefore will shape and limit a society’s conception of development. Importantly, Wilber and Jameson note that the moral base of society,

...has been undermined during the process of capitalist development since 1945...unless this tension between moral base and development is resolved, the process of development will be self-limiting, and is likely in many cases to engender major instability which can radically transform the entire experience (p.475).

Commentators have made a link between this warning and the Iranian revolution that occurred around the time Wilber and Jameson were writing (Deneulin & Rakodi, 2010). Ter Haar and Ellis (2006) outlines how newly independent governments in developing countries sometimes “assimilated and adapted notions of development which were conceived in Europe and exported through colonial rule” (p. 355). Whether or not the secular development paradigm of modernity was imposed by donors or taken on by the governments of developing countries, some academics have argued that people in developing countries are disillusioned with it (Thomas, 2004). Ver Beek (2000) highlights that the pervasive silence on religion in the development industry means that development sometimes attempted to impose change on ways of life without any religious dialogue occurring. This disillusionment can be understood as a reaction to the failure of modernisation to bring ‘development’ to these countries, but also as a reaction to the secularisation of their countries as a rival to their own values, in particular, their religious values (Casanova 1994, Williams & Demerath 1998, Juergensmeyer 2003). Thus, a struggle for an authentic development paradigm is said to be occurring within developing countries – a development paradigm which is considered legitimate for each country, based on that country’s values (Thomas, 2004).

In *Gender and Development*’s 1999 issue on religion and development, Sweetman (1999) argues that by ignoring the spiritual side, the development industry could be considered imperialistic as they are promoting only secularism at the expense of other approaches. Ver Beek (2000) argues that this material/scientific bias of development has shaped a dichotomy in development studies between the sacred and the secular. Other academics too note how development studies appears to be based on Cartesian dichotomies between the sacred and the secular, and material and spiritual (Sanderson, 2007). These dichotomies have a profound effect on development interventions, for example on “decisions about who should treat a sick child, when and how to plant fields” (Ver Beek,

2000, p.40). This raises questions on the positioning of religion in ways which are acceptable to the development industry.

The secular environment that many Western academics and donors work in also affects how they treat religion. Some academics note that Western academics and donors feel uncomfortable talking about religion in the public sphere (Alkire, 2006). They see religion as a private matter, whereas many academics from developing countries seem able to write from a cross-disciplinary perspective incorporating religious perspectives into their work (Alkire, 2006). Some academics have noted that development experts may consider themselves secular and therefore lack an awareness of how religion manifests in other people's lives. They may also have a disdain for religions, seeing them as unnecessary. In addition, these experts may also see religion as something sacred and untouchable. Development experts are also careful not to favour one religion over another. Ter Haar and Ellis (2006) highlighted that in this 'culture of disbelief' in which development experts work, taking religion seriously may run the risk of upsetting their own secular colleagues. Thus negotiating religion in a secular environment is not a clear-cut process. However, as Ver Beek (2000) states, a lack of models or precedent for working with religion is not sufficient, the development industry must have dialogue on development and religion.

Thus, it has been argued in development literature that development has been shaped by notions of secularisation based on what occurred in the West. The development industry appears to be based on a culture of disbelief or secularism. However, ter Haar and Ellis (2006) argue that the development industry has "overlooked that original connection between religion and the notion of development" (p. 353). It is this connection between religion and the very notion of development that I now explore.

A Quasi-Religious Agenda?

Despite the development industry's seeming neglect of religion, development itself has been shaped by religious ideas and has been likened to having the characteristics of a

religion. In the 1990s, a small body of post-development literature emerged which deconstructed the vision and practice of development and which drew parallels between development and religious discourses (Ufford & Schoffeleers, 1988). This literature argues that development has its roots within the Western tradition of Enlightenment thinking and Augustinian Christian thought (Rist 1997, Sanderson 2007, Lunn 2009), and likens development's notion of progress – a progression towards a desired state of being – to a secular translation of the Christian concept of creating a model society on earth (Giri et al. 2005, ter Haar & Ellis 2006, Deneulin & Bano 2009). Assisting other people to create this model society and thus to alleviate human suffering is a moral obligation based on the Christian notion of equality for all people, universal divine love and the positioning of humanitarianism in this world as something important in itself (Giri et al., 2005). Moreover, applying this idea of the importance of religion to the formation of ways of thinking and ordering the world, some argue that it is the proselytising ethic of Western Christianity (ter Haar & Ellis, 2006) which gives the impetus for the ideas of development to be exported around the world. Thus, parallels can be drawn between religious discourse and development, which demonstrate that despite being unacknowledged, religious values have impacted on how development is conceived and undertaken.

Arguing against the logical-positivist position, Thomas (2004) argues that there is “no view from nowhere” (p.134). That is, religious values provide a critical component for understanding even those societies which claim to be based on logical-positivist positions of objectivity and rationality (Holloway & Valins 2002, Rist 1997). As Ufford and Schoffeleers (1988) identify, “It is absolutely vital to realize that our western development models are tinged with this religious surplus value. The idea that they fulfil a quasi-religious and exemplary function in relation to underdeveloped countries is no longer in doubt” (p.11).

Development has even been considered a religion itself – a secular religion based on Western modernity (Deneulin & Bano, 2009). This argument holds that belief in development can be understood as the replacement of faith in God with faith in progress

(Deneulin & Bano, 2009). Ufford and Schoffeleers (1988) cite Douglas's use of the relationship between man and the transcendental as a central characteristic of religion. It is argued by Douglas that the transcendental can even be applied to bureaucracies such as those governing development because of the superior position which the Western World considers itself to hold, compared to that of the development world. Development models are considered salvific, that is enabling salvation, in that they are based on a promise of a better life and a prescription to achieve this. The development experts are considered by Ufford and Schoffeleers (1988) as "the 'priests', who mediate between the two worlds" (p.27). The development experts are likened to secular 'missionaries' who spread the concepts of liberal modernity. Thus, the likening of development to a religion, albeit one delivering a supposed secular message but which has strong roots in Christianity, demonstrates that despite development's avoidance of religion, religion appears to permeate development thought. Development appears to be closer to religion than has been previously accepted.

In this section I have discussed the literature exploring religion's importance to development and offered an account of why development theorists have sidelined religion. The broader tensions between development and religion as outlined in this section, allow me to question whether these tensions are evident in my case study of New Zealand FBOs. Another key question I will explore further in my research is whether FBOs actually offer a different approach to religion in their work than secular organisations. I will also explore whether New Zealand FBOs face any funding constraints from secular donors in modern New Zealand society because of their faith identity.

Exploring a Place for Religion in Development

This section will describe the emerging research agenda on religion and development. I will outline how donors and academics are exploring what they consider an appropriate place for religion in development. Deneulin and Rakodi (2010) argue that there appears

to be a positive trend towards responding “in more appropriate ways than the ‘one-eyed giants’ as Goulet labelled [development experts] at the time” (p.4), however a significant amount of criticisms on this emerging research agenda are posited.

A New Research Agenda

Several journals have recently published issues on religion and development, particularly on how development has treated religion such as *Gender and Development* (1999), *Development and Culture* (2002), *Journal of Religion in Africa* (2002), *Development* (2003), and *Gender and Development* (2006) and several books have been published on religion and development such as Ufford & Schoffeleers (1988), Giri et al. (2005), Tyndale (2006), Haynes (2007), Marshall and Van Saanen (2007), Clarke and Jennings (2008a), Clarke and Jennings (2008b), Deneulin and Bano (2009), and Hefferan, Adkins, and Occhipinti (2009). Other academics have published notable journal articles on religion and development such as Harper & Clancy (1999), Tripp (1999), Tyndale (2003), Harcourt (2003), Thomas (2004), Holenstein (2005a), ter Haar & Ellis (2006), Clarke (2006), Clarke (2007) Berger (2009) and Lunn (2009). Lunn (2009) argues that development literature in general is biased towards research from developed countries. She posits that literature from non-Western scholars and development practitioners is often “radical and challenging” (p. 941).

Donors too – national governments, multi-national donors and non-governmental donors – have increased their research into religion. National governments and multinational donors have expanded partnerships with FBOs for example, the Australian aid agency, AusAID funds programmes with churches in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands (Bird, 2007). Faith-based donors too have undertaken their own research on their own organisation’s relationship with Churches, for example World Vision commissioned two papers on its organisation and relationship with Churches in James (2008) and James (2009). Some donors, for example the national aid agencies of Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland, are developing their institutional policy position on religion and development and responding to the challenge outlined by Ver Beek (2000)

as to why development has marginalised religion (Holenstein 2005a, ter Haar 2009, Holenstein 2009). Secular donors are exploring how their organisations could engage with religion within their work, despite the reservations that have been voiced.

The World Bank was one of the first donors to invest considerably into exploring the interface between religion and development (Belshaw, Calderisi & Sugden, 2001). The World Bank's decision to take religion seriously can be understood in the context of the World Bank-led *Voices of the Poor* (1999) study in which 'the poor' who were interviewed identified religion and spiritual places as being very important to them. Narayan (2001) identified that "churches and mosques, as well as sacred trees, rivers, and mountains, were mentioned time and again as important and valued by poor men and women" (p. 45). Narayan (2001) also highlighted that FBOs should be taken seriously as "they are among the poor and the poor trust them more than any other organisations except their own social institutions" (p.4). Thus, not only was religious belief and practice identified as something important to the well-being of 'the poor' but also the organisations were trusted and used by the poor themselves.

A number of institutions and research programmes have been established on religion and development. The Canadian International Development Research Centre's *Science, Religion and Development Project* established in 1995, World Faiths Development Dialogue established in 1998, the World Bank's 'Development Dialogue on Value and Ethics' established in 2002, the Netherland government funded Knowledge Centre on Research and Development established in 2005, the UK Department for International Development (DFID) funded a five year research programme on 'Religions and Development' (RaD), run by the University of Birmingham (Bradley 2007, Dugbazah 2009, Jackson & Fleischer 2007, Tomalin 2007). They also fund their own research into religion and development (Alexander, 2009). They also fund the Tony Blair Faith Foundation which promotes engagement between development and religion; the Berkley Centre for Religion, Peace and World Affairs at Georgetown University established in 2006, and the Institute of Social Studies, Rotterdam University Symposium on Religion and Development. The national aid agencies from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and

Switzerland have also invested significantly on research on religion and development. The Berkley Centre notes over 200 events on religion and development in the past 10 years around the world, including several events held in developing countries. The UN Population Fund (UN FPA) has also developed guidelines on religion (2007). Thus an increasing amount of literature on religion and development is being produced. However there still exists a gap in empirical research on religion and development.

Many donors and academics are exploring the commonalities and linkages between religion and development, for example, the RaD Programme and the Knowledge Centre on Religion and Development based in the Netherlands. Religious values are being studied, partly to identify areas of congruence with development aims, but also to understand how religious values are a motivator and how religious values influence states and societies. Religion is considered important to people's concept of well-being (Deneulin & Rakodi, 2010) and visions of development are often based on religious worldviews which may significantly differ from economic ones (Alkire, 2006). Moreover these religious worldviews, ter Haar and Ellis (2006) argue, "should provide the framework for aims of development, how to measure progress and how to understand the good life" (p.365). A current gap in research is ethnographical studies of spirituality and religion in which 'development' is measured (ter Haar 2009, Bradley 2009b). Some academics have taken the call seriously to take a recipient's understanding of the world as a point of departure for development (ter Haar, 2009). Academics have also sought to find points of commonality between religions. Tyndale (2003) identifies 'the golden rule' across religions: 'do unto others as you would want do unto you'. Such principles and values could underlie a positive development model which is alternative to the mainstream (Lunn, 2009).

The 'Discovery' of Religion and Development – A Critical View

Despite the initial enthusiasm for bridging religion and development, increasingly the literature has identified limits to this approach. In comparison to the literature outlined

above, which identified areas of congruence between religion and development, in what follows I will outline the literature which critiques the new research agenda on religion and development. Some academics too have argued against development considering religion at all. De Kadt (2009) argues that there is a fine line between the study of religion and endorsement of religion in development which some academics and donors, he argues, have blurred. However a number of academics published in journal issues such as Bock (2002), *Development* (2003) and *Gender and Development* (2006) and others including Haynes (2007), Brennan (2009), Lunn (2009), De Cordier (2009) and Deneulin and Rakodi (2010) have provided a balanced approach to religion in development, arguing that religious values may be considered beneficial, but equally may be considered harmful to development. For example, there could be conflicts when religious values do not align with development values. Thus, there seems to be acknowledgement in development literature that religion ought to be taken seriously, because it can produce both positive and negative outcomes from a development point of view. Peach (2005) presents a case study highlighting the divergence of views towards females in Thailand that work in the sex industry. Although these females are labelled victims by donors, within their own cultural and religious framework they are seen as empowering themselves economically. This serves as a powerful reminder that there are different cultural and religious perspectives of what is considered acceptable or not in a particular society, which may differ from development values. The question of prioritisation between religious values and development values is important, and some academics such as Giri et al. (2005) and Tyndale (2006) are reminding academics and donors of the fine line between using religion instrumentally for development's predetermined outcomes and harnessing the value of religion in its own right.

Thus, there appears to be a gap in the literature concerning the use of religion, between idealism and pragmatism. On one hand, some academics have argued that development should be based on religious values (Wilber & Jameson, 1980), but on the other hand, when religious values clash with development values, there appears to be no easy way to resolve the conflict – to determine which values should be given priority. Institutions such as the Knowledge Centre of Religion and Development are attempting to develop

practical policies for how to negotiate with religious values from within their development work.

Some critics such as Greany (2006) and Balchin (2007) have argued that there are problems with focussing on religious values and religious affiliation as a representative identity marker for people. Firstly, the focus on religious values highlights one part of a person's identity but detracts from other important aspects of identity, such as class, social location and values. Balchin (2007) argues that by focussing on religion as an identity marker, development is homogenising identity, and may actually be giving religion, including religious values or figures, an elevated place that they did not have before (Balchin, 2007). This can also lead to a de-legitimising of secular initiatives (Balchin, 2007). Moreover Balchin (2007) argues that there is an 'orientalising' of faith in developing countries, as if all people in developing countries are religious. Thus, focussing on religious values and affiliation as an identity marker may privilege these markers more than it should. This brings into question whether the study of religion should be a separate area within development studies. It may be important to acknowledge religion in development but avoid giving it undue centrality.

Some critics have argued against essentialising the values of a religion. Some of the donors such as DFID have essentialised religion into grand narratives of 'world religions' and doctrine. In addition, the work on the congruence between religious values and development seems to paint religious values as static and easily identifiable. This is opposed to a view of religion as implicit in the culture, beliefs and ways of life of communities around the world that are being realised in different ways. Lunn (2009), Olson (2008), and Tomalin and Pearson (2008) argue that religious values are not static; rather they are negotiated through time and place. Tomalin and Pearson (2008), noted that "treating faith communities as monolithic and homogenous, and privileging faith leaders as representative of entire religious traditions risks presenting a normative version of doctrines of faith that are in reality subject to critique and interpretations within those communities" (as cited in Clarke & Jennings, 2008a, p.7). Moreover, religious believers may act in very different ways than their beliefs dictate. These criticisms can be applied

to the research on mapping religious values and development, and raise important questions concerning the efficacy of such research.

A related criticism is that donors and academics are selectively engaging with religion in a way that reinforces the existing orthodoxy. McDuire-Ra and Rees (2008) argue that donors are engaging with those FBOs that adopt “existing development orthodoxy in the development space at the exclusion of those that challenge this orthodoxy” (p.1). They argue that this marginalises those alternative development ideas and practises as ‘counter-hegemonic praxis’. The power remains with the large donors to determine who they will engage with, and in doing so, who they will ignore.

Other academics however temper this criticism by arguing that despite an increase in discussion of religion and development, little practically has been achieved (Pallas, 2005). Pallas (2005) highlights practical difficulties of donors supporting FBOs such as that some recipient governments are reluctant to let funding from donors reach FBOs, as they are seen as potential political competitors.

Alongside these criticisms, a new discourse in development has emerged focussed on the terms ‘religion’ and ‘faith’. Some academics have begun to deconstruct this discourse alleging the new focus on religion and faith relies on ‘buzzwords’ and ‘fuzzwords’. Buzzwords in development, Cornwall (2007) argues, “gain their purchase and power through their vague and euphemistic qualities, their capacity to embrace a multitude of possible meanings, and their normative resonance” (p. 472). Buzzwords are also fuzzwords as they,

can float free of concrete referents, to be filled with meaning by their users like ‘poverty’ and ‘development’. In the struggles for interpretive power that characterise the negotiation of the language of policy, buzzwords shelter multiple agendas, providing room for manoeuvre and space for contestation” (p. 474).

Discussing the use of the term ‘religion’ in development, Balchin (2007) argues that “religion is simultaneously seen as the biggest developmental obstacle, the only development issue, and the only developmental solution” (p.534). ‘Faith-based’,

Cornwall (2007) argued “is a term whose apparent novelty disguises continuities between the three C’s of the age of colonialism (Civilisation, Christianity, and Commerce)” (p. 473). Thus she critiques the approach of donors and academics that are engaging with religion firstly of a certain type, which is Christianity, and next in a way which seeks to legitimise pre-determined development outcomes.

Thus, the literature appears to be generally focussed on religion as a construct in terms of institutions and values as religious doctrine. Critics, notably Ver Beek (2000), have challenged this notion; and although academics and donors have begun to respond to this challenge, they appear to be engaged with the dialectics of religion and development in a way that is falling short of Ver Beek’s notion of spirituality. That is, academics and donors have approached religion and development by engaging with “world religions” and their religious values, while the spirituality of recipients which may not accord with these types of major religions remains relatively un-accounted for. This theme informs my research by asking whether FBOs have an advantage over secular organisations in understanding recipients’ spirituality.

One emerging area of research on religion and development is on the concept of FBOs. FBOs offer potentially another way of undertaking development which is attractive to donors. It is to FBOs that I now turn.

Faith-Based Organisations’ Development Work

The literature highlights that little is known about FBOs, what they do, where they operate and what their motivations are. An emerging body of research focuses on different ways of classifying FBOs in order to understand how faith can manifest within an organisation. However there is a paucity of empirical research on FBOs situating them in their particular contexts.

The Salience of Faith-Based Organisations in Development

There is a growing acknowledgement within development literature of the salience of FBOs in the context of international development (Bornstein 2002, Hearn 2002, Maxwell 2002, Renders 2002,, Selinger 2004, Clarke 2006, Alkire 2006, Haynes 2007, Clarke 2008, Hefferan et al. 2009, Bradley 2009a, Lunn 2009, Deneulin & Rakodi 2010). Some FBOs have undertaken development work since before the inception of the contemporary development industry, through missionary work (Ferris 2005, Benthall 2006), but the number of FBOs undertaking development has increased dramatically.

Neoliberal theory is considered to have opened a space for FBOs and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) more generally in development (Haynes 2007, Clarke 2008, Hefferan et al. 2009, Denuelin & Rakodi 2010). In the 1970-80s a new set of economic policies both in donor countries such as America and recipient countries were promoted by donors. These policies took the form of ‘Structural Adjustment Programmes’ which linked aid money to developing countries with conditions based around reducing government spending, privatisation and market liberalisation. In some countries, poverty worsened. Manji and O’Coill (2002) highlight the United Nations Development Programme report on Human Development which identifies that “in sub-saharan Africa as a whole, per-capita incomes dropped by 21 per cent in real terms between 1981 and 1989”. FBOs and other non-government organisations spiked as they filled in the gap left by the shrunken state (Tvedt, 1998, p.1). Clarke (2008) quotes the World Bank, which writes that “in sub-Saharan Africa, the World Bank estimates that 50 per cent of education and health services were provided by faith groups and FBOs at the beginning of the millennium” (pp. 18-19).

