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Abstract

By the mid-1990s, the post-war, Keynesian welfare state that had typified much the landscape of service provision in North America had already begun seriously to corrode in the presence of a resurgent classical liberalism. This meant, among other things, an increased role for civil society organisations in the provision of social welfare to citizens in need. As part of this restructuring of the welfare state, faith-based organisations found a renewed place, bolstered in part by favourable legislation, political support, and the revival of a once-recluse evangelicalism. Today, with decades of maturity and the aide of technology, evangelical faith-based organisations are prominent actors in the provision of social welfare all around the world. This has led scholars to suggest or openly call for the investigation of key questions with implications for social work, social welfare, and social policy. Among these key questions, those related to "proselytism" and/or "conversion" have proven to be the most animated, controversial, and pregnant with possibility, both nationally and internationally (e.g., Audet, 2014; Audet, Paquette, & Bergeron, 2013; Cnaan & Boddie, 2002; Harriss, 2014; Sager, 2011; Sherr, Singletary, & Rogers, 2009). Yet these are the questions that remain largely unanswered, particularly in Canada and internationally. This dissertation, therefore, consists of an exploration of "proselytism" and "conversion," which I re-conceptualise here as "religious influence," in evangelical service settings in two countries, Canada and India. The intent was to explore (a) the nature and extent, as well as (b) the outcomes of religious influence in evangelical faith-based organisations and to determine (c) what telling similarities and differences between the two countries and (d) how all of this might have implications for social work, social welfare, and social policy. Overall, the dissertation provides a candid look at religious influence in evangelical service settings, including the way it is and isn't exerted; the hopes and concerns that staff members of faith-based organisations express in sharing faith; the changes religious influence effects in service
recipients' lives; the surprising similarities and poignant differences between Canadian and
Indian evangelical faith-based organisations; the way these findings bear on social work, welfare,
and policy in the present time; the challenges to doing this type of research; and more.
Acknowledgments

This is the longest acknowledgements section you'll likely ever read. You're welcome to skip it, of course, but I think that gratitude is an important social convention, and this is the most appropriate time for me to participate in that convention with respect to this area of my life. Moreover, this dissertation is the culmination of a long process spanning a period of time that begins well before the commencement of this 4-year Ph.D. Certainly, at the beginning and even throughout most of a nearly 16-year period, I had less of a hand in initiating or facilitating the processes to which I refer - the processes of my schooling and education. So naturally I want to thank the most important figures along this 16-year journey.

I start with my parents, who pushed me to pursue higher education despite my scholastic apathy and rebelliousness, which was fostered by the mind-numbing and soul-suffocating boredom I had experienced in elementary and high school. While it was initially annoying to be almost forced to go to university, I had never realised how important it was (it is) to be pushed by the people around you until much later in life. So for that, I thank them.

Around the same time I was struggling with my scholastic apathy, I was working in a convenience store and regularly served a customer who always had a different book with her. I hadn't really witnessed a lot people reading for pleasure or committed to it myself growing up. In fact, I hadn't read a full non-fiction book throughout all of high school, relying heavily on Coles Notes and/or not submitting assignments. I asked this customer, half curious and with the typical inarticulateness of a teen, "Does it work?" Somehow she understood what I had meant and replied with something like, "You know, you don't notice it book to book, but after reading a while you'll look back and realise how much you've learned." Her example, I am certain, is why I carry a book with me almost everywhere I go now.
After I left the convenience store and started my undergraduate degree, I met a number of my undergraduate profs, who believed in me, pushed me, inspired me, helped me in some way. Among the most influential were, in alphabetical order, Michael Ashton, Gordon Hodson, Harry Hunt, John Mitterer, Tim Murphy, Sidney Segalowitz, and Paul Tyson. I owe these men gratitude. Without this first and very formative experience having been exemplary, I likely would have gotten a pass degree and left academia. It was they who first modeled in varying ways the classical scholar or academic that I endeavour to be today. What’s more is that they likely didn't receive any formal credit or recognition in tenure or promotion committees for creating the environment they did. But I know from having spoken to several friends and colleagues and having visited several other departments that the period between 2002 and 2007 in that department of Psychology was special, not unlikely due to efforts by them and others. There were also a number of students further along in their development than I was and whose professional engagement during my undergraduate experience allowed me to see what this scholarly or academic posture looked like in someone younger. I benefited greatly from these folks, too, which included Andrew Whitehead, Adam Tennanbaum, Angela Greco, Andrea Martinez, and members of “The Office” - a term we used well before the US television show was popular!

But the most important figure throughout my undergraduate and perhaps the single biggest influence on my academic drive was Becky Choma, now an accomplished Associate Professor in Social Psychology but then an overachieving Ph.D. student and teaching assistant for a course I was taking. Becky decided to ask me a simple question, which despite my reverence for the aforementioned scholars, I had not considered, "Why are you not doing an honours, research degree?" So I switched into the honours research stream shortly after and she
proceeded to help me in innumerable ways, in thankless fashion, informally but also formally through providing me with research experience for which I am grateful (even though some of it was data entry). She then served as a de facto or shadow undergraduate supervisor for my B.A. thesis. Becky is also the reason I pursued my Masters in Community Psychology, which she did, too, and helped with this dissertation, particularly around the quantitative methodology. She continues to be a mentor to me and for this I am extremely grateful.

I got into that Masters programme the second time applied, having been rejected the first time around, when a lovely man who interviewed me said, "I'm going to tell this committee that you need to be in this programme." Dr. Robb Travers is responsible for my getting into that programme and for that I am grateful to him. While in the programme, I came across a man whose wisdom and character seemed to shine, when he wasn't making funny faces or jumping in and out of dramatis personae. I asked him if he'd supervise my MA thesis and he said yes. Dr. Richard T. G. Walsh then began, perhaps unknowingly and unwittingly, a long and arduous process of educating me in a way that only the one-on-one relationship at the graduate level with a committed professional can accomplish. Everything from the line-by-line, one-on-one review of the first, quite terrible draft of my M.A. thesis all the way down to the quick and witty lessons, such as the very real presence of AFGO in professional life, has helped me in immeasurable ways. Published, settled, tenured, Richard could have taken a back seat to the process, but when I asked him "not to go easy on me" and he said "you brave soul," he delivered. Of course, years later he would lord it over me by reminding me that "you were spoiled," as far as the typical MA advisor-student relationship goes.

Richard also modeled a kind of radical, liberal Protestant Christian which I had not witnessed up close before, as most of my friends were Catholic if they were Christian and the
Protestants were largely non-practicing or practicing in a way that elevated evangelism and thus made me a “target” of their Biblical crosshairs. In fact a number of other practicing Protestant Christians who approach the world in a similarly compassionate and thoughtful fashion to Richard have demonstrated the positive, constructive face of Christian faith to me since, and I have benefitted from their conversation, friendship, wisdom, or example. This includes but is not limited to Stewart Smith, Oz Cole-Arnal, Monica Chi, and Taylor Lakusta-Wong, whose beautiful mind has fashioned a "Get Out of Hell Free" voucher waiting for me in case my decision not to commit my life to Christ backfires. (It pays to have friends in the right places.) Here, too, I include my participants, who work to make the world a better place, often struggling and sacrificing in the process. They remain nameless because I have to maintain confidentiality and anonymity but deserve my gratitude all the same.