These organisations elicit funds from private and public sources and have become significant actors in the development industry. Clarke (2008) also notes that four large FBOs including World Vision International and Caritas International “had a combine annual income of approximately \$2.5 billion at the beginning of the new millennium, or

almost two-thirds of the annual budget of the UK Department for International Development” (pp.26-27).

Apart from being service providers, FBOs as civil society actors have been increasingly involved in advocacy roles in influencing or contesting state policies. The literature identifies how FBOs have played a significant role in public life, such as supporting pro-democracy movements in Africa, Latin America and Asia (Berger 2003, Clarke & Jennings 2008a, Deneulin & Rakodi 2010). They have also influenced international development policy (Alkire & Barham, 2005), for example in the Jubilee Campaign, which successfully lobbied developed countries to cancel the debt of the poorer countries. The rise of the Christian Right in American politics led to the Charitable Choice Provision which allowed American Government funding to be given to FBOs. FBOs in developing countries have recently come into the focus of research (Beaumont, 2008) and an emerging research agenda is focused on their role in effecting social change within their countries (Candland 2000, Hearn 2002, Hauck, Mandie-Filer & Bolger 2005, Swart 2006, Volker 2009, Eriksen 2009, Hefferan & Fogarty 2010). These examples demonstrate how FBOs have played a role in constructing and critiquing development.

As Clarke (2006) highlights, there are a range of FBOs as outlined above, including organisations which are involved in public policy debates about development; in social and political processes, whether impacting positively or negatively on the poor in developing countries; and in direct efforts to support, represent or engage with the poor. I will focus my research on those organisations that undertake development programmes to support the poor in recipient countries.

How Faith-Based Organisations are Studied

Within the literature on NGOs, Tvedt (1998) and Martens (2002), both highlight the difficulty of defining an NGO. Tvedt (1998) unpacks the term ‘NGO’ and argues that currently the term ‘NGO’ is beset with a normative ideal-type definition. He advocates that NGOs should be classified to reflect their contexts, including different cultural and

political traditions. Moreover NGOs should be classified not by ideal-types but by empirically-based classifications (Tvedt, 1998). Likewise, the term ‘faith-based organisation’ has come under increased scrutiny in its application. FBOs are said to make up a heterogeneous community of organisational constructs (Berger, 2003). Adding to Cornwall’s (2007) and Balchin’s (2007) arguments that ‘faith’ is a buzzword, the term ‘FBO’ can be thought of as a ‘slippery term’, in that it is used “to describe organisations that vary considerably in terms of size, scope, theological orientation, motivations, focus and the like” (Hefferan et al. 2009, p.2).

As a starting point for discussing FBOs, Clarke and Jennings (2008a) define an FBO as an organisation that “derives inspiration and guidance for its activities from the teaching and principles of the faith or from a particular interpretation or school of thought within a faith” (p.6). There appears to be general agreement in the literature that any distinction between FBOs and secular organisations should be understood on a continuum as opposed to a discrete categorisation (Berger, 2003). To what extent and how faith manifests in the work of FBOs, what makes FBOs different from secular organisations and what is the significance of faith in the work of FBOs in a development context are some of the key questions that are being raised in the literature (Berger 2003, Bradley 2009a, Thaut 2009).

Several typologies have been developed to assess the role of faith on a number of organisational dimensions (Jeavons 1998, Smith & Sosin 2001, Ebaugh, Pipes, Chafetz, & Daniels 2003, Berger 2003, Sider & Unruh 2004, Clarke 2006, Beneditti 2006, Bradley 2009a, Thaut 2009). As Ebaugh et al. (2006) argue a multi-dimensional continuum is necessary to capture the different ways faith can manifest across an organisation. In what follows I will highlight the literature on three organisational dimensions: organisational identity, output, and resourcing.

The organisational identity and mission of FBOs is considered to be of paramount importance in shaping their services. Benedetti (2006) highlights how there are a range of FBOs, some with missions that are indistinguishable from those of secular

organisations focussing on development; others that consider promotion of their religion to be their central aim; and all manner of organisations in-between. In addition, Hovland (2008) highlights how even within the same FBO there can exist a range of missions. Berger (2003) argues that “what renders these services religious (or spiritual) is the nature of the worldview on which they are based and the motivation from which they spring” (p. 32).

Whether the development work of FBOs is different from secular organisations on account of how FBOs incorporate faith into their work is a key concern of the literature. Thaut (2009) highlights a range of organisations from those who remove reference to faith from their development programmes, rendering them indistinguishable from their secular counterparts, to those organisations which explicitly integrate their religious beliefs into their development work, and lastly organisations which are mainly concerned with the spiritual well-being of others and the conversion of development recipients to their faith, using development work as a means to achieve this. Some academics have explored whether FBOs have a comparative advantage to understanding recipients’ spirituality and incorporating this into their development work (Bradley, 2005).

Lastly several academics outline that the extent to which FBOs use religious sources for their resourcing impacts on their ability to retain their religious objectives within their work (Jeavons 1998, Berger 2003, Thaut 2009, Bradley 2009a). The majority of FBOs are thought to maintain organisational independence by remaining privately funded through their faith constituents (Berger, 2003). FBOs receiving funding from within their own funding sources are not subject to requirements from external funders such as codes of conduct or guidelines (McGregor, 2006). As McGregor (2006) outlines this “frees them to pursue whatever development goals they like, as they escape the gaze and disciplining technologies of the development industry” (p.180). Ebaugh et al. (2006) also note a negative relationship between those FBOs that seek secular donor funding and the religiosity of their services.

In regards to funding their development work, the literature explores advantages for FBOs, including the ability to draw on and mobilise their extensive faith networks both domestically and internationally as a source of support for their development work. This is a form of social capital as outlined by Greely (1997), Putnam (2000) and Berger (2003) and provides them with a comparative advantage over secular organisations. A sense of religious duty to undertake development work is promoted within some FBOs. The FBOs are able to capitalise on their faith networks' deep commitment to this sense of religious duty and pool together both human resources and long-term funding sources for their work (Bornstein 2002, Ferris 2005, Garland, Myers & Wolfer 2009). There is a gap in the literature on how these 'spiritual economies' work. Curry (2003), Gibson-Graham (2006) and (2008) and Healy (2008) partially address this gap when they argue for a research agenda that recognises alternative economic activities which they term 'diverse economies'. They critique capital-ethnocentrism and provide examples of diverse economies such as unpaid labour and alternative markets. However they do not specifically mention the role of faith in these diverse economies.

The literature also highlights disadvantages for FBOs when operating in a secular donor environment. Some academics argue that secular development donors affect how FBOs undertake their work (Tvedt 1998, Adamu 1999, Bornstein 2002, Townsend, Porter & Mawdsley 2002). With the majority of donors being secular and having secular funding rules, it has been questioned whether FBOs are able to offer any alternative development, or whether they are being co-opted into the secular development framework. Thomas (2004) highlights that donors are increasing their engagement with FBOs, so long as they behave like "Oxfam with hymns", that is, so long as they did not change the content of development. Townsend et al. (2002) also argues that FBOs are being used by the secular development industry in order to spread its message, rather than having their own message.

FBOs are thought to negotiate their religiosity within a secular funding framework. Tvedt (1998) highlights how FBOs may package themselves so as to fit within a secular framework, and simultaneously package their development work in religious ways within

their organisation. He highlights how this separation between mission and development becomes difficult in practice: “in the field it has often been regarded as irrelevant, difficult to maintain or as a combination of stupidity and dishonesty” (p. 218).

Some academics have criticised donors for marginalising certain FBOs and modes of development. Clarke (2008) criticises DFID and the World Bank for engaging primarily with mainstream Christian FBOs and not with FBOs from other faiths, in particular Muslims. This is similar to Cornwall’s (2007) argument highlighted earlier about ‘faith’ being about Christianity. Clarke argues

the challenge posed by the convergence of faith and development is to engage with faith discourses and associated organizations which seem counter-development or culturally exotic to a secular and technocratic worldview, in building the complex multi-stakeholder partnerships increasingly central to fight against poverty. In a development context, faith matters (2008, p. 41).

Thus, despite this ‘convergence’, some FBOs still appear to be off-limits to secular donors. This results in conceptual and programmatic biases (Clarke, 2006). Although donors may highlight that they engage with FBOs, in reality, they are only engaging with ones that appear to be more mainstream and compatible with donor policies. Clarke argues that donors risk repeating in their engagement with religion and development similar problems to those which have beset donor engagement with civil society in general. Clarke (2006) quoted Howell and Peace that,

donors ‘risk reifying civil society as a natural and historically inevitable component of a developed capitalist economy’, while programmatically, ‘donor attempts to operationalise the concept in the form of civil society strengthening programs threaten to reduce (it) to a technical tool and so depoliticise it in a way that paradoxically could lead to a constriction of intellectual and political space’ (p. 836).

Clarke (2006) suggests that donors widen their engagement to include organisations of other faiths including evangelical Christian, Islamic and Hindu FBOs. Clarke (2006) thus highlights that there may be areas of operational difficulty for donors when engaging with some FBOs.

My research will contribute to the growing body of literature on FBOs by exploring FBOs in a New Zealand context. Despite the development of typologies, little empirical research has been conducted on actual FBOs in order to demonstrate how these typologies may or may not work in a particular context. I will explore the advantages and disadvantages as outlined above for New Zealand FBOs to access funding, starting with the landscape of FBOs in New Zealand and how their donors impact on their development work.

Conclusion

The literature highlights, firstly, the tensions within the development industry and its regard for religion, and shows the development industry as operating within a secular framework. Secondly, it explores the types of approaches the development industry is now undertaking in an attempt to engage with religion, and the critiques of the approaches that have been made. Lastly, it shows that despite an emerging research agenda classifying FBOs through the development of typologies, there remains little empirical research on FBOs. My research seeks to build an understanding of the work of FBOs operating in New Zealand. I will look at how FBOs perceive the role of faith in their work and whether their work impacts on their ability to secure funds from donors. Faith as both as an enabler and a constrainer of donor sources will be investigated.

My research will consider whether the FBOs' perceptions agree with the broad themes as outlined in the literature. The broad key themes I will explore in my case study are:

- FBOs' perception of the role of faith in their work including organisational identity.
- The differences and similarities between the work of FBOs and the work of secular organisations.
- The positive and negative aspects of their faith identity when engaging with donors.

Introduction

This chapter outlines my research methodology and describes the methods I have employed for undertaking research. Firstly, the conceptual framework of my research is outlined, including my own positionality within my research. Secondly, I will outline the context and composition of the FBOs I interviewed. Thirdly, I will describe the research methods used, with particular reference to how I chose the sample for the semi-structured interviews which I undertook, interview method, and ethical considerations concerning the collection and presentation of the information from those interviews. Fourthly, I explain the frameworks used to interpret the information collected. Finally, the limitations of the research are outlined. I will use unique Key informant (KI) numbers to refer to each organisation interviewed (for a list refer Table 2).

Methodology

My interest in religion and development stems from a long held interest in ‘other’ religions. I studied religious studies to postgraduate level at Victoria University, mainly focusing on religions in Asia. I then worked for the New Zealand government for four years undertaking capacity building work with governments in several Pacific Island countries. I decided to combine these two interests by undertaking a Masters of Development Studies with Victoria University of Wellington’s Geography and Earth Sciences faculty. My decision to research New Zealand FBOs arose from a perceived general lack of information regarding such organisations in development studies in New Zealand.

To address the knowledge gap concerning New Zealand FBOs within development studies, I sought to discover and present the ways that FBOs in New Zealand perceive their work, rather than to evaluate their work myself. To do this, I adopted a research framework through which I could attempt to give the FBOs a voice rather than letting my view dominate. The participants I interviewed were generally religious and hold beliefs that I do not. As a non-believer, I considered the issue of neutrality to be of paramount importance. I therefore decided to adopt a phenomenological approach as my research strategy. Bryman (2004) defines phenomenology as an approach to find out how people make sense of their world. It instructs that the researcher should block out their own preconceptions. This approach enabled me to describe what participants expressed to me, as opposed to a positivist framework which seeks some outwardly verifiable way of assessing the truth of a claim. As Tomalin (2007) critiques however, there is slippery slope between representing religious views in an empathetic manner and presenting them in a way that renders them beyond scrutiny. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to outline the history of the phenomenological approach in the ‘scientific’ study of religion as a separate discipline. However it would be amiss not to mention that some academics have criticised the supposed neutrality behind the phenomenological approach arguing that this approach can in itself be understood as a religious position – one of agnosticism.

Participants questioned my own positionality. I felt compelled to explain to participants how I have a Christian background but am now not religious. I wanted to show participants that I used to be religious and therefore that we shared a commonality. The sensitivity necessary to study faith was apparent to me in that it can act as a bond but also as a way of differentiating people. Some participants requested information on my motives for undertaking the research and appeared initially suspicious of me.

As a non-believer some participants questioned why I was interested in this topic and whether I had an angle that I was coming from. One participant told me, “it is a delicate topic for us” and asked me “Do you have a bias in it yourself? Do you have an agenda in it? Do you have a hypothesis that you are moving forward with with all of this? What’s your angle?” (KI10). I explained how I chose the topic and my interest in religious

studies. This seemed to allay their fears, and thus explaining my position became an important part of establishing rapport and trust with the participants as highlighted by Davies (2007). An ethical issue is also present in the questions asked by participants concerning my positionality, that is, the issue of whether I held some bias that might portray them unduly in a negative fashion.

Some participants also asked me what benefit I thought this research would have. In deciding whether to interview or not, Kvale (2007) contends researchers should ask themselves what value the knowledge gained can have, that is, what contribution the research will make to society. Kvale quotes Mauthner et al., who contend that interviewing results in “researching private lives and placing accounts in the public arena” (p.23). There is an ethical element to the decision to undertake research as researching places accounts in the public arena which were once private. In this regard, I felt I could honestly say to the FBOs that my motivation for undertaking the research was a hope that it would be useful to the development industry in New Zealand to learn more about FBOs and how they operate, and I felt that my status as a non-believer would not negatively affect the way I approached the research. My thesis will be submitted to those FBOs that requested a copy and made available to the broader development industry.

In undertaking a phenomenological approach, I attempted to reflect on my own prejudices during the research so that I could test the extent to which my own positionality affected the way in which I interpreted the information collected from interviews. As a non-believer I have had challenges in undertaking research on FBOs. I held preconceptions that FBOs may not operate as professional development organisations. However, I came away from the interviews with a great respect for the majority of participants due to what I perceived is a generally well-thought out development programme adopting many of the new development theories I had learnt about. That they had set up organisations and undertake work internationally I found very admirable.

I adopted qualitative research as my research strategy. Qualitative research has the benefit of focusing on in-depth information and people's perceptions, as opposed to quantitative research which seeks mainly to present quantifiable information. Particularly when adopting a phenomenological approach, qualitative research appeared to be the appropriate choice because perceptions are difficult to quantify and qualitative analysis enables an in-depth approach which quantitative analysis cannot. In addition qualitative research has been chosen as the key research strategy on several other studies on FBOs (Bornstein 2005, Bradley 2005).

Faith-Based Organisations in New Zealand

As Tvedt (1998) argues, to understand NGOs they must be seen from within their social context, and the motivation and history of their past work must be considered in order to understand their current work. To this end, this section outlines the context of FBOs in New Zealand. I now give a brief account of the historical context and composition of international aid and development organisations in New Zealand.

A Brief History of the Non-Profit Sector in New Zealand – International Development

Post World War II there has been an increase in the number of organisations working overseas in international aid and development. An umbrella organisation with a broad base, the Council of Organisations for Relief and Service Overseas (CORSO), was established to meet New Zealand's obligation to UN relief efforts and to coordinate voluntary New Zealand agencies providing international aid (Sutton, Baskerville & Carolyn, 2010). By the 1980s this organisation had become defunct for a number of reasons, including a loss of government support due to perceived conflicts of interests with the government of the time, a mission change to focusing on poverty in New Zealand instead of internationally which alienated CORSO's supporters, and an increase in international charities coming to New Zealand resulting in a more competitive donor market (Sutton et al. 2010, McLoughlin 1991).

More recently, the Council for International Development (CID) was formed as an umbrella organisation for those non-profit organisations in New Zealand involved in international aid and development. In 2007, the CID undertook a survey of its members. Of the 75% of members that participated in the survey, they reported a total income of NZ\$145,509,005.¹ In the same year, the organisations reported a total of 853,587 individual donors supporting their international development work, and 475,753 were considered regular donors to the organisations. The majority of the funding (66%)² came from the public with the New Zealand government (mainly through the New Zealand Aid Programme, formally known as the New Zealand Agency for International Development, NZAID) contributing 25%. The remaining 9% came from known sources such as sales.

Composition of the Non-Profit Sector in New Zealand – International Development

In the mid 2000s there were a number of studies on the size, scope, and role of the non-profit sector in New Zealand. These studies have been undertaken by academics, the New Zealand government and research institutions.³ Tennant et al. (2006) note that in 2002 government transfers to non-profit organisations in New Zealand were estimated at NZD\$920.6 million. In one study, organisations surveyed reported receiving 25% of their funding from government (Grant Thornton, 2008). In addition, there have been estimates on philanthropic funding, which is defined as “the act of giving financial resources to a cause that is intended to improve general human well-being, and where the giver expects no direct reciprocation or financial gain in return” (Slack & Leung-Wai, 2007, p.8). The philanthropic sector, of which non-profit organisations are part, was estimated in the 2005/06 tax year worth between 1.24 billion to 1.46 billion New Zealand

¹ In comparison, in 2007/08 NZAID, the New Zealand government aid programme had a budget of \$412,650,000 (NZAID, 2008).

² These figures may be distorted by World Vision New Zealand’s statistics.

³ They include “Defining the Nonprofit Sector: New Zealand”, which is part of an international project run by the John Hopkins University; Philanthropy New Zealand’s “Giving New Zealand: Philanthropic Funding 2006”, Grant Thornton’s, “Take a fresh look at some of the Not for Profit issues currently affecting the sector: Not for Profit Survey 2007/08”, and Statistics New Zealand’s, “Counting Non-profit Institutions in New Zealand 2005”.

dollars. Almost all of the funding was reported to have gone to New Zealand recipients; however some of it went to New Zealand based charities that then funded international work. Philanthropic giving was comprised of 58% from trusts and foundations, 35% from personal giving and 7% from businesses. The level of philanthropic giving is favourable when compared with levels from countries such as Canada, Australia, and the UK.

Organisations that work in international aid and development are thought to be a small part of the non-profit sector. Of the 97,000 non-profit organisations in New Zealand identified in the Tennant et al. (2006) report, it is estimated that there are only 300 institutions with an international focus, a mere 0.3% of the total number of non-profit organisations (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). In Tennant et al. (2006), non-profit organisations that work in international aid and development are considered one of the ten major types of non-profit organisations in New Zealand. Tennant et al., (2006) denote these organisations as ‘international organisations, aid and relief’. Religious organisations however occupy a separate category, ‘religious congregations and associations’. Moreover, there is a further distinction (churches, mosques and temples), and church social services or church schools. Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain what proportion of the organisations working in international development are faith-based.

Methods

The Sample

For primary information collection I used purposeful sampling. In gathering a core sample of organisations, I wanted to avoid an unintended bias towards one type of organisation at the expense of others and to challenge my own assumptions about what it meant to be a ‘faith-based’ organisation. This approach accords with qualitative literature which recommends that in gathering a core sample the researcher survey a range of different participants in order to challenge preconceptions (Davies, 2007).

Selection criteria for the sample initially consisted of: organisations based in New Zealand, that identified themselves as ‘faith-based’, and that undertake work internationally. I firstly perused the CID membership list to get an overview of what kind of development organisations existed in New Zealand. It appears a significant number of its 96 members are faith-based. I then used the Charities Commission database and, after undertaking several searches using words such as ‘God’, ‘religion’, and ‘faith’, came across hundreds of organisations that worked overseas and matched my selection criteria. Although some of my sample derives from the CID list, I have focused mainly on other organisations in order to capture those organisations that may go ‘under the radar’. This was a key part of the research design in order to select a sample of a diverse range of organisations, particularly ones that may not have been previously researched. I was interested in marginal organisations that are less incorporated into official development and may hold a greater diversity of under-researched views. As outlined in the literature review, some academics criticise donors for engaging with religion in a way that reinforces orthodoxy and marginalises alternative development ideas and practice (Clarke 2007, McDuire-Ra & Rees 2008). These academics argue that donors are biased towards more mainstream Christian organisations at the expense of other types of organisations. Like donors, I too had to choose who to engage with, and in doing so, who I would ignore. I will discuss the variety of organisations I interviewed in what follows.

My sample of FBOs is largely unaccounted for in the above estimations. Of the CID list of 96 members, approximately half have an identified element of faith to their organisation, but only 10% of my sample are members of CID. In narrowing down my sample to 20 organisations, I came across hundreds of organisations on the charitable commission database which have an identified faith element, and which work internationally. For example, approximately 290 organisations are listed as undertaking work in Africa, in the sector of religious activities and benefitting religious groups. One hundred and ninety organisations are listed as working in Africa, in the sector of international activities, with the beneficiaries listed as religious groups. The following table shows some basic searches undertaken with a focus on Africa and religious beneficiaries or activities. The majority of these organisations appear to be faith-based.

Either they have a clearly identified element of faith in their name or organisational material, or they offer religious activities. These organisations range from individual churches to larger organisations.

Table 1: Example of types of organisations from the Charities Commission database

<i>Number of organisations</i>	<i>Sector</i>	<i>Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Area of operation</i>
290	Religious activities	Religious groups	Africa
205	Religious activities	General public	Africa
190	International activities	Religious groups	Africa
131	Community development		Africa

This suggests that the number of FBOs based in New Zealand is more than currently acknowledged and much larger than the CID membership. This salience of New Zealand-based FBOs in international development aligns with international trends as identified in my literature review (Clarke 2006, Lunn 2009). An area of further work that could be undertaken would be to map out the size and scope of New Zealand-based FBOs that work in international aid and development.

The FBOs in my sample undertake a wide range of activities such as health, education, minor infrastructure projects, business development, vocational training, providing fresh water, as well as activities such as distributing bibles, building churches, religious healing and training disciples.

I initially selected organisations that had active websites. This allowed me to supplement the information provided on the Charities Commission site (which is very sparse) with that on their own website (which was generally detailed) to ensure they were a self-identified FBO, and also to obtain an adequate amount of information on FBOs in New Zealand before honing the selection of organisations further. Later I also included organisations that did not have websites.

I refined the sample of hundreds of organisations as listed on the Charities Commission database search results to a workable sample of 30 organisations. To achieve this I developed additional selection criteria. I chose a cross-section of organisations across these criteria in order to retain diversity among the sample. These additional criteria included: whether an organisation was based solely in New Zealand, or whether it had international affiliations, or a parent or a child organisation overseas; the size of the organisation's budget; the regions that the organisation worked in; its location within New Zealand (e.g., provincial versus city-based); and whether work was focused on religion and religious groups exclusively or whether areas such as 'development', and 'community development' were also focused upon. Some organisations listed on the Charities Commission database identified that they undertook work mainly concerning religion, such as religious services, and serving religious communities. I chose to include some of these organisations because I wondered whether organisations that said they mainly undertook religious activities might actually undertake a significant amount of development work too.

I contacted the organisations in the sample via email and then followed up each one with a phone call. Initially, 19 organisations agreed to be interviewed (8 other organisations were contacted but either declined to be interviewed or did not reply).

Institutional Types of Faith-Based Organisations

In order to identify major funding sources, it is necessary to understand the variety of institutional types of FBOs. Institutional affiliation with religion, as Smith and Sosin (2001) argue, can be seen as a "coupling" of an FBO to religious authority and religious resources. In what follows I will explore the different institutional types of FBOs in my sample.

As Berger (2003) and Clarke (2006) highlighted, FBOs have a range of networks to mobilise their work. All the FBOs in my sample are based in New Zealand and mostly originated in New Zealand although some came from other countries. Some of the FBOs

have formal international connections such as those FBOs that have become the head institution of an international network for their development work establishing branches of their organisation in other countries, or those FBOS that are part of an international network which set up a branch in New Zealand.

The majority of FBOs in my sample are Christian. However, they came from a wide variety of denominations. Two organisations termed themselves ‘spiritual’, and what I have termed ‘post-traditional religious’ to denote their recent formation as an identifiable faith group. Lastly, one organisation is Buddhist.

Table 2: Institutional types of FBOs in New Zealand

<i>Key informant number</i>	<i>Religious affiliation</i>	<i>Institutional type</i>
1	Christian	Church-based
2	Christian	Domestic service provider for a Church
3	Christian	Trust set up by an individual – separate from churches
4	Christian	Service provider- across denominations
5	Christian	Missionary organisation
6	Post-traditional religious	Service Provider - Branch of international network
7	Christian	Umbrella church organisation – separate development arm from missionary organisation
8	Christian	Umbrella church organisation – separate development arm
9	Christian	Church-based on congregation
10	Christian	Separate development arm to mission organisation
11	Christian	Umbrella church organisation - separate development arm to mission organisation
12	Christian	Charitable business
13	Christian	Church congregation
14	Post-traditional religious	Charitable business, no church affiliation
15	Buddhist	An informal group around a religious leader titled a Lama
16	Christian	Missionary organisation
17	Christian	Service provider – inter-denominational

Umbrella Organisations

Firstly, umbrella church organisations make up one of the key types of FBOs in my sample. These organisations are coordinating bodies for their respective denomination for mission and/or development work overseas. These organisations have their roots in missionary work begun over 100 years ago and have evolved in different ways. One FBO that I encountered was established as a separate development arm to coordinate their denomination's development work across New Zealand. This development arm sits under the mission umbrella but is separate from it. This was the result of an intentional decision by its umbrella organisation to access New Zealand government funding for non-religious work. Another umbrella organisation that I encountered was originally set up to coordinate mission activities but had just set up a subsidiary organisation as a development arm in order to access government funding. A third umbrella organisation evolved from missionary work to become more focused on development work. It was institutionally separate from the part of their organisation that dealt with missionary work. This organisation was not set up as a development organisation *per se*, but rather as an organisation to support churches in developing countries. These three organisations are among the largest in my sample in terms of funding. One FBO coordinated contributions to development work from over 450 separate churches, all of which provided it with financial support.

Organisations Based on Religious Infrastructure

A second type of FBO comprises those organisations which are based solely on a congregation, church, or informal religious following around a religious figure. These organisations range from churches and assemblies who had been around since the late 1800s to relatively new churches which have only been recently established in the last 10 years. These organisations sometimes covered entire church activities or congregations as well as their development work; however in other instances they were set up to undertake the development work only.

Missionary Organisations

Another type of organisation that I encountered comprises those organisations that are focused predominantly on missionary activities, and are based across a number of different churches or religious figures. These organisations work across churches and religious institutions either of the same or different denomination. They are uniformly concerned with spreading their religious message. Their development work is generally considered as an adjunct to their religious work.

Service Providers

Some charitable trusts function principally as service providers. These organisations may originate from a single church, or from a number of different churches. Their institutional links vary too, with some remaining institutionally close to a church in terms of board membership for example, whereas for others the church is mainly a source of informal support. These FBOs undertake project work for purchased services and therefore their work, when compared with the other organisations is generally more sophisticated in terms of its development, design, and evaluation. Moreover, the mainly paid staff may have added to their professionalism. As Sider and Unruh (2004) highlight a heavy use of volunteers can result in amateurism.

Charitable Businesses

Two organisations I interviewed were set up as charitable businesses. One of these began its business as a separate development initiative, but soon repositioned itself as a charitable business in which the profits raised in New Zealand funded their development initiatives overseas. The other FBO has a symbiotic relationship between the two institutional arms of the organisation: the charitable arm, and the business arm. The charitable arm undertakes technological research and creates educational tools to develop and promote their product, whilst the business arm makes an income which funds the

charitable arm's operations. These businesses are not institutionally affiliated with any religious infrastructure. Some of the other FBOs also operate income-generating schemes as part of their work, even where these are not explicitly businesses. I will discuss this further in the funding section.

Thus my sample includes a diversity of types of organisations in New Zealand. This diversity points towards the FBOs existing on a spectrum with organisational links to religious infrastructure. The organisations in my sample also focus on development in different ways from service providers who are very focused on development to missionary organisations who are more focused on promoting their religion. I will explore this difference in more detail in Chapter Four. Despite selecting mainly Christian organisations there remains a diversity of institutional types in my sample. In Chapter Six I will explore how the different types of institution affect the way the organisation seeks funding from donors. As Berger (2003) and Hefferan et al. (2009) argue, the term 'FBO' makes up a heterogeneous community of organisational constructs of different size, scope and focus and so forth. My research supports this claim and shows that there are a variety of organisational types of New Zealand FBOs.

Semi-Structured Interviews

I undertook 22 semi-structured interviews during September-October 2010. Interviews ranged from 35 minutes to over 2 hours, with the majority of interviews lasting for approximately 1 hour. Before selecting interviewing as the key method for my research, I explored the advantages of interviews, how to conduct an interview, and how to validate interview information. This research was imperative to the enactment of the phenomenological approach that I had adopted. As Bryman (2007) outlined "all interviews are reality-constructing, meaning-making occasions, whether recognized or not" (p.5).

I selected interviewing as the key method for collecting information due to the advantages it held over other methods. By interviewing I could collect information that I

could not obtain from undertaking a paper-based study. For example, information on feelings, perspectives, attitudes, opinions, and case studies that may not be documented in a written format. In particular, interviewing enabled me to access information from participants who had limited to no documentation of their work. I decided to undertake semi-structured interviews whereby a base set of questions act as a loose guide to the interviews, allowing for consistent and reliable information where possible, but also enabling me to ask *ad hoc* questions where appropriate to obtain more information.

I developed two interview guides as recommended by Rubin (2005). The first interview guide contained questions relating to the themes from the literature review. I then developed a second interview guide (Appendix I) turning the academic questions into everyday vernacular as recommended by Rubin (2005) and Kvale and Brinkmann (2009). This was done so that the questions would be clear to participants. To test this format I undertook three pilot interviews with friends who worked in FBOs. From these pilot interviews it became clear that some of the questions were not relevant and there was confusion over some of the terminology I used. I amended these areas so that I shared the same meaning of words as participants would (Rubin, 2005). I used a variety of open and closed questions in the interview guide as suggested Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) in order to elicit perceptions, feelings, and opinions.

Choosing the place of interview is not just a technical decision but a decision of power dynamics (Rubin 2005, Cassell 2009). The participants I interviewed were either the heads of their organisations or very senior in their organisations. In this regard I decided that a quiet location for interviews away from other staff and other people was appropriate so that the participants could talk freely and frankly. I interviewed participants at a variety of locations including in meeting rooms at their place of work (both commercial or at their house), at a café, and outdoors. I interviewed two participants over Skype due to travel restrictions. Skype did not appear to interfere with the quality of the interview.

Kvale (2007) acknowledges that the interview can affect the participant. In this regard, I saw the interview as a process which often led to the participant undertaking a substantial amount of reflection on their ideas, beliefs and their development work. As outlined in the limitations section, I wondered after undertaking the interviews whether the interviews would have provided more in-depth answers if I had given the participants a copy of the questions before the interview took place. At the completion of interviews I undertook a form of de-briefing (Kvale, 2007). I thanked participants and asked them whether they had anything else to add. Participants often kept talking. In these instances I left the tape recorder in its place so participants were aware that they were still being recorded. Bryman (2004) calls information provided after the interview officially finishes as ‘unsolicited accounts’. I found that these unsolicited accounts involved the participants giving more detailed accounts of their faith and development work. I provided my contact details for participants to contact me should they wish to add anything further.

Interpreting the Research Information

I transcribed the first 19 interviews, generally transcribing within two to four days of the interview taking place. It took me approximately six hours to transcribe each interview. Transcripts ranged from 3,000 to 18,000 words with an average of approximately 7,000 words. Copies of the transcripts were loaded to a computer software programme called NVivo and analysed through coding practices. Transcribing the interviews was beneficial because it allowed me to become more intimately aware of the text.

Kvale (2007) outlines that “transcripts aren’t copies or representations of some original reality, they are interpretative constructions” (p.98). I decided that it was necessary to note down perceived feelings of the participant such as sarcasm and laughter as this captured the way the participant said something which would not be apparent by words alone. During the transcription I decided it was unnecessary to transcribe information that had no relevance to the research. I also decided that it was unnecessary and time-

consuming to transcribe verbatim, as I was not conducting discourse analysis, and therefore decided to leave out utterances such as ‘um’, ‘you know’, and ‘eh’ from then on.

I took notes during interviews and also noted my reflections directly after each interview had finished. This was useful as I could track my reactions to certain topics and reflect on how my own positionality affected the way that I was interpreting the information.

In working with the transcripts I used an approach called ‘Bricolage’, that is, an “eclectic form of generating meaning through a multiplicity of ad hoc methods and conceptual approaches” (Kvale, 2007, p. 115). In undertaking bricolage, I used both inductive and deductive approaches. I started my analysis of the transcripts by coding the information. Charmaz (2006, as cited in Saldana, 2009) says of coding that it “generates the bones of your analysis...integration will assemble those bones into a working skeleton” (p.8). Words or a very short phrase were used as codes to encapsulate what had been said. I attempted to use the words of the participant wherever possible in order to start with a grounded theory approach. A grounded theory approach seeks to build theories from the information provided (Charmaz 2007, Corbin & Strauss 2008). I then took this initial coding and developed these codes further based on themes or concepts derived from the information. This is the part of coding which Charmaz likened to a working skeleton.

I then took a deductive approach which Kvale (2007) terms a “miners approach”, which is to use my research questions and analyse the information in order to explore how the information and my interpretation fits in with those questions. I developed broad themes under each of the research questions and categorised each code according to which of the themes best represented it. This had the benefit of directing my analysis to ensure that it had answered the research questions.

I found analysing the information obtained through coding to be a useful way of condensing and categorising such a large amount of information.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations are integral to the design, implementation and presentation of research. Denzin and Lincoln (2008) outlined ethical issues needing attention by interviewers including: informed consent of those being interviewed, confidentiality, and the verifiability of the information collected by the interviewer. In order to meet university regulations to undertake the research, ethics approval was applied for and granted by the Victoria University of Wellington Ethics Committee.

Informed Consent

Participants were provided information on the research at two stages. This was to ensure they could make an informed decision about whether to participate. Firstly, participants were told that ethics approval had been granted from Victoria University of Wellington. An information sheet (Appendix II) and consent form (Appendix III) were provided to participants when initial contact via email was made. Secondly, I read through the information sheet and consent form with participants, and required that the latter be signed by the participant before each interview commenced, thus ensuring that the participant was aware of what was happening, and what they were consenting to.

The information sheet outlined the aims and objectives of the research; the ability of participants to withdraw from the research at any given time until the thesis had been published; the ability for participants to request a copy of their transcript or sound recording (only one FBO requested a copy of their sound recording); and an assurance of confidentiality and privacy through storage and presentation of information.

The consent form elicited written permission from each participant: to be interviewed, to be recorded during the interview, and to have the information collected from the interview presented as research in my thesis and other publications. The tape recorder was not turned on until participants had signed the form.

Confidentiality

To maintain confidentiality, given the small size of the faith and development community in New Zealand, I decided to omit any markers that might identify either the organisations or the individuals interviewed. This assisted participants to talk freely and frankly but had a negative effect for my research in that it limited the type of information I could present. Some participants did not care about confidentiality and actually expressed their desire to be identified as a way to promote their organisation. I retained anonymity for all participants to accord with the ethics approval granted by the University as well as for consistency purposes. In some instances participants asked me whether I had spoken to certain other FBOs. I responded that I could not say whether I had or not due to the confidentiality clause.

Interview sound recordings were transcribed and kept electronically on a password-secured computer as soon as practical after interviews occurred. Paper copies of the transcript and consent forms were stored in a locked cabinet in the University. This ensured that no other person had access to the information.

Veracity of Information

In order to check reliability of my understanding I attempted to check that I had understood the participant correctly during the interview as recommended by Kvale (2007). I used a technique outlined by Bryman (2007), which he terms “formulations”. I repeated information that I had heard to ‘preserve’ it. I also used my own words: ‘what I understand you said is...’ to describe what I had heard in what Bryman (2007) calls ‘transforming information’. This is also an essential part of analysing information during the interview. This has the benefit of testing the findings with the participants, and limits the need to seek validation of findings later (Kvale, 2007).

For the participants that had paper-based documentation, this was generally useful as it provided another source of information to cross-reference the information collected

during the interview process. This method is termed ‘triangulation’ by Bryman (2004) and provides a variety of ways of assessing the veracity of the same information.

As outlined earlier, many participants asked me what my motivation was for undertaking this research and what my religious background was. In these instances I provided the participant with an overview of my religious background and an overview of the development literature and how I came to undertake my topic. This was an important step in establishing trust and rapport with the participant.

The researcher should consider how their research will represent an organisation (Bryman & Buchanan, 2009). I present the findings as a unified representation of organisational opinion, and do not concern myself with how views diverged within each FBO. I chose this approach because the participants generally had a small number of employed staff (less than five), and because I generally spoke with staff who had been involved in the organisation for a number of years and were either the founders, or senior managers within the organisation.

Limitations

I did not give participants a list of questions before the interview. In part this was because I did not want participants to prepare answers to questions, as I feared that such answers might be policy prescriptions from the organisation, rather than descriptions of what is actually happening in the organisation. In hindsight however, the lack of preparation for participants may have resulted in some of the participants giving an unclear response to how they saw their faith interacting in their development work.

I did not send participants their interview transcripts to check for two reasons. Firstly, I was conscious of taking up participants’ time, particularly when some of them had already spent several hours with me during interviews. Secondly, due to the length of some interviews, the transcripts alone were in excess of 17,500 words each. I was under

time constraints already and could not factor in more time to receive comments from participants.

The majority of participants were from Christian organisations – only three participants were from non-Christian faiths, which is consistent with the religious make-up of New Zealand. However, the organisations represented a cross-section of denominations from within Christianity. The narrowness of the range of participants with different faiths means that it is hard to generalise my findings to non-Christian organisations. Despite this, I decided to include the other faiths in my research, as opposed to making my thesis focused on solely Christian organisations, because of my interest in other perspectives.