This brings me to my Ph.D. Importantly, the process of acquiring a PhD is intended to be different than the process of acquiring an M.A. or a B.A. Students at the doctoral level are intended to be like junior colleagues to professors, equals in a way, whose learning should include a little more space for self-assertion but not too much so as to sacrifice learning from our more accomplished and knowledgeable senior colleagues. That's a tough balance to strike for a professor; giving up just enough power not to engender apathy but holding onto enough not to inspire mutiny is a feat. And yet at no point did I ever feel like anything but an equal - a junior colleague - to the following people, but yet still a student whose interests were placed first, and for that, for them creating an equilibrium of independence and tutelage, I am grateful (in alphabetical order): Bree Akesson, Cheryl-Anne Cait, Lea Caragata, Nick Cody, Nancy Freymond, Bob Gebotys, Ginette Lafrenière, Deena Mandell, Martha Kuwee-Kumsa, Magnus Mfoafo-M’Carthy, Shoshana Pollock, Carol Stalker, and Michael Woodford. Although many of
these professors helped me beyond the classroom, Bree, in particular, spent considerable time helping me develop as a young scholar in innumerable ways; she remains a colleague, friend, and mentor.

As with my undergrad, a number of people, including faculty, staff, and students have helped shape me and this dissertation or provided a collegial environment in which to pursue it. Among these the most influential were (in alphabetical order): Dawn Buzza, Michelle Corbet, Tanya Diriye, Roberta Ellington, Peggy Freymond, Karun K. Karki, Zaida Leon, Cherie Mongeon, Judah Oudshourn, Stewart Smith, Jen Vasic, Monica Chi, and Julia Read. In fact, I could list another dozen names here, of doctoral colleagues, Masters students, and staff at Laurier.

Of course, the most important aspect of a Ph.D. is the infamous dissertation committee, including the dissertation supervisor. My advisor, Dr. Lea Caragata, spent about eight months in a reading course with me when I was unsure of my place in Social Work and unsure of my research focus. We read together almost 80 articles on Christianity and Social Work and at the end of it she agreed to take me on as her student, despite admitting to already being overcommitted and embarking on an upcoming sabbatical. She could have said no, which might have been her initial inclination, but she didn't. And then throughout the way, she beautifully balanced the provision of support and the permission of independence that I needed to learn to stand on my own in the academy. Dr. Jason Hackworth (Committee Member 1), for some reason, agreed to meet with me on a whim when he had no idea who I was and despite my having been from a different discipline and school. I described the initial experience with Jason to others - about two hours in his office - as "nerding out in his office about faith-based organisations," a topic on which he has written a very engaging and interesting book. He agreed
to sit on my committee, again, despite my not being a budding human geographer and him admitting to being removed from the topic of my dissertation for a number of years. Dr. Sarah Todd (Committee Member 2) and her work have been among the few to discuss conservative evangelicalism in the context of Social Work. Without her work I would have had a more difficult time creating space for this dissertation. Moreover, on numerous occasions, including our first meeting over the phone, she has been ever open and available to discuss matters with me. Her kind and encouraging words were also a nice complement to the insights she provided on the work, including an important prod to the ethical implications of the work of faith-based organisations and methodological considerations in working with clients; the former insight I accepted and it shaped this dissertation and the latter I ignored and it ultimately still shaped this dissertation. Finally, Dr. Bob Wineburg (Committee Member 3), who, from his first email to me - in response to a cold email I sent him about his work - has been a major support and source of learning with respect to FBOs, American politics, and the academy. He has given openly in a way that he certainly did not have to, but made me promise as he paraphrased his mother, that once I am "ah beeg man" that I would pay it forward. I hope to keep that promise.

Committees are funny things, though. Good ones, I think, are more than the sum of their parts. I got really lucky here. In addition to each individual contributing, supporting, encouraging, engaging me and my work, the four of them, the five of us, formed a nice group and a kind of subtle but beautiful harmony characterised working together. I described this committee as an embarrassment of riches, and it really was. The perfect way to end my schooling - four intelligent, accomplished people with character and doctorates helping me to get mine.

While those are all professional acknowledgements, I want to thank a number of people who have supported me in personal ways throughout the four years of the Ph.D. Naturally this
includes friends and family. To start, the friends (old and new) with whom I’ve spent the most time along the way, both in person and digitally (in alphabetical order): Bree Akesson; Ryan Andre, Steven Boich, Matt Boros, Nicole Costa, Peter Dalziel, Monica Fenech, Christine Fu, Johnny Hocevar, Taylor Lakusta-Wong, Danielle Law, Mark Lipiec, Bruno Paltrinieri, Francois Paltrinieri, Tony Pasquini, Sarah Rich, Justin Turco, Jen Vasic, and Stephanie Wiebe.

Next is my family, which includes first and foremost my parents. Second, it includes the Dhokai family. When I was in Mumbai I was supported by the Dhokais, particularly Dhiraj, Amit, Nimeet, Poonam, and Rupa, the latter of whom was like my “Mumbai Mama” – always making sure I was OK, well fed, and had everything I needed. Third, I can’t forget my late brother Marcus, whose wisdom and serene disposition will always stay with me. Mid-way through the Ph.D., I relocated my home, my office, and my life. Somehow I got lucky enough to stumble into another life, which was composed of a number of individuals who openly accepted me, sometimes in small ways and other times in much larger ways. This includes Roberta Paletta, John Facciponte, Sierra Paletta, Joshua Paletta, Serena Paletta, Dan Golfi, Rick Paletta, Michelle Paletta; Sebastian Paletta, Sky Spiers, Michael ("Frat") Fratocangeli, Sally ("Selly") Franze, and my nephews Caddy Baron Gokani-Paletta and Caruso Baron Gokani-Paletta. Outstanding among this second group is a man whose acceptance, generosity, and love I will never forget: Jonathan Paletta. And, of course, finally, the most important person for last - my dear sister, Mamta, who's grown into a remarkable woman, a paragon of strength and virtue. There is a very good chance that without her support this dissertation would be of lower quality and I less deserving of this Ph.D. For that I am forever in debt to her. Hewo.

Finally, I want to break convention and thank those who actively worked and continue to work against me. We all have people like this in our lives and contrary to our initial, almost
visceral, reaction to their efforts, we, in fact, owe them great thanks, for without their negative presence - open and raw as it often is - we might never be called to respond in positive ways that make us stronger, better. I won't name the people in my life who serve or who have served this function along this 16-year journey; indeed, sometimes they seem too numerous; but many of them might suspect who they are, some might know quite well who they are, and though they're likely not going to read this, know that I'm winking at you.