My positionality as researcher may have affected the interview interaction. As a self-identified non-religious person, I wondered whether my interaction in the interviews may have been different if I professed allegiance to the participants' faiths. This concern however may be more reflective of my own secular bias as only in one of the interviews was I asked to accept an offering of a bible and in in-depth explanation of the benefits of their religion.

Outside the scope of this research, but potentially useful, would have been to witness these organisations undertaking their work in developing countries. This would have provided another method of triangulation. It would be informative to note any disconnect between what the participants report and what actually happens in practice. However as outlined earlier in my phenomenological approach it was not my intention to evaluate the effectiveness of their work, rather, to capture their perceptions, even if those perceptions were consciously portrayed for my benefit.

Introduction

Following on from the discussion in Chapter 3 of the different categories of FBOs in my sample, in this chapter I will explore the ways that faith influences the development work of the FBOs.

Development literature posits that spirituality is an integral component of recipients' lives and should be taken seriously in development work (Goulet 1980, Wilber & Jameson 1980, Ver Beek 2000, ter Haar 2006). Academics have argued that secular organisations have instead ignored recipients' spirituality in their work (Ver Beek, 2000). I will consider whether FBOs are more effective in incorporating and engaging with recipients' spirituality in their development work in contrast to secular organisations.

Some academics maintain that it is primarily the mission of FBOs that distinguishes them from secular organisations. Others argue there is a range of FBOs from those whose missions are indistinguishable from secular organisations (Beneditti 2006, Thaut 2009), to those who consider the promotion of their religion to be their central aim. Hovland (2008) observes that even within the same FBO there can exist a range of missions. I will explore whether this observation applies to the FBOs in my sample.

One key question is that of how and to what extent FBOs' faith manifests within their development work. As Thaut (2009) argues, "without understanding the role of faith, it is impossible to identify the advantages or drawbacks of faith-based humanitarianism – its inherent tensions" (p.321). It is to the practice of FBOs' development work, and the tensions within that work that I now turn.

This chapter will explore how FBOs approach religion in their work and outline where this differs from the approach of the secular donors as outlined in the literature review. I will explore the extent to which the FBOs engage with recipients' spirituality and whether they hold their own biases towards a particular religion or faith as Clarke (2006) and McDuie-Ra and Rees (2008) have argued that donors do.

Religious Motivations for Undertaking Development Work

FBOs that undertake development work can be characterised as either 'intentional', having an explicit development agenda, or 'non-intentional', where work that appears to fit the description of development is undertaken, but in an unsystematic way; sometimes without any acknowledgement by the organisation in question of any development aspect to their work. This distinction can be seen most clearly in the ways that FBOs are first motivated to undertake development work. In what follows I will give a brief account of the two principal ways that this happens. Firstly I will consider organisations that were set up principally as Christian missions but which turned to development work at some point; secondly I will consider organisations that were set up primarily to undertake development activities. Finally, I will outline how a sense of religious duty can provide both types of organisation with the motivation to undertake development work.

Non-Intentional Development

There are a range of missionary organisations in my sample. Some have a long history, spanning more than 120 years; while others have been established in the last decade. The mandate of such missionary organisations can usually be understood in terms of 'conversion', that is convincing non-believers to join their religion.

To varying degrees these organisations undertake development activities as part of their mission work. The concept of mission work has evolved beyond conversion to include development as a key part of that work for these organisations, rather than an adjunct to

their mission work. One organisation, acknowledging the evolving concept of mission, stated,

from the white person going into places that don't know about God and waving the Bible and all those sort of things...to responding to needs either within the church and supporting social services of the church in various places, or simply just responding to the needs of schooling, medical clinics, all those kinds of things. (KI8)

Organisations of the type alluded to by KI8, although originally engaged in many development activities as part of their mission work, have chosen to focus on development work in its own right, albeit to varying levels. Another reason for this shift in the mandate of mission work is the interest in the practical needs of others, as opposed to purely spiritual needs. One organisation commented, "it kind of started at a time where there was a global interest amongst churches in engaging with issues like poverty and injustice of the world". (KI5)

Some FBOs have a divergence of views within their organisation on whether development work or mission work should be given greater precedence. This finding is similar to Hovland (2008) who noted a long-standing debate within the Norwegian Mission Society on how development and mission fit together. In contrast, some organisations retained a primary focus on their mission work. KI16 commented,

And so probably our main focus is on the ministry work and getting alongside people, perhaps counselling them, giving them encouragement. And then alongside that, if we identify a need we then try and organise that. Whereas, somebody like the [organisation name omitted], their main focus is more the practical aspects. That's their major focus, and ministry comes secondary. So to our organisations there are different focuses.

Of the missionary organisations in my sample, the majority are moving towards explicitly undertaking development work as opposed to more traditional roles. To facilitate this, these FBOs have developed their organisations in different ways including establishing separate institutional development arms to their mission work and incorporating the development work within their mission work.

Intentional Development

In contrast to the missionary organisations outlined above, other FBOs were set up primarily to undertake development, that is, development work was an intentional and fundamental part of their establishment.

The majority of these FBOs undertake work domestically as service providers, such as providing social services (family counselling, for instance) in New Zealand. These FBOs continue to undertake their domestic work alongside their internationally-focused work. These institutions generally decided to undertake international development work after receiving requests from religious figures or institutions in developing countries, such as bishops or churches. Requests to these organisations typically cover a variety of needs such as health, education, religious development and church development. Some of these FBOs noted a ‘hunger’ from people in developing countries who were requesting the assistance of their FBOs instead of non-FBOs. KI17 stated: “because I go into many impoverished and difficult places, and people – they really just do hunger for things of God, because they just don’t see any other way you know”.

Some FBOs did not wait for requests, rather they identified needs themselves and set up their international work around that. A number of these FBOs established their work as an expression of their faith. KI1 stated after undertaking a discrete project in giving some aid that “this was a really defining moment for us in terms of that is what we want to do, it’s the front end of Christianity”. These FBOs do not necessarily have any history of mission work overseas but rather were set up as charitable trusts in order to undertake work which was understood by them to be an expression of their faith. KI3 stated: “simply, I felt God told me to start the charitable trust. So in prayer and stuff like that. So I had faith in that and started doing that”. Most of these organisations are relatively new, established in the last decade, perhaps indicating that this is a new phenomenon in New Zealand.

Development Work – A Religious Duty

I will now explore this concept of religious duty underpinning the FBOs' development work. This allows a more in-depth understanding of why they engage in the work they do, and will thus pave the way for a discussion of how they treat faith in their work.

Faith was reported by all the FBOs as the *raison d'être* for their development work. Speaking on how their religion underpins their development work, KI10 stated that "it's the reason we do what we do." KI11 remarked on how it considered that a faith motivation is the difference between an FBO's development work and a non-FBO's development work

I just think that we need to emphasise that much of the humanitarian stuff, the feeding, the clothing, the healthcare and whatever, for us, is an outcome of people who are wanting to serve God, and to bring Christ to people. And I think that is a point of difference.

This finding supports as Berger (2003) identified, that it is primarily the religious beliefs of the FBOs which distinguishes them from secular organisations.

All of the FBOs identify teachings within their religious doctrine, for example biblical passages or Buddhist teachings that motivate them to undertake development work. These religious teachings instil a sense of religious duty in FBOs to undertake development work as KI4 noted:

Look, there are conditions and situations which shouldn't be. We believe that it's not God's intention for people to live in depravity, poverty and chaos and that sort of stuff. We believe it's our corporate responsibility to bring about change, to be part of that change.

Some of the organisations have these teachings formalised in written documents such as mission statements and values frameworks; for others they are not formalised. FBOs outlined a variety of religious teachings that serve as motivation for their development work. Teachings included: loving thy neighbour; assisting the poor; bringing about justice; practicing what you preach; and establishing God's kingdom on Earth. As Tyndale (2003) and Lunn (2009) identify, there exist commonalities between the

principles and values propounded by different religions that can serve as a positive development model.

A small sample of FBOs reported that they believe God will judge them adversely if they do not meet their religious duty to assist people. KI10 stated:

I came across the story where Jesus is talking about that there will be an end of the age, all of the nations, all of the people groups will be brought to one place and there will be a form of judgment...and I thought, this is pretty heavy. But what was the judgment all about? People who are hungry, people who are sick, in prison, homeless, naked, needed help, and [God will judge] ‘you helped them so there is a reward for you’. And others didn’t help. So sorry, ‘there is punishment for you’.

However FBOs did not identify needs in developing countries from a solely religious perspective. KI10, commenting on the FBO’s workers noted that

Some of them are just more practical workers but with a passion...I guess they have a great awareness of the benefit of growing up in a place like New Zealand, and the huge needs and disempowerment that so many face in the grind of just existing in poverty.

Some FBOs reported feeling that their organisation, or other FBOs, had failed to meet their religious duty to undertake development. KI8 commented thus on some churches: “churches are pathetic, they’re asleep. The only people that are awake are the young people”. KI1 noted that religious teachings espoused that the needs of the poor should not be forgotten and that the church was originally set up to help the poor. KI1 criticised churches for deviating from this religious duty to assist people: “so all these churches now that are [not assisting people] are made into something quite different ... not necessarily bad, but not necessarily Christianity”. Some FBOs felt that secular organisations were working in development because, as KI8 states,

perhaps all these aid agencies came about because the church forgot what it was about, what it was supposed to do. The church turned into a club. While it turned into a club, the needs were still there.... So they [aid agencies] picked up the slack, while we were sleeping others got on and did it, and hopefully now we’re waking up and doing it as well.

The FBOs highlighted a variety of teachings within their religious doctrines which compel them to undertake development work. Some Christian-based FBOs also commented that the concept of Development came from Christianity, and that development was therefore a religious duty for them. This accords with arguments of those academics who deconstructed the discourse of development and drew parallels between development and religion, Christianity in particular (Ufford & Schoffeleers 1988, Rist 1997, Lunn 2009). However this raises the issue of the concept of Development can be found within other religious traditions. As Thaut (2009) highlighted, there is a diversity of theological traditions, particularly within Christianity that motivate different Christian groups to undertake development work. My findings also demonstrate that religious groups other than Christian groups are involved in development work as they believe it to be an expression of their faith.

By the Power of God

Some Christian FBOs also reported that God took an active role in influencing and shaping their development work. In this respect their organisations' development work, and in some instances, establishment, is considered as being directed by God rather than by the staff of the organisation. God is reported as playing a pivotal role in bringing people together to undertake the work, directing the nature of the work, enabling the work to occur, and providing staff with miraculous healing powers.

One key theme was that of the 'extraordinary ways' that God brought people together to commence work. KI9 commented,

This is the miracle of it. How do any of us come together? ... We all feel that God calls us. So many different stories And we've come from such difference places. Why would you pluck someone from Tonga, Australia, Fiji, England, Ireland, South Island, and you didn't even know each other? And you are all sort of coming here to this group of dedicated and committed people to the work we are doing.

KI17 noted the extraordinary ways that their organisation would receive requests from people in developing countries to assist them:

Our pamphlet which went via [organisation name omitted], to Hawaii, and from Hawaii it ended up with a young couple in a remote area of India. It was quite extraordinary. And quite extraordinary that this letter that he posted and my response got to him, and it was just the way things work. The way I would say God works.

Another related theme is that God directs who should undertake work and what they should do: several FBOs noted that “people become fired up to mission, or God calls them into mission” (KI11). Even more specifically God directs which countries people should work in: “God has called them to go to that country” (KI13). KI3 noted that they are “strongly influenced by prayer and by what God tells us to do, he tells us to go out to a place” (KI3). KI4 noted how God continued to direct their work while it was underway. The concept of “journeying” was used to refer to the experience of receiving inspiration from God while working with communities.

These FBOs reported that they had faith in God to provide for their organisation, and that this motivated them to undertake their work. God was perceived as not only providing for work in terms of sources and skills, but also ensuring the effectiveness of work through God’s involvement. KI7 noted that they have “faith in terms of when we go and pray to people – that God is going to touch people’s lives and change people, and lead us and guide us. And the whole thing is done on prayer really, by praying”. The explicit belief is that God would provide for these organisations. KI3 noted that, “I had a vision to start with ... that I felt God was going to supply lots of funds, so I believe that we’re going to keep on growing in that way” (KI3). Moreover, this organisation would use skills that God had given them: “using what we think God’s given us to go out and do these things [their development work]”. Thus there is a perceived dependence on God by these organisations – a perception that without God, none of their undertakings would be successful.

In addition, some FBOs reported that God enabled healing to occur in recipients. Healing is considered to be done by God (albeit through an FBO practitioner). KI16 stated,

it’s not us that have done the healing, it’s God. And that’s the faith healing through prayer...something that is faith-based; it’s something that obviously God in his infinite

wisdom or emerging grace heals someone. That is obviously a faith. Because I personally haven't done it. I've just opened myself up to be the channel for God to use me in and touch someone's life. Ok, because on my own I couldn't heal a fly.

The finding that a response to God is a key motivation for undertaking development work is mirrored in a study by Garland et al. (2009) which cites one of the common motivations for protestant volunteers to serve is their experience of God. My finding demonstrates that this is a key motivation across a number of Christian denominations.

To conclude, this section demonstrates how religious doctrine compels individuals and organisations to undertake development work. This religious motivation identified by the FBOs confirms as Putnam (2000) argued that the power of the divine can directly motivate action. For these FBOs, religious teachings and experience of God is not only motivating their development work but compelling them to undertake their development work as a religious duty, a moral duty. Even those organisations whose mission and sometimes development work is indistinguishable from their secular counterparts are motivated by faith. I will explore this idea of religious duty further when discussing the expectations of faith-based donors on FBOs' staff and wages.

The FBOs hold a religious identity which has been considered by some such as Berger (2003) and Beneditti (2006) as a key part of what makes them different from secular organisations. I will now turn to a discussion of how FBOs translate their faith identity into their development work. I will give an overview of how the FBOs in my sample reflected on the place of religion in their development work. Firstly I will outline what the FBOs considered appropriate ways to deal with their religious identity as an adjunct to their development work. Next, I will explore how FBOs change the content of their development work by incorporating religion into their work.

Organisational Practice and Tensions

Religious Identity and Propagation of Faith

In some instances the recipients of development work share the same faith of the FBOs. A ‘hunger’ for religious assistance from development recipients who already share their faith was noted by the majority of FBOs. Requests for development assistance came through the FBOs’ religious networks such as bishops, vicars, churches, and individuals based in developing countries. This agrees with the findings of Narayan (2001) that recipients may trust FBOs more than secular organisations, demonstrating the concept of religious and social capital (Putnam 2000, Iannaccone 2003).

FBOs reported that churches in developing countries requested assistance to undertake services such as evangelism or the provision of religious schools. Other requests involved investing in the church administration in order to make it self-sufficient, prayer, providing religious services, types of religious training, “standing with recipients” and “for things of God”. As Jeavons (1998) noted, an ideal type of religious assistance could apply to services that church congregations undertake, such as religious education. Religious assistance can be considered a point of difference between FBOs’ development work and that of non-FBOs.

In other cases, the recipients do not share the faith of the FBOs. In these cases the FBOs reflected on what they considered appropriate ways of propagating information about their faith with recipients. Their responses span a spectrum from being open about their faith identity to actively seeking conversions. The majority of FBOs thought they should make their faith identity clear to recipients. One organisation commented, “When the opportunity arises, [we shouldn’t] be shy about saying we are a church” (KI8). In comparison, KI9 thought that their faith identity and that of recipients was a moot issue, as their religious doctrine is explicitly based on assisting all races and creeds without bringing up religion as a discussion. KI9 commented on their founder who their organisation’s beliefs are based on that:

she worked for all creeds. And there is a story that as her coffin was going down the street, a man said ‘What religion is this woman?’, and the other man working on the road, leaning on his shovel said, ‘That is a question that she never would have asked you or me’. (KI9)

Other FBOs reported instances where they felt they needed to conceal their faith identity. These FBOs reported that some recipients had negative experiences with other FBOs, such as child abuse, which resulted in the recipients being unwilling to engage with them. As KI1 stated when they are dealing with recipients of this nature, “we don’t go in saying we are faith-based unless it comes up. We are not waving it out there”.

Many FBOs also discussed how they concealed their faith identity in what they termed ‘restricted access countries’. These are countries which are considered outwardly adverse to those FBOs representing faiths other than those condoned by the state. FBOs felt they needed to conceal their identity in these countries because of the danger posed by the authorities. As Armstrong (2003) argued, there is a real danger to staff of FBOs that work in countries which do not adhere to their religion. The FBOs keep the names of the restricted access countries they operate in and people who are working in them a secret so as to protect their identity. In some cases they entered countries under the aegis of the secular development arms of their organisations in order to avoid detection. These FBOs noted however that their concealment stopped at the authorities, and they were open about their faith identity to the recipients of development assistance. FBOs reported that at times the authorities of these countries had restricted their operations as they perceived that the FBOs were talking about their faith when they should not be. The FBOs acknowledge the risk that their mere presence in a restricted access country may incite conflict, raising the question as to whether the FBOs are doing more harm than good in regards to development in these countries (Haynes, 2007). As Clarke (2006) argued, donors may have operational challenges when supporting FBOs whose work may be a source of conflict as would appear to be the case in restricted access countries.

As an example, the Buddhist organisation in my sample reported that the Tibetan recipients of their development work already adhered to Buddhism as it has permeated

the culture in Tibet, and the issue of their faith identity was not an issue to recipients. However it was an issue with Chinese authorities who shut down some of their operations in Tibet; the authorities did not have control over the operations and saw this as a threat to their power. As Pallas (2005) highlighted, recipient governments can be reluctant to allow funding to FBOs as they may be seen as a potential political competitor.

On the other hand, one interviewee gave an example where authorities in a restricted access country accepted their work. Speaking of their work through the mission arm of their organisation, KI7 stated “In Bangladesh as a Muslim country, in actual fact, our experience was that as an explicitly Christian organisation we had more acceptance than some of the secular agencies”. When questioned why they thought this to be the case, the interviewee continued:

Because Muslims don't understand secularism. And they suspect an ulterior motive behind secularism. Whereas if we declared ourselves as Christians, they understand who we are and are happy for us to be working there. There was an incident in one of the areas we worked in Bangladesh [with the mission activities], where there was a big protest against the work of NGOs because they were seen as undermining Islam. But they specifically said ‘we are quite happy with your work’. We had a maternity hospital and child health programmes that explicitly started every day with a bible reading, but that was no problem. Because it was all there and upfront, and known, [that is] ‘where we come to you we know what we're getting. Whereas with secular NGOs there is a suspicion that they have ulterior motives’.

This statement supports Giri et al.'s (2005) argument that secularism could be perceived not as a neutral position to religion but as a rival religious claim. It also shows that even when working in restricted access countries: a situation where it is considered FBOs would be at a clear disadvantage to secular organisations (even by their own admission), the FBOs may actually hold an advantage to secular organisations.