I warned you this was a long acknowledgments section, so let me finish up with a final message of thanks: Bob (Wineburg), like Richard (T. G. Walsh), has a penchant for pithy sayings, one of which he used to describe two overachieving male academics whose work we were discussing: "Those guys are fucking wizards," he said one day to me over the telephone. Bob won't admit it, but he's a fucking wizard, too. And it is a fucking wizard I hope to be some day. If and when that day comes - and even if it doesn't but who wants to think like that - I owe a deep and ineffable sense of gratitude to all the people I've mentioned here.
Table of Contents

PART I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 1: Fragments of an Interpretive Framework

Fragment #1: The State and Civil Society
Fragment #2: The Ethics of Service
Fragment #3: Secularism and Religious Freedom
Fragment #4: Proselytism and Conversion
Fragment #5: Christianity as a Colonial Force

Chapter 2: Evangelicalism
The American Revival
Canada for Christ
Global Christianity
In Social Work, A Site of the "Culture Wars"

Chapter 3, Good Works and The Great Commission: Religious Influence in Evangelical FBOs
The Spectrum of Proselytism & FBOs
Contemporary Empirical Scholarship on Faith-Based Organisations
Conclusion on The Dual Mandate in FBOs

PART II: METHODOLOGY

PART III: PRIMARY FINDINGS

Chapter 1: Religious Influence in Canadian Evangelical Faith-Based Organisations
Chapter 2: Religious Influence in Indian Evangelical Faith-Based Organisations

PART IV: SECONDARY FINDINGS

Chapter 2: Notes on an Emerging Comparison

PART V: DISCUSSION

PART VI: CONCLUDING REMARKS

References
Appendices
Good Works and The Great Commission: An Exploration of Religious Influence in Service Settings in Canada and India

In some sense, I came to be interested in this topic a long time ago. I was maybe nine or ten years of age when I turned on the T.V. on a Sunday morning, doubtless looking for cartoons, when I stumbled upon *Hour of Power* with Robert H. Schuller, who is described on the website for the show today as a "legendary televangelist." Of course, I don't actually remember the first instance this occurred, but it became enough of a mainstay of my Sunday-morning channel-surfing routine that it's now a memory of my childhood. And eventually, to Schuller's programming, I would add pretty much any other such programme I could find, sometimes watching no more than 5 minutes and other times watching for much longer. I likely couldn't have articulated then why I was so enthralled, why a young child making his way from one cartoon station to another made frequent and seemingly irresistible stops at shows that presented a platter of children's nightmares - a slow pace, a quiet atmosphere, usually monotonous speech, serious content. But looking back I think I was always at some level fascinated with the certainty, urgency, and zeal with which Christians like Schuller spoke about their faith and encouraged others to become Christians. Appropriately, then, what the reader is about to embark upon is a more mature articulation of this fascination, which is perhaps even stronger today than ever before.

In the following pages I present the reader with a dissertation devoted to an exploratory study of religious influence (i.e., evangelism or proselytism) in evangelical service settings in two countries, Canada and India. I begin with the literature review in Part I, which presents three major types of literature. The first type consists of five sub-sections, each of which summarises theoretical literature important to ground the dissertation's topic. The second portion presents
information on evangelicalism; this section, too, is designed to provide background for the dissertation's topic. The third and final type of this first part delves into the empirical scholarship, which sets the stage for several research questions to be developed; the primary research questions pertain to the nature and extent of religious influence and their outcomes in evangelical service settings. From there I move on to Part II, wherein I discuss the methodology and cover how it is that I sought to answer the questions I outline. Part III then presents the primary findings from both Canada and India, while Part IV presents the secondary findings, about which I elaborate in the Methodology section. After having presented all of the findings, I then move to Part V, the Discussion, where I situate the findings in portions of the literature review covered in Part I, specifically the five types of theoretical literature. The Discussion, thus, brings the reader full circle before moving on to Part VI, where I make some concluding remarks, commenting on how this work gives direction for future research.

Before I begin with Part I, the literature review, however, I want to provide a handful of preliminary definitions. These are not intended to be uncontested or complete, but instead an orientation to some of the terms that I will use throughout and hopefully became clearer and more refined in the mind of the reader over time. Let's start with the most obvious terms.

**Good Works.** I use the term here to refer to the secular mandate to provide service to citizens in need. While there are indeed Biblical justifications for this mandate (e.g., the second of two Great Commandments, Matthew 22: 39), I refer to it as a "secular" mandate not because it is devoid of religious history, in fact almost nothing in contemporary society is, but because it is common to all civil service organisations, faith and non-faith related. In other words, it is

---

1 While there are Biblical justifications for this mandate (e.g., the second of two Great Commandments, Matthew 22:19).
amenable to "public reason" and thus despite its religious significance for some, it is fully "accessible" to those in the public sphere (see Rawls, 1993 for a description of public reason).

**The Great Commission.** The Great Commission refers to the Biblical injunction to proselytise, evangelise, and ultimately convert the entire world's people into a specific strain of evangelical Christianity. For instance, the most popular Biblical passage for this is Matthew 28:19, according to which Jesus is believed to have said "Therefore go and make disciples [i.e., Christians] of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." While the Bible itself doesn't construct this passage and other similar passages as "The Great Commission," evangelicalism nevertheless does construct the meaning of such passages in such a way. Both secular and religious scholars have argued or shown that this belief in making followers of Jesus is an inextricable part of contemporary evangelicalism (e.g., see Brouwer, Gifford, & Rose, 1996 for a secular academic source and Smietana, 2015 for a religious one).

**Religious Influence.** This brings me to the term I use to stand in for the process by which followers of Jesus are made. Typically, terms that are used instead are "proselytism" or "evangelism" for the process; and then for the outcome one reads often of "conversion" or some kind of colloquial expression, such as "accept Christ" or "Give my life to Jesus." While I will use these terms throughout the paper, usually when I'm referring to someone else's usage, I do my best to use "religious influence," because these existing terms are fraught with connotation. For instance, proselytism often seems more popular with secular scholars, and is at times used pejoratively; on the other hand, evangelism seems preferred by religious scholars and is used with positive intent. In order to avoid the semantic chains tethered to each of these terms, I opted
to use a relatively neutral term in "religious influence," one inspired from the National Association of Social Workers' Code of Ethics.

But a second reason I chose religious influence, related to the first, is that terms such as "proselytism," "evangelism," "conversion" belie a complexity that's necessary to recognise for any serious study of this topic. These conventional terms all point to a monolithic or categorical understanding of what can be considered "religious change." Familiar to most, according to this dominant though not universal representation of religious change, at one point a person is not a Christian but through an encounter or encounters with a believer, or divine inspiration or experience, the person converts and becomes Christian, thereby switching from one category of believer to another. Overall, any religious change tends to register only or primarily upon a marked or monolithic change in identity; this means that exertion of religious influence is typically considered real or present only if it is intended to change that religious identity (i.e., "proselytism") and the outcome of that religious influence is achieved only if that identity changes (i.e., "conversion"). Implicit in what I am saying, then, is neither "proselytism" nor "conversion" are simply about changing religious identities, and that it seems far more reasonable and defensible to consider that religious influence is exerted in a kind of generalised way. It is, in other words, more accurately conceived as occurring at varying gradations or degrees or steps in between the two categories of non-conversion or conversion, of non-believer and believer, both of which are salient end points and so understandably get the most attention. Of course, in some cases this religious influence might move clients into conversion anyway, but in other cases it might not, and in those cases it is no less noteworthy if, for instance, clients are moved to believe that addiction is a function of demonic possession or, to give another example, that abortion might be overshadowed by the implication of a "soul" (e.g., Kelly, 2014) or to give
a non-religious belief, that poverty is an individual, spiritual problem and not a social one and thus best dealt with through behavioural modification (e.g., Lockhart, 2011). In sum, religious influence is the term I use to refer to what a believer might intend or act on in order to move a non-believer closer toward, and ultimately to, the end goal of becoming a follower of Christ.

*Social Work vs. social work.* The final definition departs from the last three and is more of a formal comment than a definition. When I use the term "Social Work" where both words are capitalised it means I'm referring to the professional and academic discipline. In contrast, where I use the term without capitalisation I'm referring to the general idea of doing social work inside or outside of professional bodies. With those definitions in hand, let's begin with Part I, wherein I will review some relevant literature on "proselytism" and "conversion," but also much more.
PART I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 1: Fragments of an Interpretive Framework

Recall that this first chapter of the literature review will address five "fragments" of an interpretive framework that is intended to provide a theoretical backdrop against which my dissertation figures. These five fragments are only partial representations of the full scope of scholarship pertaining to each of these areas (for reasons of space and the dissertation's scope), but they should provide the reader with sufficient theoretical information. The five fragments are (1) "The State and Civil Society," wherein I discuss the political economic context within which social service provision occurs; (2) "The Ethics of Service," wherein I discuss the ethical dimension of social service provision within social work generally but also the discipline of Social Work; (3) "Secularism and Religious Freedom," wherein I discuss some of the legal and non-legal scholarship on the separation of "church and state" and the exercise of religious freedom; (4) "Proselytism and Conversion," wherein I discuss some of the legal and non-legal scholarship on each, understood as a special instance of the exercise of religious freedom (thus, religious influence here falls within the exercise of religious freedom); and (5) "Christianity and Colonialism," wherein I discuss the entanglement of Christianity, particularly the missionary impulse, and colonialism. In a sense this last fragment is a brief visitation of the "good works and The Great Commission" in history. Finally, in all five sections for each of the fragments, the reader will notice that I attempt to stay as close as possible to the main focus of the dissertation, i.e., religious influence, and therefore, do not cover everything or even, in some cases, the most popular sub-topics within each of the fragments.
Fragment #1: The State and Civil Society

At the risk of simplifying, a governing tension of the last century seems to be between two schools of economic thought and social policy. Both assume a capitalist economy functioning within a state, but they differ in their views as to how best to keep this economy functioning. Chronologically speaking, the first of three periods of importance is often referred to as the "classical" period of capitalist economies. This period refers, at least in the US, to the time between the mid-19th century through to The Great Depression in 1929, the "golden age" of industrial capitalism that produced paragons of wealth such as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller. The classical economic position dominating at this time was that markets functioned best with minimal state interference and that theoretically the population could achieve "full employment" - and thus minimise problems which stem from its absence - if the market is functioning under such "free" conditions.

But in response to the Great Depression and obvious and rampant poverty, another school of thought emerged under a British economist, John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946). Keynes, an atheist who lived through World War I and World War II, observed what might seem obvious to us now, that capitalist economies are inherently unstable consisting of "booms" and "busts," periods of economic expansion and recession, respectively. Accordingly, a market functioning under free conditions would not result in full employment and thus would not address social issues stemming from unemployment, i.e., the "busts" or recessions would by definition create unemployment and poverty. A rebuttal to Keynes's cautionary note at the time was that ultimately these recessions would result in expansions anyway, the "long run" it was argued was good for all despite the busts; to this Keynes famously responded that the "long run is a misleading guide to current affairs. In the long run," he quipped, "we are all dead." Thus, Keynes
advocated for a type of state-based social policy which posits that the inherent instability of the economic cycle of booms and busts should be and could be mitigated by state involvement in the market through monetary policy and the "socialization of investment," i.e., injecting stimulus capital into the market. Accordingly, the state could provide respite from unemployment and social problems in the short term.

But Keynes wasn't a Keynesian, strictly speaking (Dasgupta, 2007). Today the term often is used synonymously with a number of others, including socialist, social democrat, welfare state, social policy, and the pejoratively-intentioned "big government." That is partly because Keynes's thoughts were one among many influences on US social policy at the time of Keynes's influence, including Marxism and socialism (Skidelsky, 2010) and, interestingly, the Social Gospel movement (Kruse, 2015). Therefore, together under the banner of "Keynesianism" fits not only Keynes's own beliefs about monetary policy and state-based, tax-payer-funded investment into the market, but beliefs about the state regulation of the market including banking; fiscal policy including taxation of individuals and corporations; state-based utilities and essential services; and the state subsidisation of "public goods," such as health care, education, and transportation. What I have observed is that usually when people write about "Keynesianism" in the social sciences, they're speaking about this broad cluster of ideas and influences which found its first and only major expression in the US under the longest serving President and devout Christian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) (Kruse, 2015).

Apart from FDR, major US proponents of this form of state-market relationship - to varying degrees - are former Labour Secretary under Bill Clinton, Robert Reich; Paul Krugman; and most recently Bernie Sanders and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. In Canada, major proponents

¹ In fact they are all pejoratively intentioned in much of contemporary conservative discourse.
were Pierre Elliot Trudeau; Tommy Douglas, a Baptist minister who founded in Saskatchewan what ultimately became Canada's national health care system; and New Democratic Party Member of Parliament and leadership candidate, Nicky Ashton.

FDR's "The New Deal" - a sprawling social stimulus and state-based social policy package was the major policy outcome of Keynesianism in the US. More recently, however, Barack Obama's Affordable Care Act (2013) can be considered a function of Keynesian logic, as was Bernie Sanders's proposal for free public post-secondary education. In Canada, various acts from around the WWII era to the 1980s can be considered Keynesian in nature - Unemployment Insurance Act (1940); Universal Health Care Act (1961); Canada Pension Plan (1965); and Canada Health Act (1984).

Around the 1970s, however, in response to the economic crisis generated by debt from the Vietnam War, the oil embargos of 1973 and 1979, and the infamous "stagflation" - characterised by a stagnating economy but a rising cost of living - the old "classical" model of economics found new voices and new ears (Harvey, 2005; Skidelsky, 2010; Steger & Roy, 2010). Milton Friedman (1912-2006) is perhaps most commonly identified with this new or "neo" expression of the pre-FDR view that the market functions best if you liberate or liberalise it from state fetters. Friedman's views, thus, would not have been unfamiliar to Keynes - the state hinders economic growth by interfering with the market; the capitalist economy is unstable but self-correcting; full employment is possible and managed by supply and demand more efficiently than by the state (Harvey, 2005; Steger & Roy, 2010).

But as with Keynes, Friedman's advocacy of market-based solutions is narrower and different in some ways than conveyed by the term "neoliberalism" - the term most commonly given to the cluster of such pro-market policies today. As a kind of antithesis to Keynesianism,
neoliberalism posits that the state should *not* regulate the market; that publically owned utilities and essential services would function most efficiently under privatisation; as would public goods, such as health care; and fiscal policy should reduce the tax "burden" on individuals and corporations as "stimulus" to the economy (Harvey, 2005; Steger & Roy, 2010). While Friedman's own views were at times obviously conservative, neoliberalism today seems far more closely associated with the spectrum of neo-conservative social positions, the expressions of which occur not only in economic terms (as Friedman's seem to be) but also in social, moral (Chunn & Gavigan, 2007) and of course, religious terms (Kruse, 2015). Nowhere is the difference between Friedman and neoliberalism more palpable than on the position of minimum income, which Friedman argued, again in economic terms, was more efficient than state-based social services within a "big government," but which proponents of neoliberalism dismiss, often in veiled moral or ideological terms. Conversely, today advocacy of "min-come" is a policy fixed within the domain of the left, members of which often decry the effects of neoliberalism, and who might shudder to think they shared such a large policy in common with a prophet of neoliberal economics.