In some instances, there was a blurring of the religiosity of the request. Some FBOs even acknowledged that religious-seeming requests for religious training or bible support seemed to disguise other non-religious aims such as a desire to have an education and learn English, rather than to receive the religious training itself. KI9 described how in a

Pacific island country they were requested to establish a religious school by their religious counterparts, “a lot of Indians were not Catholic. They were so keen to come in and get a good education, because we were New Zealand teachers, they would learn English well you see”. Another organisation recounted how non-Christians requested that their organisation provide religious services to them: “Even though we are Christians, a lot of non-Christian people would like us to spend time with them, praying with them, encouraging them. And they would say, ‘neat, someone has come to talk to us, and see where we are at’” (KI16). In this example, non-Christians were requesting prayer for such things as passing their school exams. These examples show that like the authorities in recipient countries, recipients sometimes accommodate different religious views demonstrating that a ‘clash of civilisations’ does not always occur as outlined by (Huntington 1996, Thomas 2004, Habermas 2005).

Giving these varying degrees of acceptance of their religiosity, many FBOs also reflected on what they considered an appropriate way to educate recipients about their faith. This included an identified fine line between talking to recipients about the FBO’s faith and actively seeking to convert the recipient. An amount of evangelism was considered acceptable by some FBOs as long as it was done in an appropriate way; without what they deemed as ‘coercion’. Only a few mission FBOs stated that they were explicitly bringing the gospel to developing countries alongside their development assistance. For these organisations their key focus was on recipients adopting their faith as opposed to development work. KI11 stated: “...the hospital is not only serving and helping save lives and provide medicine, but also bringing the Christian gospel to these places as well...providing a spiritual component”. At times the development work was considered a necessary means to facilitate this conversion. KI13 commented,

[the missionaries’] main objective is to teach [recipients] that Christ died for their sins...The fact that we all need a saviour because we have all fallen short of God’s standards, that’s for sure. And that’s their main purpose, to go and tell them that there is forgiveness, that God will forgive. When they get there, they see these other needs they see someone in need so they help them.

Generally, the secular development arms of missionary organisations had no need to undertake conversion as part of their development work, as the religious parts of their organisation engaged in that practice separately.

Several FBOs which undertook development as their primary goal also reflected on conversion within their work. This finding shows divergence from Thaut's (2009) typology, which includes under the term "evangelistic-humanitarianism" FBOs that seek to undertake development work with the primary goal of conversion of recipients, but not FBOs whose primary goal is development but that also undertake conversion incidentally.

Some FBOs reflected that discussing their religion with recipients may lead to people adopting their faith, but noted that their development work was not a prerequisite for this. As KI10 said "we certainly wouldn't make [adopting our religion a requirement for development assistance], it's not a requirement – 'if we do this for you, we want you to do that'...we would never play that game" (KI10). KI8 mused that development assistance should be a prerequisite for FBOs before they begin to spread the news about their faith: "when do we get the right to be even spreading the news about the gospel ... if we are not even going to respond to [their] human needs first?".

Giving people the opportunity to 'journey with God' (the God of the FBO), was selected by some FBOs as an appropriate way of dealing with their religious motivation to bring people into their faith. Many FBOs describe the concept of being on a 'journey with God' which refers to a development of faith. As one organisation noted, "we're not missionaries in the sense of trying to get people to join; we're teaching people to develop their faith ... so it's teaching rather than evangelism" (KI12). Journeying appears to be a half-way point between merely being upfront about their faith identity and actively encouraging someone to join their religion. As KI4 stated, "We do let people know that we have a Christian background. Some people say that they don't mind but are prepared to journey with it. People are increasingly ok with it these days" (KI4). At the end of the

journey FBOs reported that it was ok if the recipients did not adopt their faith, “and if at the end of that journey they say no, well that’s fine” (KI8).

To conclude, possessing an organisational identity based on faith can be seen as an advantage when working with recipients who hold the same faith. This enables religious capital to form and facilitates relationships between recipients and FBOs under which development work as well as religious assistance can be undertaken. FBOs are sensitive to the inherent tensions of working with people of other faiths, particularly in countries where their faith identity is not welcomed by authorities. In these instances FBOs reflect on how they can appropriately educate or, in the case of mission organisations, convert people to their faith, in addition to undertaking development work.

Development with a Religious Flavour

Building on the above discussion on how FBOs address their identity and seek to propagate their faith, I will next explore how the FBOs integrate religion into their development work.

Townsend et al (2002) and Thomas (2004) argue that FBOs are being co-opted into a secular development framework by donors. This results, they argue in the removal of any distinctly religious character from their development work: with the result being that the content of development remains secular. As outlined earlier, where missionary organisations have set up secular development arms, these are cleansed of all religious content. FBOs of this type Thaut (2009) terms “accommodative-humanitarian”, and she argues they “may be unsuited to, and even ignore the role of spirituality in the lives of the beneficiaries they assist, thereby potentially rendering their work less effective, disrupting the religious culture of the community” (p.347).

Some of the FBOs in my sample however clearly articulated how their development work intertwined with their religious values. The FBOs set up as service providers all clearly

articulated how their development work is infused with their religious values. In all cases this was reflected formally in policy documents.

KI4 reported that their development work is based on a ‘holistic framework’ and considered this explicit incorporation of religion into their work to be unique. As KI4 noted, “everyone needs a framework, and our one is unashamedly a Christian, Jesus-centered framework”. Another service provider, KI17 said their organisation brought “the Christian faith and professionalism together so that one flows out of the other. So they’re not divorced, but that they are an integral part of who we are and the services that we deliver”. KI17 reported that this approach to their work was applauded by development partners that they had trained because of how “our Christian faith and professional knowledge had been married in together”.

KI4 reported how it used their concept of religion and development in their response to a request for religious assistance from recipients. The request was from members of a community to make their young people better Christians. KI4 stated that their response was to “give them training around a more community-based approach to mission, what we term as mission – this is to understand the context, the needs of the people, empowering them and dignity and all that sort of stuff.”

Other organisations sought to incorporate religious values into their work, but had no formal articulation of how this would work in practice. Instead, aspirational goals were formed by these FBOs. Some FBOs reported that they thought it important to consider recipients’ spirituality when it aligns with their own. As KI1 stated,

our intention is to build the whole person because people are not one dimension they are physical, mental, social, spiritual, so we are quite comfortable to bring those dimensions in. If they allow us to serve everywhere apart from the spiritual then we will still serve.

KI1 continued on how it tried to incorporate religious values into its work: “the scripture said Jesus brought the truth and grace. If you just hand out the truth to everyone in poverty...you can’t get people to change in an atmosphere of truth...it takes grace” .

Another organisation used the term ‘holistic ministry’ to describe how their faith may be incorporated into their work so that they can engage with a range of issues:

the rubbish issue, defecation, or water, [in the community they are based in] or it might be how do you be a church and bear witness to God in this community without being seen as an out for out proselytiser or manipulator of people’s minds and emotions. (KI5).

Other organisations noted that the absorption of their religion by recipients would result in development. “It’s an influence ... of Godliness amongst that place. In the way they grow with the Lord” (KI3). In this way, development would occur as the recipients inculcated the religious values of the FBO.

As Jeavons (1998) argued, it is not the products or services that FBOs implement which differentiates them from secular organisations, but rather the way they go about their work, whether or not their work reflects their religious values. The service providers in particular were able to demonstrate how they changed the content of their development work by infusing it with their own religious beliefs. This gives their work a point of difference from secular organisations. This point of difference could provide them with an advantage when working with recipients of their own faith.

In comparison to explicitly integrating religion and development, the Buddhist organisation in my sample, KI15 argued that these two things are already intertwined in their development work by virtue of their recipients’ religion permeating every aspect of their life. They commented,

In one sense you could say you cannot, strictly speaking, make a distinction [between religion and development], because for the Tibetan people their religion is their life. It’s inextricably woven in. But in terms of training someone to be a motorbike mechanic, how he incorporates that into his Buddhist kind of practice, how he approaches his learning from a Buddhist point of view, that is his responsibility. But from an outsiders’ point of view, and objective point of view, you may say that it’s not Buddhist.

This comment by KI15 expands the argument made by academics such as Ver Beek (2000) and Balchin (2007), that recipients may not always require development organisations to incorporate spirituality into their development work. Just because a

recipient is religious does not mean that their faith has to be incorporated into every development intervention. As Balchin (2007) argues in some cases it may be inappropriate to do so, or result in an imposition on the recipient.

Despite their reflection on how they treat their own religion with recipients, there was limited discussion by FBOs on the faith of recipients when recipients did not hold the same faith as FBOs. A few FBOs acknowledged that recipients have their own faith which may not coincide with theirs,

you're very aware, it's all around you, the religious you know. The religiousness or the spirituality of the people you are working with. It's just in your face everywhere...whether it's an idol somewhere, or an altar, or a temple, or someone in religious clothing, a Buddhist monk or whatever. It's just everywhere. People have things around their necks, and bracelets on their arms, which all have a spiritual significance. (KI10)

In general, however, there was a lack of engagement in, or consideration of such faiths by the FBOs. This finding agrees with Bradley's (2005) research on a Christian organisation working with Hindus in India, which found that the Christian organisation did not engage with the recipients' beliefs.

Some FBOs perceived a danger associated with supporting recipients' religions if this support could be used for nefarious ends such as inciting conflict. As KI10 noted, "we would not go out of our way to encourage a religion that we thought might lead to extreme militance, terrorist behaviour for example". The idea that supporting a recipients' alternative religion may lead to violence illustrates some FBOs' negative views, stereotypes and lack of interest in recipients' religion when it differs from theirs.

Only one FBO, a service provider, brought up anything positive about recipients' faith when it was different from their own, and actually stated that they have developed a formal policy on how to work with differing faiths. KI2 stated: "so for us, it is not about Christian values, it is the best in what we have in indigenous religions as well". This organisation used the term 'open discussion' to refer to a discussion about religion that did not privilege their religion over the recipients, "for us it is not about proclamation

about one sect over another, or one religion over another, it's about an open discussion about spirituality that is liberating and not constricting and constraining of people" (KI2). This open discussion is in contrast to those FBOs outlined earlier who focus only on the parameters in which they could discuss their own religion with recipients.

This organisation acknowledged their uniqueness in basing their work on recipients' faith stating,

[our organisation is] very unique, because we've had to find new concepts [in basing their work on recipients' religion], rediscover old concepts and bring [the recipients' religion] forward to our own disciplines in which we build new knowledge and new practices. New ways of doing our work. (KI2)

Thus, their exploration of the faith of others is not static as some of the development literature criticised (Balchin, 2007) but rather can be negotiated in each unique situation. In this sense, this organisation is not treating religion as a doctrine separate from culture, but rather something which is interwoven within it. Also meeting the criticisms from those who argue against the blanket acceptance of religion, this organisation commented that, "what we are saying is that there are some things in some of our culture that are not sacred at all, but would be liberating to leave. There is an element in each of our cultures that is sacred which would bring forward liberation – those are the elements we are most interested in" (KI2). This FBO meets the aforementioned hope of the development literature, namely that the recipients' values are considered a moral basis for society, not an optional extra, and therefore be incorporated as a basis of development work (Lunn 2009).

Conclusion

To conclude, there are a variety of ways that FBOs seek to integrate their religion and development work together. There is an awareness and active discussion on how to appropriately share their faith with recipients and following on from that how to explicitly include their religious beliefs in their development work, with the result being a uniquely colouring. The majority of FBOs did not report engaging with recipients'

spirituality unless it coincided with their own, thus limiting the supposed comparative advantage that FBOs may have over secular organisations in engaging with issues of spirituality in cross-faith contexts.

In this section I have demonstrated with the exception of the secular arms of the mission organisations, the FBOs seek to varying degrees to incorporate their religious beliefs directly into their development work. This challenges the assumption of Berger (2003) that it is primarily the mission work of FBOs that distinguishes them from secular agencies. As such FBOs appear to offer a unique type of development style. I will now turn to a discussion of how FBOs believe that their faith can affect their relationships with donors.

Introduction

As outlined in Chapter 3, there are a variety of organisational types of FBOs in New Zealand such as charitable businesses, service providers, umbrella organisations and missionary organisations. In this chapter I will explore the landscape of FBO/donor relationships in New Zealand and highlight how donors' views impact on the work of FBOs.

FBOs have the ability to draw on and mobilise their extensive faith networks as a source of support for their development work. A sense of religious duty to undertake development work is promoted within some FBOs, linking the FBOs to their religious constituents and providing a spiritual dimension to their work (Jeavons 1998, Smith & Sosin 2001, Ebaugh et al. 2006). The FBOs are able to capitalise on their faith networks' deep commitment to this sense of religious duty and pool together both human resources and long-term funding sources for their work (Bornstein 2002, Ferris 2005, Garland, Myers & Wolfer 2009).

The extent to which FBOs use faith-based sources for their resourcing impacts on their ability to retain their faith objectives within their work (Jeavons 1998, Berger 2003, Thaut 2009, Bradley 2009a). The majority of FBOs are thought to maintain organisational independence by remaining privately funded through their faith constituents (Berger, 2003). This organisational independence results in them operating outside the mainstream development industry and not being compromised by secular demands on funding. This raises the question of how spiritual economies operate in my sample of FBOs and what impact they have on the FBOs work.

Academics have demonstrated that the mainstream development industry is secular and largely ignores the work of FBOs (Ver Beek 2000, ter Haar 2009). This is due to a perceived irrelevance of religion in modern secular society (Deneulin & Rakodi 2010, Selinger 2004). Moreover, secular donors have been criticised by academia for letting their secularism become ‘a barrier’ to consideration of religion in development (Giri et al. 2005, Alkire 2006, ter Haar & Ellis 2006). This raises the question of whether these broad findings concerning the international development industry are applicable to the development industry in New Zealand.

The literature also highlights disadvantages for FBOs when operating in a secular donor environment. Some academics argue that FBOs accessing secular donor funding compromise their objectives and as a result the religiosity in their work decreases (Tvedt 1998, Adamu 1999, Bornstein 2002, Townsend, Porter & Mawdsley 2002, Ebaugh et al. 2006). These FBOs are said to be co-opted into a secular development framework. Some academics argue donors are increasing their engagement with FBOs as long as they follow a secular model for development. Donors have also been criticised for a bias toward mainstream Christian organisations at the expense of others types of FBOs (Clarke 2006, McDuie-Ra & Rees 2008). In this chapter I will explore how the FBOs in my sample negotiate their religiosity within a secular funding framework.

A Brief Overview of Major Funding Sources

Firstly, I will highlight the key donor relationship for the FBOs in my sample. It is difficult to quantify the funding sources of the FBOs. As part of the requirements under the New Zealand charitable trust legislation, FBOs are required to fill out annual returns. The majority of FBOs interviewed completed annual returns within the last year, a small number receiving a waived requirement. Of the ones that had filled out returns, it is difficult to ascertain which income was received to fund their international work as opposed to their domestic work, and which funding was received from faith-based sources. Some broad generalisations however can be made. The majority of funding

usually comes from donations/koha. Other income, including investment income, comes a close second, followed by government funding for contracts and grants. Funding for services comes next followed by a very small amount under grants and scholarships. Gross income of the FBOs interviewed was between zero to over 2 million New Zealand dollars. The majority of the FBOs report a gross income of over NZ\$100,000.

As the table below shows, the majority of funding comes from faith-based networks. External funding outside the faith-based networks was not as prevalent, despite being sought after by some of the FBOs. Service providers were generally funded through external funding. Some of the FBOs received Government funding to support substantial project work and others had received subsidies from the New Zealand Aid Programme for supporting disaster relief in a dollar for dollar match of their fundraising. Some organisations complained that they were not eligible to give tax rebates to their donors and this discourages donors from giving them funds.

The table below shows the main funding sources as highlighted by each organisation.

Table 3: FBOs' funding sources

<i>Key informant number</i>	<i>Religious affiliation</i>	<i>Main funding source for development work</i>	<i>Other key funding sources</i>
1	Church-based	An international company	Voluntary Church fundraising
2	Domestic service provider for a church	Multilateral donor organisations	Raise funds through project work Church donations
3	Charitable Trust set up by an individual – separate from churches	Self-funding through own donations	Yet to seek other funding
4	Service provider- across denominations	Government funded	Funded through an international FBO
5	Missionary organisation	Relational Christian funding	

<i>Key informant number</i>	<i>Religious affiliation</i>	<i>Main funding source for development work</i>	<i>Other key funding sources</i>
6	Service Provider - Branch of international network	Members through membership fees, volunteering, bequests	Don't seek funding from other sources
7	Umbrella church organisation – separate development arm from missionary organisation	Churches of the same denomination	Government funding Other FBOs
8	Umbrella church organisation – separate development arm	Churches of the same denomination	Bequests from church individuals or church trusts
9	Church-based on congregation	Self-funding – income from businesses/commercial interests	Bequests, volunteers
10	Separate development arm to mission organisation	Relational through Churches and religious individuals	One NGO
11	Umbrella church organisation - separate development arm to mission organisation	Churches of the same denomination	Volunteers, Government funding – subsidies
12	Charitable business	Business income	Volunteers, Business investors
13	Church congregation	Individuals from church	Volunteer missionaries
14	Charitable business, no church affiliation	Business income	Investors Charitable funders
15	An informal group around a religious leader titled a Lama	Private donations – humanitarian rather than religious sources	Humanitarian Organisations
16	Missionary organisation	Churches of the same denomination	Voluntary from church members
17	Service provider – inter-denominational	Trusts	Government subsidies Prayer support

Spiritual Economies

Religious Networks as Donors

In this section I will discuss the importance of faith networks as the primary source of funding to the majority of FBOs, and the issues that arise as a result of this dependence. I will explore the idea that remaining privately funded through their faith constituents enables the FBOs to maintain organisational independence (Berger, 2003).

For some organisations this funding decision to seek funding from faith networks is formalised. For instance, KI6 only receives money from its members through membership fees and bequests. Other organisations seek funding from within their faith networks due to a perceived affinity from their shared faith. KI16 said, “If we’ve got a message and an identified need and we go and sell it to people in the [church denomination omitted] churches, they are more readily able to identify with the need and support it”.

Faith networks acting as donors include: congregations, religious groups, and denominations across New Zealand depending on the level of coordination of the FBO. For example umbrella organisations coordinate support from across a whole denomination. KI8 receives funding of approximately two million dollars each year, mainly from its churches. It still receives funding from other sources, but these are minimal. KI8 stated:

Donors to me are 400 parishes and a whole lot of individuals that have expectations on us, that are totally different from the expectations that the government has...donors isn't government.

Other organisations may seek support from a single congregation. KI10 stated “all our financial support has come through churches, either as churches as a unit or individuals within the church”. FBOs also have extended faith networks including domestic and

international and inter-denominational faith networks. Some FBOs reported an expectation that the recipients of their development work also contribute financially. For example, KI9 highlighted that their FBO expected recipients to fundraise in their country to contribute to the development work. That the majority of FBOs seek funding from within their own faith networks first and foremost highlights the importance of social capital (Putnam, 2000) to FBO funding. That is, drawing on the relationships between the people in the faith networks and their commitment to their faith which motivates them to pull together resources. An example of how FBOs use social capital is the formal religious “endorsement” for their development work. In these cases, FBOs are embedded within a formal religious infrastructure such as a church group or umbrella group of numerous churches, making them formal recipients of funding from their faith constituencies. KI13 reported,

If the elders give [the missionaries] their blessing and send them, then you don’t send them and not supply what they need. It is part of our duty as an assembly. First of all to supply their needs...we must see [the missionaries] are looked after and provided for et cetera, and if they start up any work as best as the Assembly can, we give towards that work, building a new church, or a school or a hospital or whatever they are doing. [The Assembly] has special collections and may be labelled for the hospital building, the hospital work, or the eye clinic or whatever they are doing.