Major proponents of neoliberalism were Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher - both of whom were advised by Friedman - as well as Bill Clinton; Brian Mulroney; and Stephen Harper. Major policy changes include, in the US, the welfare reform bill of 1996, called the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), while in Canada, similar examples of welfare reform and neoliberalisation include the "Common Sense Revolution" of Mike Harris in Ontario; Stephen Harper's alteration of the federal Health Transfer from 6% to 3% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP); and most recently the Ontario Liberal Party of Canada's privatisation of a public utility (i.e., hydro) (Chunn & Gavigan, 2007).
In social policy literature social services are often considered to be derived from either the state or the market, both of which I have just discussed, or the "third" sector, which I will refer to as "civil society" (Edwards, 2014). Civil society here is understood in broad terms as the voluntary or "associational" life of citizens (Edwards, 2014). Accordingly, individuals within capitalist societies must, in theory, derive social welfare from one of these three domains (state, market, or civil society) in what Daly (2010) calls a "mixed economy." It is civil society which is an expression of political liberties and intended to be a direct collective influence of citizens, either against the threat of the market or state or in response to the pursuit of some collective goal (Daly, 2010; Edwards, 2014). The Civil Society Organisation (CSO), the term I will use, is a formal expression of this pursuit, and within such CSOs are a variety of "models," one of which is the FBO.

Over the course of the oscillating tension between Keynesian and neoliberal economics I described above, the citizen's ability to derive social welfare shifted in response to broader economic and political changes. During the classical period before the Great Depression social welfare provision was largely a function of the market (i.e., for those privileged to access it) or of FBOs - primarily Christian organisations and churches - and the Charity Organization Societies (COS) (Daly, 2010). Daly (2010) states that social (i.e., state) spending on welfare during at least the 1920s in the US was as little as "one sixth of 1 percent of national income" (p. 33), while the "churches' panoply of mission efforts, leveraged by huge inputs of voluntary labor time, was highly visible in the social field - almost a private mirror image of what government looks like today" (p. 31).

---

1 While Edwards comments on three different "schools of thought" on what a civil society is, I will, for the purpose of the paper, use this first school of thought, the dominant one.
The prominence of FBOs in social provision then declined with the Keynesian welfarism of the 1940s, 50s, and 60s resulting in a "crowd out" effect on FBOs (e.g., Daly, 2010; Zehavi, 2013). A strong state rendered unnecessary overreliance on either the market or on religious organisations for social provision, a process which has been famously referred to as "decommodification" (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The era of state-based welfare provision also introduced notions of "social citizenship" (Marshall, 1950) and "social rights" (Daly, 2010), both of which conceive of the citizen in terms neither economic nor religious; moreover, these concepts existed alongside the emerging legal and political discourse of the secularisation of human rights, which further wrested the construction of citizens from the grip of economic and religious discourse.

Of course, at the advent of neoliberalism in the 1980s and after the institution of the welfare reforms of the 1990s, the market and civil society were faced once again with a greater share in social provision and the notion of social citizenship or "social rights" began to diminish with the power of the state (Daly, 2010). But unlike the pre-New Deal era the state remained strong alongside civil society, i.e., there was no return to the 1% level of social spending. However, like the pre-New Deal era, FBOs, which had been a strong part of the mixed economy before the 1990s (see Sager, 2010), were once again poised to be a major area from which people could derive their welfare, this time within a more "cooperative" framework (Daly, 2010).

Unfortunately, none of the sources I read gave a clear picture as to the place of religious influence over the course of this time, only general impressions that perhaps the boundaries we now consider within especially professional working relationships were not as clear. But those general impressions do not contradict what we know about the missionary zeal in the 19th and 20th century, for instance, in Canada with respect to the Residential School System (e.g., Milloy,
What does seem clear, however, is that social service provision by FBOs was and remains still inextricably linked to potential moral and ethical conundrums. Some of these problems emerge in the contemporary scholarship around legislative changes, especially in the US; the PRWORA's effect of increasing the place of FBOs in social welfare, for instance, is bound in the history of a complicated relationship between the "church" and "state" around the use of government money for "sectarian purposes" (Wineburg, 2007; Daly, 2010), a point on which I will elaborate further below. For now, I want to elaborate on some of those ethical conundrums with the sources that are clearer.

**Fragment #2: The Ethics of Service**

The most pertinent and salient ethical consideration for this dissertation is about the use of the professional relationship to influence a client into adopting certain religious beliefs, attitudes, behaviours, opinions, and ultimately a religious identity through conversion. As with the social policy texts I consulted, the texts on ethics generally seem to avoid direct reference to this kind of conduct (e.g., Hugman & Smith, 1995; Gambrill & Pruger, 1997; Clifford & Burke, 2009). But the ethical codes which define appropriate conduct within the discipline of Social Work in the US and Canada do contain some information, so I begin with them.

While no direct mention is made of "proselytism" in either the *National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics (American Code)* or the *Canadian Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics (Canadian Code)*, in both there are statements which clearly indicate when the social worker is transgressing a religious boundary. The *American Code* lists under the responsibilities of social workers to clients, under section 1.06 entitled "Conflicts of Interest," the following: "Social workers should not take unfair advantage of any professional relationship or exploit others to further their personal, religious, political, or business interests" (NASW,
The Canadian Code makes no clear statement, but the Canadian Association of Social Workers Guidelines for Ethical Conduct (Canadian Guidelines) - intended to be a companion to the Canadian Code - is a little more specific, in fact, by way of an almost verbatim reproduction of the American Code in a section entitled "Ethical Responsibilities in Professional Relationships": "Social workers do not take unfair advantage of any professional relationship or exploit others to further their personal, religious, political or business interests" (p. 11).

More generally, both Codes highlight the importance of service over interest or influence in the professional relationship, generally. The American Code does this, for instance, through its first listed value, "service," according to which the "primary goal" of the social worker "is to help people in need and to address social problems" and thus to "elevate service to others above self-interest." The Canadian Code similarly declares under Value 3: Service to Humanity, that social workers must "place the needs of others above self-interest" and to use "power and authority vested in them as professionals in responsible ways that serve the needs of clients" (p. 6). Other similar statements about undue influence are in the Canadian Code, too, such as that social workers should "refrain from imposing their personal values, views and preferences on clients (p. 6).

Statements in both Codes on belief and the diversity of belief are also telling of the ethical boundary between social worker and client in a religious encounter. The American Code (2008), for instance, states that social workers "should obtain education about and seek to understand the nature of social diversity and oppression," and includes religion among the many categories of oppression. While similarly recognising and respecting the "diversity of Canadian society" the Canadian Code qualifies its perspective slightly, recognising in Principle 4 of Value

---

1 The CASW Code begins with an acknowledgment of its indebtedness to the NASW Code and affirms that its reproduction was done with permission.
I that individuals have a right to "their unique beliefs" but "consistent with the rights of others," an allusion, it would seem, to the notion of competing rights. Elsewhere both Codes exhibit a greater consciousness about the potential for conflict that might arise from the competing rights and/or beliefs in the professional relationship. The Canadian Code begins its section on the "Recognition of Individual and Professional Diversity" with the following cautionary statement:

[A] social worker's personal values, culture, religious beliefs, practices and/or other important distinctions, such as age, ability, gender or sexual orientation can affect his/her ethical choices. Thus social workers need to be aware of any conflicts between personal and professional values and deal with them responsibly (p. 2).

The Canadian Guidelines are even more extensive, listing under a section on "cultural awareness and sensitivity" five separate points, not reproduced here but which elaborate on the general impression of the above statement. And the American Code similarly states that Social workers also should be aware of the impact on ethical decision making of their clients' and their own personal values and cultural and religious beliefs and practices. They should be aware of any conflicts between personal and professional values and deal with them responsibly.

Notably, this issue of competing rights or beliefs has been peripherally acknowledged by Clifford and Burke (2009) as a consideration emerging from the renewed focus on religion and spirituality in Social Work. Referring to the field's value of respecting cultural diversity, they acknowledge that this respect refers to religious diversity, too, but with the caveat that the social worker and the field as a whole should employ reflexivity in adjudicating religious or spiritual content. The professional relationship in particular is a focus of their short reference to this emerging issue, stating that "It follows from this that an anti-oppressive approach to ethics must
necessarily be reflexive about the ('spiritual') values held by the worker” (p. 11). Going further, they state that "whether the worker belongs to a religious tradition or has secular values, then the question is the same: how far those values should be allowed to influence their practice, especially those vulnerable to them" (p. 11, emphasis theirs).

The most elaborate exposition of this topic of competing beliefs is by Alexandru Neagoe (2013), who more recently discussed it in a fashion ostensibly more balanced toward religion than Clifford and Burke are, both of whom at times seem unenthused about religion generally. Also situating his paper in the emerging current of literature on religion and spirituality in Social Work, Neagoe (2013) attempts to mediate the conflict between professional duties and religious beliefs that might emerge in particular for Christian Social Workers. Of particular concern to Neagoe (2013) is what he refers to as "religious or secular exclusivism" - generally, a "prescriptive" solution to a client's problem which is presented in a way that "excludes" contradictory perspectives. But eschewing any "detailed decision making" model, his solution is presented rather generally, as a "descriptive" model, according to which the social worker - secular or Christian - would present all the alternative solutions to a given problem without misrepresentation and let the client decide. This, it is argued by Neagoe (2013), is the most fair and balanced manner which respects diversity in a "post-secular" age. But immediately Neagoe (2013) notes the potential difficulty for devout evangelicals:

For many Christian workers [the descriptive approach] becomes problematic in those situations in which, according to their understanding of Christian principles...one alternative [i.e., the non-religious one] is clearly detrimental. In such situations can the Christian worker simply 'describe' the alternative, or should (s)he have the freedom to

1 Their placement of spirituality in quotation marks is interesting to read into. Neagoe, it seems, is a lay pastor and has degrees in theology, though this paper was published in the journal *International Social Work.*
'prescribe' what is considered to be the better direction [i.e., the Christian one]? (p. 317)

At this point of conflict Neagoe (2013) trails off, offering no resolution, noting instead the various areas of contentious disagreement between secular social work and a devout evangelicalism, such as abortion, assisted death, contraceptive use, and "sexual and family ethics" (p. 318). He notes, however, that the potential for the imposition of religion is a concern and that in such cases of intense conflict "there may come a time when the social worker needs to ask herself [sic] radical questions about her [sic] suitability for the present case, job, or even profession" (p. 321).

It is important to note that although Neagoe cites what seems to be the British Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics (British Code), the aforementioned "descriptive approach" he suggests, whereby secular and religious alternatives are presented, could very well contradict the warnings of the Canadian and American Codes related to influencing clients with the social worker's religious beliefs. Moreover, all three Codes do conceivably render inadmissible any religious beliefs which would directly contradict so-called "secular" beliefs associated with marginalisation; incidentally, all of the issues Neagoe mentions (e.g., abortion), save for "family ethics" clearly refer to one or more marginalised or oppressed groups, the side of which social work in all three Codes has clearly taken. These contradictions Neagoe (2013) doesn't note.

However, he draws to light another important issue more subtle than social worker influence or competing beliefs, which is when the client requests a religious solution or service.

---

6 A similar discussion is occurring right now in Canada but with respect to the medical profession, as the provinces have begun to debate the parameters which might permit doctors to abstain from not only objecting to participating in assisted death, legal as of 2016, but in providing "effective" referrals to doctors who would participate - religion is a major factor undergirding this objection.

7 Neagoe (2013) is at a Romanian university and the British Code doesn't make such clear references to religion (perhaps itself telling of the type of conflicts unique to North American Social Work).
of some kind. Couched in the belief that "there seems no good reason for social workers not to have the freedom to include religious elements as part of their service, as long as the elements are desired by the service user," Neagoe (2013) is of the opinion that such things as prayer or Bible readings are not problematic. His beliefs seem widely supported by a number of other social workers, many of whom I will discuss below (e.g., Murdock, 2005, Wiebe, 2014). While there is no clear answer to this emerging ethical conundrum, in fact only Neagoe (2013) seems to mention it in any detail, it does seem to me that referrals are perhaps more in line with the Codes than participation in religious practices, which is what Canda and Furman (1999) seem to recommend. In other words, while it might not be a clear contravention of ethical responsibility to do something like pray with a client upon their request, the way to resolve this tension "responsibly," to use the word of the Codes themselves, is referral to a religious service, because it sidesteps the ethical minefield onto which one steps upon transgressing such a boundary. Here one important consideration is the responsibility of the social worker to respond professionally and in a manner consistent with the client's best interest, which religion without reflexivity can endanger. Neagoe (2013) uses a case which he applies and which clearly illustrates such an ethical mine formed by the conflict between religious and professional priorities:

Daniela, a Pentecostal social worker and a graduate of a double major degree in theology and social work, is working in a government facility for female victims of domestic abuse in Western Romania. She is asked by one of the service users, Mariana (also a Christian, but of an Orthodox background) why God allowed her alcoholic father to rape her repeatedly during her early teen years and whether Daniela [the social worker] is willing to pray for her to be able to forgive her father. Daniela is torn between her desire to respond to Mariana's requests [for prayer] and her concern that, if Mariana happens to
mention this episode elsewhere, it may be interpreted by other professional colleagues as an act of religious proselytization." (Neagoe, 2013, p. 316, emphasis mine)

It is hard to generalise from one case, but it also quite clear that both the social worker in the case, and in fact Neagoe (2013) himself, miss key elements of professional social work in favour of a kind of unreflexive approach to religion. For instance, one could argue that Daniela, the social worker, seems more concerned about being "found out" for proselytism than she is about what might best serve Mariana, and moreover, she seems to encourage forgiveness through prayer as a response to incestuous rape rather than any professional response, including criminal justice. Moreover, Daniela's conduct clearly seems to contradict the Canadian and American Codes in multiple ways, for example, in terms of the integrity of professional conduct, the client's right to competent practise, and by missing or ignoring the social justice issue at hand.