This endorsement is significant because it shapes this FBO’s development work as religious work. Smith and Sosin (2001) identify that the more dependent on religious sources an FBO is, the more linked to faith their work is.

In some instances, funding was thought to be provided directly by God: “we lived on divine providence” (KI9). In discussing how their work was historically funded at an orphanage, KI13 explained that God provided resources for their work, which they termed “living by faith”:

They [the workers] rely on God to supply all the finances for all they need, all the food. Because there were many times when they woke up in the morning and had nothing to eat, and they would have their prayer breakfast and then there would be a knock at the

door, and suddenly the baker is there and he has all this bread that he couldn't sell, so [the baker] said, 'I'll take it to the orphanage'.

KI13 went on to outline how this was a response to prayer by God, facilitated through their faith networks:

this was all in answer to a prayer. That they had prayed that God would supply their needs. So this [prayer] was basically getting around to the Christians who have a great desire to help people in other places who need money, food, and that sort of thing.

KI3 also described how God provided for their organisation: "we believe in God and that he is the supplier of our needs. We feel that that is a great advantage of being faith-based. We believe that God is the one that supplies it all". In contrast to KI13 however, KI3 stated a belief that resourcing did not need to be limited to faith networks: "I believe God can supply through anyone". A belief that funds come from God provides motivation to undertake challenging and sometimes risky work.

One purported advantage to faith-based funding FBOs reported is the sustainability of their funding sources. This sustainability can be understood as both an expression of religious duty as well as an expression of trust in the FBOs. As Putnam (2000) highlighted, social capital is based on trust and it is essential for social networks to produce value. A key part of some FBOs' strategies to secure long-term funding is the leveraging of personal connections within their faith networks. It has given them a dependable funding base not reliant on the vagaries of international donors or government policies; and significantly there are far fewer restrictions on how that funding is used.

The majority of FBOs cultivated close personal relationships with their faith-based donors. One organisation developed a prayer handbook in which it listed all its affiliated missionaries who undertook international development work. This prayer book enabled individual donors and church groups both to pray for the workers and to provide monetary donations. This type of marketing allows donors to directly link themselves with people undertaking international development work in an intimate fashion,

providing both spiritual and financial support. KI5 considered their approach to be very spiritual in comparison with other organisations: “with [some] organisations, [marketing to donors] is done impersonally, but we front up to individuals and say, ‘we are going to do this work and we can’t do it on our own, we need your support’”. FBOs considered that such close, personal relationships provided greater security for them because of the mutual respect and trust that these relationships fostered. In contrast, they perceived secular donors such as government to be driven by political consideration.

One of the charitable businesses, KI12, operated away from faith-based donors and took pride in its ability to operate away from conventional religious infrastructure. This was driven by its faith teaching that conventional religious infrastructure was hegemonic. As KI12 stated:

So yeah, up until the last ten years, I felt like I was beating my head against a brick wall because people didn’t understand. But now there are lots of people around the world who have been studying this revelation and so there is what’s called the [name omitted] that is increasing around the world. And so it’s quite different from what’s accepted in the normal church...but when it comes to actually committing your life fully to God, you are the only one that knows. So there is no church as such that you can go and join. So it is individuals all throughout Christendom, like in the church and outside the church that have this commitment to serve God one hundred percent, one hundred fold.

In order to stay true to their anti-institutional principles, this organisation undertook to fund itself to maintain their independence from other sources including faith-based sources. This finding provides an alternative example to the literature which does not identify FBOs that self-fund and operate outside traditional faith networks.

Faith-based funding sources enable the FBOs to undertake development work that otherwise they might not be able to provide. That the majority of FBOs seek funding from faith-based donors, Berger (2003) argues, means that they are more likely to retain their organisational priorities than if they had received funding from outside their faith-based networks. However, a number of FBOs reported a divergence of opinions within their faith donor networks on where and how the FBOs should be focussing their

development work. Jeavons (1998) argues that the fact that FBOs acquire their resourcing from religious sources is not enough to assess the religiosity of a given FBO. Rather, one must look at whether those sources shape the work – whether the work itself is considered religious work or not. KI8 spoke of how some of their donors thought that they should focus on conversion rather than development work, which was not their own view. This demonstrates that the organisational priorities of an FBO are not clear cut when it comes to faith-based donors' expectations. Counter to Berger's assumption, faith-based networks are not necessarily homogenous groups and priorities of donors may alter FBOs' priorities, in the same way that secular funding can affect them. This is important because it demonstrates the complexity of faith-based donor relationships within their spiritual economies. As highlighted some FBOs have formal mechanisms for endorsing where their development work sits within the priorities of their organisation; however for other organisations, despite endorsement to undertake development work, it is open to interpretation by constituents where development fits in with their religious priorities. My findings show that FBOs may have difficulty prioritising their religious objectives within their work to begin with; and some FBOs hold a wide divergence of views within their organisation on how development work should be undertaken alongside other religious objectives.

Religious Workers and Wages

The literature outlines that FBOs rely significantly more on volunteer staff than secular organisations (Wilson & Janowski 1995, Garland et al. 2009, Cnaan, Dickin, Jones & Salomon. 2010). Ebaugh et al. (2006) showed that FBOs mainly source volunteers and paid staff from their faith networks. In agreement with the literature, FBOs in my sample use a mixture of volunteers and paid staff from within their faith networks rather than from outside their faith networks. In contrast, some FBOs gave examples of non-religious volunteers assisting them on one-off occasions. In this section I will explore the issues around the religious dimension to employment within FBOs, whether voluntarily or paid.

Firstly, some FBOs reported that their staff are expected to work voluntarily, for sub-market wages, or for long hours, as part of their religious duty. This duty may be institutionalised due to a theological underpinning, for example a formalised vow of poverty. As KI9 stated, “the Sisters didn’t get paid wages, so that made a heck of a difference on how you run places. They were very cheaply run”. Religious duty may also be an informal expectation. One participant, commenting on their own employment in the FBO, said, “part of it was this thing of expectations, and I am working in this job and it is expected that as a matter of course I would do 15 percent per week for free” (KI8). The interviewee went on to link this expectation with the historical example of priests: “go back to this history where the parish priest would only get money in his pocket based on what the collection plate was” (KI8). The religious duty may also be predicated by the organisation. For example, KI16 placed the onus on those going on missions to pay for their own travel to recipient countries: “we got the team members to pay airfares and everything”. As Bornstein (2002) and Ferris (2005) highlight in such instances there is a commitment to faith displayed by the staff which motivates them to work.

The question of wages is considered a topic of fundamental philosophical importance for some FBOs. The interviewee from KI6, a post-traditional FBO, commented on the possibility of their organisation moving away from a voluntary arrangement into a waged arrangement: “it’s a very complex question in that it gets into the philosophy of [our organisation], because it was set up deliberately by [the founder of the organisation, name omitted], that we don’t receive money from it”. Questioning that decision, the interviewee went on to ponder whether they should receive a wage or not: “And I questioned it too. [That’s if] I could do this full time, more people could receive [the service provided]”. However the interviewee noted that introducing a wage could have negative effects on their motivation for undertaking the work. KI6 said that if they changed their organisational structure so as to provide wages, “it’s ludicrous but it would

change, and I know what it would do to me, it would totally change my motivation as to why I was helping. I would start looking at it as a business”.

Another example of the importance of the spiritual dimension in volunteering is evident in KI12’s charitable business in New Zealand. KI12, an organisation based on faith principles of poverty and operating on the will of God, commented,

we are pretty careful that we don’t pay anybody over [in recipient countries] to do anything. Just like I don’t get paid either, I do this voluntarily and live on my wife’s wages. So all projects we have run so far have been by people that we know over there but they do it not for financial gain...the projects are basically being run by pastors of churches over there...so you know they have a relationship [with us] for spiritual purposes as opposed to monetary purposes...so that’s quite good. Because you get a lot of people that are seeking the white man’s money...but we’ve never had any in the past. So the last time I went to Africa, I actually went there on 50 cents per day, so that was quite a challenge. So you sort out those who are interested in the message compared to your money pretty easily that way”.

This demonstrates how faith can promote volunteerism thus giving the FBOs an advantage over other development organisations in securing low cost labour. From a conventional economic rationalist perspective this could be considered labour exploitation. However, as Gibson-Graham (2006) and Healy (2008) argue, diverse economies offer alternative reward systems. The spiritual reward FBOs offer can be considered an alternative to the conventional economic idea of reward.

FBOs also reported there could be problems with faith-based funding sources as faith networks often expect them to work on a limited budget. In some cases the promotion of cost-effectiveness is pursued to the detriment of being able to provide adequate administration for large sums of money. KI18 commented, “Some of our harshest questioners and critics are from the churches, usually borne from not understanding. It’s like ‘sorry you can’t run a nearly two million dollar organisation completely on volunteers, it’s impossible””.

FBOs' expectations concerning staff remuneration are not however always fuelled by faith. In some instances, expecting staff to work on a voluntary basis or for less than market rates was necessary because FBOs did not have the money to meet those costs. As KI9 noted,

the hardest thing that got us in the end is the wages...there were no more Sisters to work in the hospital, and you had to pay out big wages for the people to work in the hospital. In the early days the doctors gave their time, but in the later years that wasn't really practical, they had families to keep. Some would donate it back [wages] but others would take it. Then it became very expensive. We were losing [dollar figure] running this hospital per year.

Generally faith does act as an enabler for FBOs in securing workers at a low cost. Because the FBOs are carrying out religiously sanctioned work, it possesses a spiritual dimension for volunteers. As a result FBOs appear to have an advantage in mobilising human resources for their organisation over their secular counterparts.

To conclude this section, I have demonstrated how the spiritual economies of the FBOs in my sample operate and how they impact on the FBOs work. The spiritual economies generally operate through formal organisational endorsement of the development work which requires constituents to support the work. In addition a close relationship with those undertaking the development work is forged through personal relationships with donors.

In general, the spiritual economies provide multiple benefits to the FBOs, through access to funding sources which enables them to undertake development work that they would otherwise not be able to undertake; through the sustainability of these funding sources; through the provision of low cost labour and human resources support; and through support from God. These spiritual economies illustrate the concept of spiritual capital and build on Putnam's (2000) concept of social capital. However, there is divergence

within the spiritual economies in how development work aligns with other religious objectives.

Some FBOs reported that they sought funding from secular donors in addition to their faith-based sources. However this was limited to government funding through the New Zealand Aid Programme or tax concessions, or funding from trusts. This is because for some FBOs their faith morally forbade them from accessing some secular funding sources. Many FBOs reported that they either had a policy position developed or were in the process of developing a policy position on whether they should access funding which had been sourced from gambling or from taxes on ‘morally questionable’ products, such as cigarettes or alcohol. FBOs held a wide variety of positions on this issue, with some organisations reporting that at times they had sought such funding, but had then changed their position. Some argued pragmatically that the funding had been sourced from people in need, and therefore it should be used, whereas others argued that the money was tainted and should not be used. A large portion of grants in New Zealand come from New Zealand Lottery Grants; this is a contentious issue for FBOs and many will not accept grants from this source.

To secure secular donor funding generally required great effort by FBOs to ensure that the secular donor understood the religious dimension of their work. I will now discuss how the FBOs perceive the dominant secular culture in New Zealand, and the perceived funding constraints involved in securing secular donor funding.

Spiritual barriers

Secular Culture in New Zealand

The literature argues that within modern secular society there is a perceived irrelevance of religion (Selinger 2004, Haynes 2007, Deneulin & Rakodi 2010). As Selinger (2004) and Marshall & Van Saanen (2007) argued, the separation of church and state in the West can be considered crucial in shaping the development industry’s treatment of religion.

Development studies has used this Western model of secularisation, that is, ascribing a place for religious institutions in terms of state-religion relationships, as a normative model for its development work. In what follows I will highlight how the FBOs perceive secular culture in New Zealand society and the impacts that it has on their work.

FBOs consider ‘the secular’ as opposed to ‘the religious’ to hold a more privileged position in New Zealand. As KI1 reported, “New Zealand is known as the most secular country in the world” (KI1). Some Christian FBOs commented that New Zealanders are moving away from religion, resulting in fewer people in New Zealand holding religious beliefs. The 2006 New Zealand census shows that 34.7% of the population state they have no religion (of the people that filled out the census), up from 29.6% in the 2001 census. From 2001 to 2006 people affiliated with a Christian denomination fell from 60.6% to 55.6% (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Some Christian organisations reported what they believed was an embarrassment in New Zealand concerning Christianity in particular: “we have this embarrassing [attitude that says] ‘no, we’re not [a Christian country], we’re a secular country’.” (KI8).

Furthermore, some FBOs reported a belief that public expressions of Christianity were no longer acceptable. This finding aligns with the wider literature on ascribing a place for religion in society (Selinger, 2004). One interviewee mused that “if we had all the development leaders in [a development conference], we would be struggling to start it with a prayer, or even an expression of spirituality, unless you drive it from a cultural angle” (KI2). The interviewee then went on to juxtapose the comfort they claimed that government and society would have with a cultural type of welcoming, to the discomfort that might be experienced if the development conference were started with a Christian prayer. “A conference in New Zealand”, the interviewee continued,

would have to be either Pacific or Maori hosting, whereby you would have the welcome, the powhiri, and that would be a spiritual thing, or a kava ceremony, and then you get into prayers and acknowledgment of people’s presences...but it would be a really strange experience for people to start the meeting with a prayer [without the cultural aspect as outlined above].

This hypothesis of discomfort for Christianity displays that participant's own feelings of marginalisation. In the account above the interviewee does see an acknowledged space for Christianity, but only when expressed by the non-dominant cultures. In this case, the Christianity of minority cultures such as Maori and the various Pacific island cultures are thought by that FBO to be tolerated more readily through 'a cultural angle' by a secular audience.

Many of the Christian FBOs reported that despite Christianity being sidelined, other religions seem to enjoy support from government and other institutions. This finding extends the literature on religion's place in secular society. One organisation commented on the treatment of other religions, "it's like their culture and faith [i.e., of non-Christian religious entities] come in as one ..., other religions, other faiths are supported by [government and other entities]". This organisation believed that unlike Christianity, which is perceived by secular society as separable from culture, the converse applies for other religions. KI8 continued, "It's actually said [by government and other entities that] 'culturally we've got to allow the Muslims or the different types of faith to do the things they do'".

Similarly, two post-traditional religious FBOs reported that they considered their organisations to be sidelined by New Zealand society; however they believed a shift was occurring in their treatment by society. KI14, speaking of how their work used to be perceived, stated, "People would respond to us by 'go hug a tree'". KI14 went on to say,

We also have a way of being able to frame our work in such a way that they [others] don't think we are completely mad. But there are a lot of really mad people out there that are very sane. You know normal life is absolutely insane, the way our planet is operating. So-called normal politics, normal economics, normal environmental practices are absolutely insane, so you've got to be a bit unusual to be normal if you know what I mean.

Contrasting this with people's perceived positive perception now, KI14 went on to say, "But now when I talk to people, they say [the work] is modern, fabulous...so the world has changed. It has caught up with us". KI14 gave an example of a donor that became an investor in their organisation:

it's extraordinary the number of people that are beginning to think the way we are thinking. So for instance one of our investors is a billionaire in [place name omitted]. Basically he wants to do something really good for his life, and is looking for ideas to help the planet. He has become convinced of reincarnation and intelligence on other planets which seems to be pretty common sense. And it's like, 'woah guys, this is just what I'm after'.

Another post-traditional organisation KI6, stated that personal experience was generally the means by which people became members of, and donors to, their organisation:

If people are interested [in our service] something resonates. Because they are looking, and they know something is there. And it's usually more by example or experiencing something like the [service]. That's the way most new people are coming in. 'Wow, that's amazing, I'd like to learn how to do this' because they would like to do it to someone else. And that in a way is the biggest marketing thing, through people receiving [the service].

KI6 went on to give an example of how people came to perceive through personal experience the efficacy of their service, and how that draws people to their organisation.

One example is a guy who is a plastic surgeon, and he came in because he experienced someone [who] fell on a bbq somewhere and there was a third degree burn, and [the person] would have been badly scarred. And someone was at the bbq and [provided a healing service] and started work on [the burn], and that's why [the doctor] joined the organisation...[the doctor thought] 'wow, it's a healing technique that heals burns'.

This perception of newfound credibility of some religions highlights a gap within development literature – there is limited mention of the rise of these types of post-traditional religious FBOs.

Secularism as an imposition

As outlined earlier, the influence of secularism on development theory has been noted within development literature. Academics have highlighted that secularism has become a 'barrier' to supporting FBOs (Giri et al. 2005, Alkire 2006, ter Haar & Ellis, 2006). In this way donors have been criticised for promoting secularism at the expense of other approaches.

The FBOs contrasted the widespread religiosity in recipient countries with the secularism in New Zealand. One organisation commented “countries like New Zealand seem to be priding themselves on secularisation” (KI1). Another organisation said:

When you think of Indonesia, PNG above us [New Zealand], and then the Pacific islands around us, New Zealand and Australia are surrounded by faith-based people, and we’re the odd ones out (KI17).

A general feeling by FBOs is that donors should be required to explain their ‘secular bias’. As KI2 wanted to ask secular donors, “how do you keep atheism to yourself?”, mimicking a similar question that donors often ask of FBOs. I have outlined above how some FBOs claimed that they were keen to ensure that they did not impose their religion on recipients. It appears that the FBOs have concerns that donors are imposing their ‘culture of disbelief’, despite faith being important to recipients. It is assumed the donors themselves do not acknowledge that their culture of disbelief is value-laden. One FBO commented,

You take away a Christian belief system and put your neutral belief system [secularism], it’s still a belief system. But in [the minds of those who promote secularism] they think they are being tolerant but in fact they are putting their own belief system (KI1).

These concerns are similar to those raised within development literature, that is, imposing secularism at the expense of other approaches could be considered imperialistic as argued by Sweetman (1999).

As outlined earlier, KI2 developed a formal policy on how to engage with the spirituality of others. This interviewee criticised donors for ignoring religion in their work. This finding supports Alkire’s (2006) postulation that secular development experts may lack an awareness of the significance of religion in the lives of recipients. KI2 contrasted the difference between acknowledging religious protocols and understanding development issues from a religious perspective. On donors who accompanied them on an income-generating project in Samoa, KI2 commented that, “[the donors] were very sensitive and polite [to the recipients] who wanted to pray and talk about religious issues”.. However these donors were thought by the interviewee to not fully understand development problems from a religious perspective,

but those concerns that [recipients] are talking about [that is,] the close relationship to the environment, would not be seen as a spiritual concern by the [donors], they would see it as an environmental concern (KI2).

KI2's comments support Sanderson (2007) and Ver Beek (2000) who argue that a dichotomy between the sacred and the secular can have a profound effect on development interventions.

My findings in this section show that most FBOs believe that the secular nature of New Zealand society marginalises their organisations. This finding agrees with the themes in the literature, that the wider development industry has sidelined religion.

Negotiating Religiosity within a Secular Development Framework

Establishing Credibility within a Secular Framework

Development literature highlights an inherent view that secular development is science-based and therefore superior to a religious basis for development (Ufford & Schoffeleers 1988, Ver Beek 2000). As Ver Beek (2000) argues, this material/scientific bias shapes a dichotomy in development studies between the sacred and the secular. In this section I will report how FBOs sought to establish themselves as credible to secular donors.

Several FBOs consider their professional credibility should be of paramount importance to donors and should be more important than faith. For example, once they had established a reputation as a credible provider of services they considered they would be assessed on that alone. KI1 stated, "one issue is credibility and establishing your organisation ... as providing services and doing good". Many FBOs reported that they sought external evaluations of their work and marketed their work in ways that they believed would be considered credible by secular donors.

Firstly, some FBOs reported that they sought science-based evaluations of their work to prove the effectiveness of it. These organisations did this because they considered that

secular donors, as highlighted by Alkire (2006), approached the issue of religion as something negative or “weird or wacky” (KI6, KI14), and therefore not worthy of serious consideration. One organisation, talking about the concept of spirit, stated: “in the Western World...spirit is this willy-nilly Willy Wonka sort of concept which means you float off in a cloud of belief” (KI14). KI2 commented that their motivation to undertake science-based research on their service stemmed from a desire “to show the outside world that there is more to it than just a spiritual technique” (KI2). This is due to a demarcation between science and religion as highlighted by Sanderson (2007). “The work [of Western donors] is very driven by medical explanations for health and well-being. And in a lot of those explanations there is not the regard for spirituality or for religious backgrounds of people” (KI2). As a result, FBOs sought to fit their work into an evaluation framework that would maintain credibility with donors.

KI2 reported that their organisation’s work on spirituality had not received the mainstream attention that would enable secular donors to readily understand their work. They felt that the onus was on their organisation to market their work in a way that donors could understand:

we are one of the organisations that work at the edge, and we’ve had to develop work to respond to that edge, and we’ve had to develop a vocabulary in each of these areas, [list omitted] and sometimes the funders have not usually gotten a hold of this, or this has not been mainstreamed enough for the funders to become aware of it. So by the time we get the funding, they haven’t got the language or the theological awareness. Sometimes we have those kind of struggles...I think it puts the responsibility on us in working with these kinds of values to take these types of concerns and mainstream them into the lingo of policy makers, researchers or whatever.

KI2 went on to present an example of how donors might not understand their work on faith in development. KI2 stated,

something of a truly religious or spiritual basis, like the regard for the environment, if you wrote it in such a way that it looks too spiritual or religious it won’t be funded. You have to write it in such a way that it is acceptable to the funders. So there is always that tussle. How do you get into the language, technical explanations for things that [donors] have. And how do you start bringing in your own words, metaphors that speak to your

own faith-base and spirituality, and start mainstreaming it. There is always a tension (because [the donors] are the decision-makers), on how much you should push it. That the work of KI2 may make donors feel uncomfortable supports Alkire (2006) and ter Haar and Ellis (2006) who show that secular donors have difficulty talking about religion. This discomfort impacts on the FBOs' work and ability to raise funds from these sources.

Government Funding and Tax Restrictions

One key theme within the literature is that FBOs compromise their religious objectives to access secular donor funding (Tvedt 1998, Bornstein 2002, Townsend, Porter & Mawdsley 2002, Ebaugh et al. 2006). Some academics argue that being co-opted into a secular development framework renders the FBOs little more than Oxfam with hymns (Thomas, 2004), that is, their development work becomes indistinguishable from that of secular organisations.

Some FBOs with a non-intentional development focus reported they were unable to access New Zealand Government funding.. Government funding in New Zealand includes direct funding such through the Government's international aid agency (New Zealand Aid Programme, Ministry Foreign Affairs and Trade), and indirect funding through tax concessions. In order to access Government funding several FBOs (KI11, KI10, KI7) created subsidiary or stand-alone organisations solely focused on development work with no reference to faith, whilst retaining a solely missionary focus within their main organisation. This finding demonstrates that the secular bias of donors impacted on the FBOs development agenda, This agrees with the findings of Tvedt (1998), Adamu (1999), Thomas (2004), Bornstein (2005), and Olson (2008). As Thaut (2009) argued that the removal of religion from development work renders it less effective by ignoring spirituality in the recipients. However, my finding also shows that far from forgoing their religious objectives, these FBOs in fact retain their religious objectives but through a different mechanism. I will explore this further below.

KI7 reported a formal decision that their missionary organisation and their secular development organisation work separately in developing countries. In practical terms, this meant that staff of each organisation are not supposed to work together. In addition, there was a demarcation of the focus of their work. KI7 illustrated this separation with the example that they would only build a secular school because they are not using their development work to promote religion, whereas their counterpart mission organisation supported theological colleges. KI7 stated: “while we are working from a faith-based motivation we are not using this money at all for promotion of religion, only for development purposes.” One arm of KI10’s organisation is concerned with religious aspects such as church planting, performing baptisms and making disciples, whilst their development arm is focused solely on development devoid of any religious content. KI10 reported that the reasons for the distinction between the mission and development work were unclear to them, and they felt the distinction was forced upon them by Government funding, and Governments in developing countries.

KI7 did not see the removal of religion from their development agency as compromising their character, as they still retained their mission focused activities. This organisation continued to direct their marketing at their faith constituents alongside accessing Government funding:

In terms of promotional materials that we produce ourselves for fundraising purposes, most or all of them will be directed at the churches, that’s our main constituency, that’s where we look for most of our funding, except for situations where we look for other organisations like government funding...we do regular adverts in the [religious group omitted] publications.

This marketing at faith constituents for a secular development agency indicates that faith constituents can still consider development without any reference to religion as religiously-sanctioned work. This supports Jeavon’s (1998) finding that when assessing the religiosity of an organisation’s funding, the research should look not at the sources of the funding but rather at whether the resources are sought for and used for explicitly religious work. Ebaugh et al. (2006) argue that there is a negative relationship between government funding and religiosity. That these organisations deliberately separated their mission work from their development work to access this funding appears to support this

finding. However, given that these organisations desire to undertake development work as a religious duty, even when devoid of explicit religious content, that Ebaugh et al.'s correlation is limited in its implications.

Some FBOs were critical of other FBOs' work particularly around conversion: "historically, in the name of things done by mission organisations some of the agendas [such as conversion] do need to stand up to critique" (KI4). Some FBOs mused that the Government could not be seen to support the spread of a specific religion, particularly in countries which do not generally adhere to that religious practice, such as the countries termed 'restricted access countries' by FBOs. Supporting such religions could be a source of a diplomatic conflict, and therefore not likely to be funded by Government.

Despite this, FBOs such as KI7 and KI10 retain a significant focus on mission work including promoting their religion in countries where this may be considered taboo. This raises the question of whether retaining both a focus on mission work and development work as Tvedt (1998) argued is problematic in practice, especially when these FBOs are receiving government funding to advance their development work while also receiving funding within their faith networks to advance their mission work.

In comparison to the above organisations, the service providers reported receiving funding from Government without feeling they had been co-opted into a secular development framework. The service providers retained their religious flavour and procured a significant amount of their funding to support their programmes. This contradicts Smith and Sosin (2001) who posit that service providers who rely heavily on government funding will change their services to become more secular. Unlike the postulation of Ebaugh et al. (2006), there is not always a negative relationship between government funding and religiosity. As an example, KI2 sought to secure government funding by marketing their work so that government staff could understand it, rather than changing the content of their development work.

Other FBOs reported that they lacked access to Government funding due to substandard accountability standards in their organisations. Many FBOs felt that although they undertook their work ‘in good faith’, their accountability standards were not yet sufficient to satisfy requirements of secular donors including Government. This does not mean that they could not achieve accountability, but rather, that these standards were not required by their faith constituents and so had not been invested in. However, as outlined earlier, the religious donors generally did not understand why an administration cost should occur. This sometimes prevented the FBOs from setting up the standards they needed so that they could access other donor funding. Some FBOs chose to piggy-back off other development organisations with adequate accountability standards already in place.

Thus, FBOs are developing different models for negotiating their religiosity within a secular development framework and successfully securing funding from secular donors. In this regard, the criticisms from academics such as Clarke (2006) and McDuie-Ra and Rees (2008) that donors are increasing their engagement with FBOs as long as those FBOs only perform secularised development work has limited application to the New Zealand context. While some FBOs did report that they felt they needed to remove all reference to religion from their development work, others clearly articulated how religion is incorporated into it. This shows that faith may not be such a constraining factor for secular donors if clearly disclosed upfront. Moreover, the FBOs that did remove religion from their development work retained their religious objectives through a separate mission part of their organisation, thereby enjoying both faith-based and donor funding. This indicates FBOs may face fewer disadvantages when accessing donor funding in New Zealand than previously thought.

Conclusion

In this chapter I explored how secular and faith-based donor funding is changing the landscape of FBOs in New Zealand. Extending the literature that FBOs need to negotiate their religiosity within a secular development framework, I have identified that FBOs

also negotiate their religiosity and development work within a faith-based framework. Firstly, for some FBOs they desire to operate outside traditional faith networks where their faith dictates they remain separate from religious institutions. These FBOs avoid negotiating their religiosity and development work by self-funding thus demonstrating that FBOs' faith can dictate the funding model the FBO decides on, independently of the donor landscape. Next, the majority of FBOs secure funding from within their spiritual economies, where support for the FBO is generally formalised providing FBOs with a sustainable funding source. When there is a divergence of opinion on how to undertake development that meets their religious objectives, FBOs negotiate within their spiritual economy. Thirdly, FBOs have successfully secured funding from secular donors by removing religion from their work, while others clearly articulated the role of religion. My research thus demonstrates that the FBOs operate on different funding models which can be shaped by not only donor expectations but also by the expectations of the FBOs.

To conclude my thesis, I begin by presenting a summary of the main research findings. I will then recap the main points from the critical discussion and address the aims of the research. Lastly, I will suggest areas for future research arising from my research topic.

Responding to Research Questions

The main question of this research has been ‘How do FBOs perceive that their faith enables or constrains donor relationships?’. To answer this question I have identified the funding arrangements of FBOs, identified how important FBOs’ faith is to their organisational identity, investigated how faith manifests in their development work and explored how FBOs negotiate their faith in their work and in their relationships with donors. I will highlight the significance of my research by demonstrating how it has extended the existing literature.

FBOs’ Treatment of Religion in their Development Work

The literature asks how and to what extent FBOs’ faith manifests within their development work, and whether this renders them distinct from secular organisations (Jeavons 1998, Berger 2003, Thaut 2009, Bradley 2009a). Moreover it has been questioned whether FBOs’ faith identity provides them with the ability to better engage with recipients’ spirituality in their development work (Putnam 2000, Berger 2003, Benedetti 2006, Clarke 2007, Hovland 2008). My findings show that FBOs are compelled to undertake development work as a religious and moral duty, and that their faith identity translates into a distinct form of development assistance in some cases.

The FBOs’ faith identity affects their ability to deliver their development work both positively and negatively. An advantage that a faith identity gives them is the ability to easily connect with religious networks in developing countries and with recipients who

share their faith. This results in the FBOs being requested by those networks and recipients to assist them. In these situations, the FBOs are more able to incorporate their religious beliefs into their development work. In contrast, FBOs' faith identity posed problems when working in so-called restricted access countries, where authorities did not want FBOs to propagate their faith. In these cases they were impeded in their ability to undertake their development work.

In resonance with Goulet's (1980) plea to development experts to not "act as if man could live by bread alone, as if human destiny could be stripped to its material dimensions alone" (p.4), my research has shown that all FBOs deal with the treatment of recipients' spiritualities in varying ways. For example, missionary organisations seek to convert and colonise recipients' spiritualities from the outset, whereas other FBOs seek to share their message with recipients but stop short of overt conversion. This second category integrate their faith into their development work giving it a distinctly religious flavour. The FBOs in my sample have not ignored religion in their development work, which is the key point of difference to the secular organisations in the field. However FBOs have also demonstrated a clear bias to incorporating recipients' spirituality in development work only when it coincides with their own faith. Only one FBO reported incorporating the spirituality of recipients when it did not coincide with their own.

Spiritual Economies

My research shows that there are advantages to being an FBO. Faith networks enable access to resources that they would not be accessible otherwise. This illustrates the concept of spiritual capital, building on Putnam's (2000) idea of social capital. My research extends the views of Gibson-Graham (2006) and Healy (2008) on diverse economies to spiritual economies associated with FBOs by demonstrating that a number of the FBOs are able to mobilise resources through their spiritual capital, particularly in securing workers at a low cost. Moreover, some FBOs believe that God is part of their spiritual economy and gives them access both to financial resources and extraordinary healing powers. This supports the findings of Bornstein (2002), Ferris (2005), and

Garland et al. (2009) that FBOs are able to leverage their faith networks' deep commitment to religious duty, and shows how spiritual economies can operate on principles other than economic rationalism.

It is argued that FBOs' ability to retain their religious objectives within their work is directly related to the extent to which they draw from religious sources (Jeavons 1998, Berger 2003, Thaut 2009, Bradley 2009a). However, my research has demonstrated that this is not always the case. Faith-based networks are not necessarily homogeneous groups, and expectations of faith-based donors may alter FBOs' priorities just as secular donor support may. This is an important point because it demonstrates the complexities of faith-based donor relationships within their spiritual economies. FBOs who mainly receive funding from faith-based donors are held to account by them. Faith-based donors may also have conflicting expectations. Some FBOs reported that some of their donors had a primary focus on mission work whereas other donors were driven by development outcomes.

My research has found a variety of organisational types of FBO that do not need or want to seek funding from secular donor sources, such as self-funding charitable businesses, umbrella organisations funded by hundreds of churches, and church-based development organisations funded by their immediate constituencies.

Secular Tensions

My research findings demonstrate that FBOs perceive that they are at a disadvantage when applying for funds from secular organisations including Government, as the development industry is largely secular. The literature questions whether FBOs that do receive funds from secular donor sources are able to offer any alternative development or whether they are being co-opted into a secular development framework, reducing them to "Oxfam with hymns" (Tvedt 1988, Adamu 1999, Bornstein 2002, Townsend et al. 2002, Olson 2008). Moreover, Ebaugh et al. (2006) note a negative relationship between those FBOs who seek secular donor funding and the religiosity of their services. My research

has shown that this is the case for some FBOs however it does not apply to all. Some FBOs have positioned their organisation to get the best of both funding worlds. They have established separate development arms within their organisation devoid of any religious reference or content in their development work and retained a religious arm which seeks to promote their faith. These agencies often enter restricted access countries under the guise of their development arms. Some of these organisations feel this demarcation is forced on them by secular donors, and they would prefer to combine their development function and religious function.

As Tvedt (1988) highlights, the artificial separation between mission and development can become difficult in practice. My research demonstrates that an inadvertent effect of secular donors funding the development arms of these organisations is the ability of these FBOs to dedicate more funding from their spiritual economies to solely religious work that might otherwise have also catered for development work.

FBOs who are service providers reported easier access to secular funding when they were clear about how they incorporate religion into their work. One of these FBOs considered themselves on the cutting edge of development, counter to Clarke's (2006) and McDuierra and Rees's (2008) argument that donors in New Zealand only engage with mainstream FBOs. This shows that more FBOs may be able to access donor funding if they can transform themselves into professional service providers.

Spiritual Economies versus Secular Tensions

As outlined in the literature, the broadly secular nature of the development industry affects how development work is performed (Clarke, 2006). My research demonstrates the broader tensions evident in the wider industry between development and religion. In the New Zealand context the differing expectations of a variety of donors changes the way development is undertaken. Most FBOs, even the ones that received secular donor funds, believed their organisations were sidelined in New Zealand. Most FBOs did not seek mainstream secular funding, not only because they did not believe they would be

successful, but also because they obtain sufficient resources through their spiritual economies. These organisations are able to pursue their development away from the gaze of the mainstream development industry.

Some FBOs wanted to access New Zealand government funding, in particular tax concessions, but had not done so successfully. These FBOs believed that New Zealand Government policy discriminated against their organisations; and that the only way they could succeed was to change their organisations in order to meet the policy criteria. The FBOs thought this requirement was unnecessary because they believe their development work and their religious work complement each other. With the exception of the service providers, FBOs that seek secular donor funding generally feel they need to remove all religious content from their work. In some instances this involved splitting the religious work away from the development work rendering these FBOs, as Bradley (2009b) and Thaut (2009) argue, no better placed to address recipients' spirituality in their work than secular organisations. By ignoring religion, as Ver Beek (2000) argued, these organisations are missing an integral part of how development recipients "understand the world, make decisions, and take action" (p.31).

My research highlights a number of FBOs that operate outside the mainstream development industry, and are either self-funding or funded through their immediate faith networks. A challenge for the industry is to work out how to engage with these organisations in order to understand their work and to see if there are positive outcomes that could be replicated within the mainstream development industry in terms of their treatment of religion and development.

Future Directions

My findings demonstrate that a variety of unconventional FBOs exist in New Zealand. Suggested areas for future research include a more quantitative study of FBOs in New Zealand with the aim of identifying the extent of the sector. Such a study would usefully

contextualize the qualitative findings of my research. For example, some FBOs reported feeling that secular donors were sidelining their work, while simultaneously receiving a significant amount of funding from secular donors. In order to map FBOs' funding sources in more breadth, a quantitative approach would be useful.

Moreover, research could be undertaken on what is actually occurring in practice in developing countries, using as a model, for example Bradley's (2005) empirical study of a particular FBO. Empirical studies will help to discover whether there is a gap between the perception held by FBOs, their donors, and the empirical evidence.

Lastly, for those organisations that are incorporating their religion into their development work and are thus changing its content *vis-à-vis* the work of secular organisations, more research could be undertaken to understand the comparative advantages of this approach and to explore its effectiveness for achieving the desired development outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Adamu, F. L. (1999). A double-edged sword: Challenging women's oppression within Muslim society in Northern Nigeria. *Gender and Development*, 7(1), 56-61.
- Alexander, D. (2009). *Health and education - where faith fits*. Retrieved from <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Media-Room/Speeches-and-articles/2009/Health-and-Education--Where-Faith-Fits/>.
- Alkire, S. (2006). Religion and Development. In D. A. Clark (Ed.), *The Elgar Companion to Development Studies* (pp. 502-509): Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Alkire, S., & Barham, A. (2005). Supporting the MDGs: A faith-based movement's story. *Development*, 48(1), 122-125.
- Armstrong, S. (2003) Dangerous Mission: Many aid workers, especially missionaries, are in peril. *Maclean's*, 116, 18.
- Balchin, C. (2007). The F-word and the S-word - too much of one and not enough of the other. *Development in Practice*, 17(4), 532-538.
- Beaumont, J. (2008). Introduction: Dossier on Faith-Based Organisations and Human Geography. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 99(4), 377-391.
- Belshaw, D., Calderisi, R., & Sugden, C. (2001). Introduction. In D. Belshaw, R. Calderisi & C. Sugden (Eds.), *Faith in Development: Partnership between the World Bank and the Churches of Africa* (pp. 3-6): A Co-publication of the World Bank and Regnum Books International.
- Beneditti, C. (2006). Islamic and Christian Inspired Relief NGOs: Between Tactical Collaboration and Strategic Diffidence? *Journal of International Development*, 18, 849-859.
- Benthall, J. (2006). Introduction: Faith-based organisations as Political, Humanitarian or Religious Actors, in *Religion, Politics, Conflict and Humanitarian Action*, 3-7. The Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva.
- Berger, J. (2003). Religious Nongovernmental Organisations: An Exploratory Analysis. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, 14(1),

- Berger, P. (1984). Underdevelopment Revisited. *Commentary*, 78(001), 41-45.
- Berger, P. L. (2009). Faith and Development. *Society*, 46, 69-75.
- Bird, C. (2007). *Blowing the Conch Shell: a baseline survey of churches engagement in service provision and governance in the Solomon Islands*: Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID).
- Bock, J. G. (2002). Communal conflict, NGOs, and the power of religious symbols. In D. Eade (Ed.), *Development and Culture* (pp. 78-91).
- Bornstein, E. (2002). Developing Faith: Theologies of Economic Development in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 32(1), 4-31.
- Bornstein, E. (2005). *The Spirit of Development: Protestant NGOs, Morality, and Economics in Zimbabwe*. Stanford University Press.
- Bradley, T. (2005). Does Compassion Bring Results? A Critical Perspective on Faith and Development. *Culture and Religion*, 6(3), 337-351.
- Bradley, T. (2007). *The Relationships Between Religion and Development: Views from Anthropology*: University of Birmingham.
- Bradley, T. (2009a). A call for clarification and critical analysis of the work of faith-based development organisations (FBDO). *Progress in Development Studies*, 9(2), 101-114.
- Bradley, T. (2009b). Physical Religious Spaces in the Lives of Rajasthani Village Women: Ethnographic Study and Practice of Religion in Development. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 10(1), 43-61.
- Brennan, N. (2009). *Faith: An Obstacle or an Element of Development?* : Irish Missionary Union.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods second ed*. Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2007). *Qualitative research two*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bryman, A. & Buchanan, D.A. (2009). *The SAGE Handbook of organizational research methods*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Candland, C. (2000). Faith as social capital: Religion and community development in Southern Asia. *Policy Sciences*, 33, 355-374.
- Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. University of Chicago Press.