The conundrum of client initiation gains texture when we look at three other issues. The first of these pertains to areas of social work practice where professional boundaries might be at risk. Romantic and sexual relationships, financial profiteering, and so on, all seem clear - for obvious reasons, including power and professionalism, the social worker is forbidden despite a potential client request; in other words, the very fact of the client's request itself is an insufficient justification to break boundaries. Religion might not be an exception, particularly for the reasons on display in Neagoe's (2013) case, and of course, secular boundaries which I will discuss below. Second - and this point might make more sense upon reading the section on evangelicalism - there is no way to prevent the Social Worker from being an object of proselytism. One might ask, at which point in the client's request for service does the encounter become a client attempt to proselytise the Social Worker? At what point does the request to pray encroach upon the Social Worker's own rights? Third, there is no way to know at which point the client is
responding to what social psychologists refer to as the "demand characteristics" of a given situation, i.e., aspects of a situation which suggest or influence a person to behave, think, or feel in a way they perceive, in this case the social worker, wants them to.

Another important element of the ethics of service is the often vulnerable position of the client - this is present in both Codes as well as Clifford and Burke (2009). But again, religious influence, and this time even religion, remain out of the purview of all three documents with respect to vulnerability, which in the Canadian Guidelines are defined with almost exclusive focus on physical harm. The closest mention is in the American Code is section 4.06(a) entitled "Misrepresentation," under which it is stated that social workers should not engage in uninvited solicitation of potential clients who, because of their circumstances, are vulnerable to undue influence, manipulation, or coercion." As I will discuss below, critics of proselytism often argue much the same, that it often occurs in a manipulative or coercive manner and/or that its influence is amplified because of the "circumstances" in which vulnerable persons are placed (e.g., see Bauman, 2015a). The issue of coercion seems not to be discussed in religious terms in either Codes, but both mention that coercion is a concern in the shadow, particularly, of a power differential.

The final point I want to touch on is the ethical dimension of the social worker in the FBO, which formed the content of Cnaan & Boddie's (2002) question. Regarding FBOs, Neagoe states that they are "most prone" to "religious exclusivism" but doesn't elaborate (p. 316). Tangenberg (2005) explores some of the problems, too, but by asking important questions and, again, not elaborating on them: "Does the client have agency and physical and mental capacity to resist religious program elements if she or he objects to them?" or "Is there potential for
discrimination against the client if she or he engages in services? Will efforts likely be made to trivialize or change a client’s belief system?" are two examples (p. 203).

However, both the Codes are far more clear about the potential conflict between Social Work and FBOs. Instances may arise when social workers’ ethical obligations conflict with agency policies and when such conflicts occur, social workers must make a responsible effort to resolve the conflict in a manner that is consistent with the values, principles, and standards of the field, not the FBO. If a reasonable resolution of the conflict does not appear possible, social workers should seek proper consultation before making a decision. The American and Canadian Codes, however, do seem rather clear - the social worker is to put the values of the profession and the interest of the client before self-interest, and in such a case of conflict, to resolve them responsibly - a clear indication of the prominence of secularism within the field, which is the third and next fragment to discuss.

**Fragment #3: Secularism and Religious Freedom**

Charles Taylor (2007), in a much celebrated, Templeton-Prize-winning book, *A Secular Age*, discusses three theoretical varieties of secularism. One variety refers to the decline in belief among inhabitants of what was once "Western Christendom;" this decline is also known as the very popular "secularization thesis" of Berger (1967). Secularism, according to this variety, is an artefact of modernity characterised by declining belief or religiosity. A second variety Taylor refers to as the "conditions of belief and experience," namely those conditions which allow for religion, its beliefs and practices, to be one epistemological option among many. This variant of secularity, the focus of Taylor's (2007) book, is related to the first inasmuch as the first version, the decline in belief, is discussed as a function of the second, the broader "conditions" facilitating this decline of belief in favour of non-belief, a phenomenon which Taylor (2007) notes is new to
the West. The third definition is the popular institutional one; simply put, the separation of church and state constitutes secularism and thus "a secular age"; this variant is sometimes (some might say erroneously) referred to with the French-origin term "laïcité" (Zoller, 2006), and can be traced back in the West to thinkers such as Luther and Calvin (Höpfl, 1991) and Locke (1689)

While the first variety (secularity as declining belief) and the second variety (secularity as conditions which facilitate declining belief) are no doubt likely to bear important analytical fruit vis-à-vis FBOs, it is the third definition (secularity as the separation of church and state) and thus boundaries between the private and public spheres which seems most pertinent to the FBO. This is because, unlike the other two, it carries legal and historical weight and thus defines liberal democracies more directly, and as a result, debates on the separation of church and state and the boundaries around public space (understood heretofore as both physical and figurative unless specified), are conspicuously present when studying FBOs. In fact, the phenomenon of the FBO itself straddles the line dividing church and state - the church becomes temporarily a "public" space, its adherents public agents, as it provides services to citizens in civil society, almost always with indirect or direct public money and in fulfillment of a state or broader civil society objectives. In such a case, whether or not diminishing belief (the first definition) or an alteration in the conditions of belief and non-belief (the second definition) characterises broader society is peripheral. What is, in fact, of paramount importance is what generally citizens receiving service from an FBO can reasonably expect in the public sphere when religion is conspicuously present and powerful - i.e., what the "promise" of such a secular society is in such cases. Accordingly, the following few pages will consider (a) the legal basis of the separation of church and state, a context within which FBOS work, and its corollary in religious freedom, and (b) the value of scholarship and public discourse on elucidating what laws do not. Because I will be doing
comparative work, I will look at secularism within Canada and India.

**Separation of Church and State in Canada.** The legal parameters of secularism in Canada are distinct from the popular and much-discussed example of the U.S, (Berger, forthcoming), which nevertheless is a tempting comparison and so I begin with that. The first clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, referred to as the "establishment clause," states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" (First Amendment, 2016). This clause "prohibits the government from passing legislation to establish an official religion or preferring one religion over another" (First Amendment Overview, 2016). Notice that this example of the U.S. represents a fixed point at the beginning of its history when the secularity of its future was enshrined almost at the dawn of the country's formal existence.

In Canada, the separation of church and state is far less "fixed" and rather represents an ongoing definitional, one might say dialectical, process. This contrast between the U.S. and Canada is tellingly demonstrated by a piece of Canadian history at the beginning of its founding as a Westphalian nation state. Benjamin Berger, a legal scholar at York University in Toronto, Canada, states that the Roman Catholic doctrine of Ultramontanism "translated papal supremacy and infallibility into a claim about the relationship between church and state" (Berger, 2015, p. 3). Accordingly, "in inferior to the church in origin and nature, the state was beholden and should accede to the positions, directions, and interests of the church" (Berger, 2015, p. 3). This doctrine manifested in an election in Cherlevoix, Québec in 1875, in which a Liberal candidate, Pierre-Alexis Tremblay, faced "a father of [Canadian] Confederation and trusted senior minister in Sir John A. Macdonald's Conservative governments, Hector-Louis Langevin" (Berger, 2015, p. 3). The bishops of the Catholic Church who oversaw this county in Québec, issued a letter in which voting members of the Catholic Church were proscribed from voting for the Liberal
candidate, "that to vote on such a side is a sin, that to do such an act makes [one] liable to the censures of the Church" (cited in Berger, 2015, p. 3). Langevin, the candidate supported by the bishops and an architect of the Residential School System, won, but the nascent Supreme Court of Canada ultimately overturned the decision, citing language of a previous case in which a Canadian Justice stated that "no church, no community, no public body, no individual in the realm, can be in the least above the law, or exempted from the authority of its civil or criminal tribunals. The law of the land is supreme, and we recognize no authority as superior or equal to it" (cited in Berger, 2015, p. 10). But the damage from the bishops' religiously inflected admonishments was done - Langevin, not prevented from doing so, ran again, and won again, serving over 20 years in the Canadian federal government (Berger, 2015).

This point in Canadian legal history represents but one instance in that ongoing dialectic between the assertion of power by Christianity, and increasingly by other religions such as Islam, and the assertion of power by the state, all for influence over the public and private spheres. Increasingly, Canada has moved further and further away from the days of Ultramonatanism, but the legal separation of church and state is still quite complicated, as this "[unique] history has meant that secularism has taken unique shape in Canada - eschewing strict nonestablishment and formal laïcité" and "that the lines between law and community belonging have been particularly live and salient" (Berger, 2015, p. 51). For instance, Canada's official head of state is also the head of the Anglican Church, "Queen Elizabeth II" of England; there exists still preferential funding for Catholic schools, a legal relic of the pragmatic work of Protestant Britain in managing Catholic French dissent; legally, a citizen of Canada can invoke a section of the Criminal Code in cases of "blasphemy," though this hasn't been done in almost a century and the section might be on its way out (e.g., see Breakenridge, 2017); and our Constitution refers to
"God." The point here is that there is not a Jeffersonian "wall of separation" between church and state. Instead, it seems more like a haphazardly built fence, the planks of which were placed over centuries, influenced by the struggle between the English and French, the Protestant and Catholic, restricted by legal precedents from eras which otherwise do not bear on us now, and allowing for passages between church and state that do not legally (from the vantage of the First Amendment) occur in the U.S, or at least should not.

Religious Freedom Law in Canada. To refer to the U.S. once more, the second clause of the U.S. Constitution, referred to as the "free exercise clause," states that Congress shall make no law "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion. Naturally, this clause ensures, "in most instances," the right to religious freedom (First Amendment Overview, 2016). With respect to religious freedom in Canada, Richard Moon describes the period between the mid 18th-century and the end of World War II as one of "pragmatic compromise to ensure social peace and political stability." (Moon, 2014, p. 7). This started with the Treaty of Paris in 1763, according to which Britain, victorious in the Seven Years' War with France, "agreed that the French Catholic inhabitants of Canada would retain the right to practise their religion" (Moon, 2014, p. 2). This freedom was later formalised in the Quebec Act of 1774, and re-asserted a number of other times including Confederation in 1867, when several provinces agreed to join the newly forming state of Canada on condition that it protect and recognise Roman Catholic religious freedom in the form of educational rights. Religious freedom was extended again as a pragmatic policy to attract new European Christian settlers in the few decades after Confederation and into the 20th century. However, the pragmatism - perhaps Machiavellianism - of religious freedom policy in Canada up to this point is underscored by the numerous examples of religious freedom denied to those who

---

1 The French were mostly Catholic while the British were headed by the Anglican Church.
were arguably not in any position to make powerful political demands such as the French were. These exceptions include the "banning of the Jehovah's Witness community during World War II" and most notably the complete disregard for the religious freedom in favour of religious genocide of Canada's indigenous people (Moon, 2014, p. 2). The darker side of this pragmatic religious freedom in Canada, thus, spans the entirety of contact between First Nations and Canadian settler society.

Influenced by the international movement toward human rights, a primary one of which was freedom of religion, the post-World War II period in Canada is characterised by a more "principled" stance, Moon argues, codified in documents, such as the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act, 1947, Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, and ultimately the currently-enforced Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982. It is section 2(a) of the Charter which states that Canadians, ipso facto, are recognised as having the "fundamental" right (i.e., the right in principle) to "freedom of conscience and religion" (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982). Moon states that this version of religious freedom indicates not only the "freedom to practise religion without state interference," but also "the freedom from state compulsion to participate in a religious practice" (p. 25). This right under the Charter is limited only pursuant to section 1, which states that the Charter "guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society" (emphasis mine). Since the Charter's formal adoption Canada has relied on a formal "test" called the Oakes Test to determine whether or not a given limitation or restriction on religious freedom is justified by our Constitution.

Separation of Church and State in India. Like Canada, Indian secularism is less like the Jeffersonian "wall of separation" and far more like that haphazardly built fence to which I refer
above; this means that while India is identified as a secular, democratic state, it nonetheless like Canada has developed a version of secularism unique to its context. That context, naturally, is markedly different from the Canadian one, and it's important to impress upon the reader that the history and context of the emergence of present-day secularism in India is one, sufficiently singular (see Bhargava, 2002; Acevado, 2013), and two, not apishly or solely Western (see Nandy, 2004; Bhargava, 2015). As a function of that singularity, the uniqueness of Indian secularism has been influentially described as characterised by a "principled distance" (as opposed to separation) between state and religion, based on a "contextualist" understanding of secularism that seeks to pragmatically synthesise the abstract or idealist aim of secularism with social and political realities (Bhargava, 1995; 2002). These realities include, among others, a population more religious overall (Madan, 1987) and religiously more diverse than almost any on Earth (Warf, 2006); the aftershocks of Britain's Machiavellian management of that religious diversity (Dhavan, 1985); and colonially-exacerbated tensions between Hindus and Muslims, the two largest religious groups in India (Bhargava, 1995). Naturally these realities, especially the third, informed the drafting of India's Constitution, which has been described by Hanna Lerner as "formally permissive" for its pragmatism in realising a balance between idealism and realism with respect to that principled distance between religion and state (Lerner, 2013).

One recent and contentious example of this permissiveness in the last year has been the Bharitya Janata party's attempt to institute a uniform civil code, which currently does not exist. While Article 44 of The Constitution of India (Indian Constitution) does read that "The State shall endeavour to secure for the citizens a uniform civil code throughout the territory of India"

---

1. There are substantial minority religious groups apart from Muslims, including approximately 13 million Christians, 20 million Sikhs, 8 million Buddhist, and 4 million Jains, which when added to the 10 million who are categorised as "Other" or who did not identify a religion, equates to almost triple the population of Canada.
2. See Khan's The Great Partition for a discussion on how British policies helped make more marked and political this division.
(see The Constitution of India, 1949), a uniform civil code has not been enforced or legislated because of this wording, which is considered directive more than legally binding. Consequently, there are several such "civil," i.e., secular laws, which apply to Hindus, but not to religious minorities, such as Christians and most prominently, Muslims. The major opposition to the uniform civil code comes from a segment of India's Muslim population which currently is permitted to litigate civil matters (such as divorce) according to Islamic civil law or sharia, and thus not in line with the secular ethos intended by the Indian Constitution.

**Religious Freedom Law in India.** The case of