- Casell, C. (2009). Interviews in Organisational research. In A Bryman & D.A. Buchanan (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Research Methods* (pp. 500-516): Sage Publications Ltd.
- Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development – Putting The Last First*. Essex, England: Longmans Scientific and Technical Publishers.
- Charmaz, K. (2007). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Clarke, G. (2006). Faith Matters: Faith-based organisations, civil society, and international development. *Journal of International Development*, 18, 835-848.
- Clarke, G. (2007). Agents of transformation? donors, faith-based organisations and international development. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(1), 77-96.
- Clarke, G. (2008). Faith-Based Organisations and International Development: An Overview. In G. Clarke & M. Jennings (Eds.), *Development, Civil Society and Faith-Based Organisations* (pp. 17-45): Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clarke, G., & Jennings, M. (2008a). Introduction. In G. Clarke & M. Jennings (Eds.), *Development, Civil Society and Faith-Based Organisations* (pp. 1-16): Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clarke, G., & Jennings, M. (2008b). Conclusion: Faith and Development - of Ethno-separatism, Multiculturalism and Religious Partitioning? In G. Clarke & M. Jennings (Eds.), *Development, Civil Society and Faith-Based Organisations* (pp. 260-274): Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cnaan, R.A., Dickin, A., Jones, K.H., & Salomon, M. (2010). Estimating Giving and Volunteering: New ways to measure the phenomena. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly Online First*. 1-29. Published 26 April, 2010.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*: Sage Publications.
- Cornwall, A. (2007). Buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse. *Development in Practice*, 17(4), 471-484.
- Crocker, D. A. (1991). Toward Development Ethics. *World Development*, 19(5), 457-483.
- Curry, G. N. (2003). Moving Beyond Post-development: Facilitation Indigenous

- Alternatives for "Development". *Economic Geography*, 79(4), 405-423.
- Davies, M.B. (2007). *Doing a successful research project: using qualitative or quantitative methods*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- De Cordier, B. (2009). The 'Humanitarian Frontline', Development and Relief, and Religion: what context, which threats and which opportunities? *Third World Quarterly*, 30(4), 663-684.
- De Kadt, E. (2009). Should God Play A Role in Development? *Journal of International Development*, 21, 781-786.
- Deneulin, S., & Bano, M. (2009). *Religion in Development: Rewriting the Secular Script*. Zed Books: London and New York.
- Deneulin, S., & Rakodi, C. (2010). *Religion and the Transformation of Development*. Submitted to : World Development, 1-32.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Dugbah, J. (2009). *The Relationships between Values, Religious Teaching and Development Concepts and Practices: A Preliminary Literature Review*. University of Birmingham.
- Ebaugh, H. R. (2002). Presidential Address 2001 Return of the Sacred: Reintegrating Religion in the Social Sciences. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(3), 385-395.
- Ebaugh, H. R., Pipes, P. F., Chafetz, J. S., & Daniels, M. (2003). Where's the Religion? Distinguishing Faith-Based from Secular Social Service Agencies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42(3), 411-426.
- Ebaugh, H. R., Chafetz, J. S., & Pipes, P. F. (2006). Where's the faith in faith-based organisations? Measures and correlates of religiosity in faith-based social service coalitions. *Social Forces*, 84(4), 2259-2272.
- Eriksen, A. (2009). 'New Life': Pentecostalism as Social Critique in Vanuatu. *Ethnos*, 74(2), 175-198.
- Ferris, E. (2005). Faith-based and secular humanitarian organisations. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 87(858), 311-325.
- Garland, D. R., Myers, D. R., & Wolfer, T. A. (2009). Protestant Christian Volunteers in

- Community Social Service Programs: What Motivates, Challenges, and Sustains Their Service. *Administration in Social Work*, 33, 23-39.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006). *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Gibson-Graham J.K. (2008). Diverse economies: performative practices for 'other worlds'. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(5), 613-632.
- Giri, A.K., Harskamp, A.V., & Salemink, O. (2005). *The Development of Religion/ The Religion of Development*. University of Chicago Press.
- Goulet, D. (1980). Development Experts: The One-Eyed Giants. *World Development*, 8, 481-489.
- Grant Thornton. (2008). *Take a fresh look at some of the Not for Profit issues currently affecting the sector*: Grant Thornton.
- Greany, K. (2006). Editorial. *Gender and Development*, 14(3), 341-350.
- Greeley, A. (1997). Coleman Revisited: Religious Structures as a Source of Social Capital. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 587-594.
- Habermas, J. (2005). Religion in the Public Sphere. *Philosophia Africana*, 8(2), 99-109.
- Harcourt, W. (2003). Editorial Clearing the Path for Collective Compassion. *Development*, 46(4), 3-5.
- Harper, S., & Clancy, K. (1999). 'The way to do is to be': Exploring the interface between values and research. *Gender and Development*, 7(1), 73-80.
- Hauck, V., Mandie-Filer, A., & Bolger, J. (2005). *Ringling the church bell: The role of churches in governance and public performance in Papua New Guinea*: European Centre for Development Policy Management.
- Haynes, J. (2007). *Religion and Development: Conflict or Cooperation?*: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Healy, S. (2009). Alternative economies. *The international encyclopedia of human geography*, Elsevier, 338-334.
- Hearn, J. (2002). The 'Invisible' NGO: US Evangelical Missions in Kenya. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 32(1), 32-60.
- Hefferan, T., Adkins, J., & Occhipinti, L. (Eds.). (2009). *Bridging the Gaps: Faith-based organisations, neoliberalism, and development in Latin American and the*

- Carribean*: Lexington Books.
- Hefferan, T., & Fogarty, T. (2010). The Anthropology of faith and development: an introduction. *NAPA Bulletin*, 33, 1-11.
- Holenstein, A.M. (2005a). Government donor agencies and faith-based organisations. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 87(858), 367-373.
- Holenstein, A.M. (2005b). *Role and Significance of Religion and Spirituality in Development Co-operation: A reflection and working paper*: Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation SDC.
- Holenstein, A.M. (2009). The role and significance of religion and spirituality in endogenous development: A learning process between SDC and NGOs. Retrieved from www.compassnet.org
- Holloway, J., & Valins, O. (2002). Editorial: Placing religion and spirituality in geography. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 3(1), 1-9.
- 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 Organisations*.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon and Schuster.
- Iannaccone, L.R. (2003). *Spiritual Capital: An introduction and literature review*. Prepared for Spiritual Capital Planning Meeting, October 9-10, 2003.
- Jackson, P., & Fleischer, C. (2007). *Religion and Economics: A Literature Review*: University of Birmingham.
- James, R. (2008). Working With Churches, commissioned by World Vision International, Available from http://www.missioncouncil.se/download/18.61632b5e117dec92f47800059793/working_with_churches_rick_james.pdf
- James, R. (2009). *Churches in Development: Learning about change processes in churches and church development organisations*. Swedish Mission Council, SMC Report No.2.
- Jeavons, T. H. (1998). Identifying Characteristics of "Religious" Organisations. In N. J. Demerath III, P. Dobkin Hall, T. Schmitt & R. H. Williams (Eds.), *Sacred*

- Companies: Organisational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organisations* (pp. 79-96): Oxford University Press.
- Juergensmeyer, M. (2001). *Terror in the mind of God: the global rise of religious violence*. University of California Press.
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing Interviews: The Sage Qualitative Research Kit*. Sage Publications.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*: Sage Publications.
- Lewis, A. (1955). *The theory of economic growth*. London: Allen
- Lunn, J. (2009). The Role of Religion, Spirituality and Faith in Development: a critical theory approach. *Third World Quarterly*, 30(5), 937-951.
- Manji, F., & Coill, C. (2002). The missionary position: NGOs and development in Africa. *International Affairs*, 78(3), 567-583.
- Marshall, K., & Van Saanen, M.B. (2007). *Development and faith: where mind, heart , and soul work together*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Martens, K. (2002). Mission Impossible? Defining Nongovernmental Organisations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, 13(3), 271-285.
- Maxwell, D. (2002). Editorial. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 32(1), 1-3.
- McDuie-Ra, D., & Rees, J. A. (2008). Religious Actors, Civil Society and the Development Agenda: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion. *Journal of International Development*, 18(6).
- McGregor, A. (2006). Religious NGOs: Opportunities for Post-Development?. *Southern Perspectives on Development: Dialogue or Division?*. Proceedings of the Fifth Biennial Conference of the Aotearoa New Zealand International Development Studies Network, 165-183.
- McLoughlin, D. (1991). Up in Alms: Politics in the Aid Trade. *North and South*, 60(8), 60-68.
- Narayan, D. (2001). Voices of the Poor. In D. Belshaw, R. Calderisi & C. Sugden (Eds.), *Faith in Development: Partnership between the World Bank and the Churches of Africa* (pp. 39-48): A Co-publication of the World Bank and Regnum Books

- International.
- NZAID (2009). *Annual Report 2007/08*. Edited by NZAID. 1-36, 2008.
- Olson, E. (2008). Common Belief, Contested Meanings: Development and Faith-Based Organisational Culture. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 99(4), 393-405.
- Pallas, C. L. (2005). Canterbury to Cameroon: a new partnership between faiths and the World Bank. *Development in Practice*, 15(5), 677-684.
- Peach, L. J. (2005). 'Sex Slaves' Or 'Sex Workers'? Cross-cultural and Comparative Religious Perspectives on Sexuality, Subjectivity, and Moral Identity in Anti-Sex Trafficking Discourse. *Culture and Religion*, 6(1), 107-134.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rakodi, C. (2007). *Understanding the Roles of Religions in Development: The Approach of the RaD Programme*. University of Birmingham.
- Renders, M. (2002). An Ambiguous Adventure: Muslim Organisations and the Discourse of 'Development' in Senegal. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 32(1), 61-82.
- Rist, G. (1997). *The History of Development: from Western Origins to Global Faith*.
- Rubin, H.J. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data*. Sage Publications.
- Saldana, J. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*: Sage Publications.
- Samuel, V. (2001). The World Bank and the Churches: Reflections at the Outset of a New Partnership. In D. Belshaw, R. Calderisi & C. Sugden (Eds.), *Faith in Development: Partnership between the World Bank and the Churches of Africa*: A Co-publication of the World Bank and Regnum Books International.
- Sanderson, E. (2007). The Challenge of Placing Spirituality within Geographies of Development. *Geography Compass*, 1(3), 389-404.
- Selinger, L. (2004). The Forgotten Factor: The Uneasy Relationship between Religion and Development. *Social Compass*, 51(4), 523-543.
- Sider, R. J & Unruh, H. R. (2004). Typology of religious characteristics of social service and educational organisations and programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(1), 109-134.
- Slack, A., & Leung-Wai, J. (2006). *Giving New Zealand: Philanthropic Funding 2006*:

- Philanthropy New Zealand.
- Smith, S. R., & Sosin, M. R. (2001). The Varieties of Faith-Related Agencies. *Public Administration Review*, 61(6), 651-670.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2007). *Counting Non-profit institutions in New Zealand 2005*. Embargoed until 16 April 2007. Statistics New Zealand.
- Sutton, D., Baskerville, R., & Carolyn, C. (2010). *A development agenda, the donor dollar, and voluntary failure*: New Zealand Institute for the Study of Competition and Regulation.
- Swart, I. (2006). Churches as a stock of social capital for promoting social development in western cape communities. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 36(3-4), 346-378.
- Sweetman, C. (1999). Editorial. *Gender and Development*, 7(1), 2-6.
- Tennant, M., O'Brien, M., & Sanders, J. (2008). *The History of the Non-profit Sector in New Zealand*.
- Tennant, M., Sanders, J., O'Brien, M., & Castle, C. (2006). *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: New Zealand*: The John Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies.
- ter Haar, G. (2009). *Who is Afraid of Religion?*
- ter Haar, G., & Ellis, S. (2006). The Role of Religion in Development: Towards a New Relationship between the European Union and Africa. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 18(3), 351-367.
- Thaut, L. C. (2009). The Role of Faith in Christian Faith-Based Humanitarian Agencies: Constructing the Taxonomy. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, 20(4), 319-350.
- Thomas, S. M. (2004). Building Communities of Character: Foreign Aid Policy and Faith-Based Organisations. *SAIS Review*, XXIV(2), 133-148.
- Tomalin, E. (2006). Religion and a rights-based approach to development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(2), 93-108.
- Tomalin, E. (2007). *Religious Studies and Development: A Literature Review*: University of Birmingham.
- Tomalin, E., & Pearson, R. (2008). Intelligent Design: a Gender Sensitive Interrogation of Religion and Development. In G. Clarke & M. Jennings (Eds.), *Development*,

- Civil Society and Faith-Based Organisations* (pp. 46-71): Palgrave MacMillan.
- Townsend, J. G., Porter, G., & Mawdsley, E. (2002). The Role of the Transnational Community of Non-Government Organisations: Governance of Poverty Reduction? *Journal of International Development*, 14, 829-839.
- Tripp, L. (1999). Gender and development from a Christian perspective: Experience from World Vision. *Gender and Development*, 7(1), 62-68.
- Tvedt, T. (1998). *Angels of Mercy or Development Diplomats?: NGOs and Foreign Aid: Africa* World Press, Inc.
- Tyndale, W. (2003). Idealism and Practicality: The role of religion in development. *Development*, 46(4), 22-28.
- Tyndale, W. (2006). Some final reflections. In W. Tyndale (Ed.), *Visions of Development: Faith-based initiatives* (pp.153-179). Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Ufford, Q. V., & Schoffeleers, M. (1988). Towards a rapprochement of anthropology and development studies. In Q. V. Ufford & M. Schoffeleers (Eds.), *Religion and Development: Towards an Integrated Approach* (pp. 1-30). Free University Press.
- United Nations Population Fund (UN FPA). (2007). *Guidelines for engaging faith-based organisations as agents for change*. Retrieved from http://www.unfpa.org/culture/docs/fbo_engagement.pdf.
- Ver Beek, K. A. (2000). Spirituality: a development taboo. *Development in Practice*, 10(1), 31-43.
- Verhelst, T., & Tyndale, W. (2002). Cultures, spirituality, and development. In D. Eade (Ed.), *Development and Culture* (pp. 1-24): Oxfam GB
- Volker, H. A. (2009). The Role of Churches in Creating Social Capital and Improving Governance in Papua New Guinea: Lessons for Working in Fragile Situations. *Public Administration and Development*. Retrieved from <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/helicon.vuw.ac.nz/cgi-bin/fulltext/122630233/PDFSTART>. doi:10.1002/pad.546
- Wilber, C. K., & Jameson, K. P. (1980). Religious Values and Social Limits to Development. *World Development*, 8, 467-479.
- Williams, R. H., & Demerath III, N. J. (1998). Cultural Power: How Underdog Religious and Nonreligious Movements Triumph Against Structural Odds. In N. J.

- Demerath III, P. Dobkin Hall, T. Schmitt & R. H. Williams (Eds.), *Sacred Companies: Organisational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organisations* (pp. 364-378): Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, J., & Janowski, T. (1995). The contribution of religion to volunteer work. *Sociology of Religion*, 56(2), 137-152.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Interview Guide

Key informant interview guide – Faith-based organisations

The following key topics will be covered in an open-ended interview.

Sample questions:

Institutional aspects

- How did your group evolve?
- Where do you choose to work? How was this decision made? Who is your target audience?
- In what ways is faith important to your organisation?
- How does the knowledge and awareness of religion influence your work?
- Which kinds of groups and organisations do you work with and why?
- Does your organisation offer any services which aren't offered by other organisations?

Donor relationships

- How does your organisation decide which type of donors to seek and receive support from?
- Does the type of donor have any impact on the work you undertake?
- Do you think that being a faith-based organisation gives you any advantages and/or disadvantages in accessing donor support?
- Do you see advantages in working with faith-based donors? And with non-faith-based donors?
- Does your organisation have any concerns working with faith-based donors? And with non faith-based donors?
- If your organisation does not engage with certain types of donors, what are the reasons?

Appendix II: Participant Information Sheet

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui



Participant Information Sheet for a study of how faith enables and constrains relationships between faith-based organisations and donors

Researcher: Jane McLoughlin, School of Geography and Earth Sciences, Victoria University of Wellington

I am a Masters Student in Development Studies at Victoria University of Wellington. As part of this degree I am undertaking a research project leading to a thesis. The project I am undertaking is exploring how the 'faith aspect' of Faith-based development agencies enables and constrains donor relationships.

I have been granted ethics approval from the University to undertake this research.

I am inviting faith-based organisations and donors that are based in New Zealand to participate in key informant interviews. Each interview will take no longer than 45 minutes. I will conduct the interview in person at your organisation's headquarters where applicable. If mutually agreed, phone interviews will be undertaken.

Responses collected will form the basis of my research project and will be put into a written report on a confidential basis. It will not be possible for you or your organisation to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential. No other person besides me and my supervisor, Dr Andrew McGregor, will see the interview notes. The thesis will be submitted for marking to the School of Geography and Earth Sciences and deposited in the University Library. It is intended that one or more articles will be submitted for publication in scholarly journals. Interview notes and responses will be destroyed three years after the end of the project. You may withdraw yourself (or any information you have provided) from this project (before data collection and analysis is complete) without having to give reasons.

If you have any questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact me at jmmjnz@gmail.com, 04 463-5233 ext 8393, or my supervisor, Dr Andrew McGregor, at the School of Earth Sciences at Victoria University, PO Box 600, Wellington, phone 04 463-6452.

Jane McLoughlin

Signed:

Appendix II: Consent Form

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui



CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of project: How faith enables and constrains relationships between faith-based organisations and donors

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I may withdraw myself (or any information I have provided) from this project (before data collection and analysis is complete) without having to give reasons.

I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the research, the supervisor, and the person who transcribes the tape recordings of our interview, the published results will not use my name, and that no opinions will be attributed to me in any way that will identify me. I understand that the tape recording of interviews will be electronically wiped at the end of the project unless I indicate that I would like them returned to me.

Signed:

Date: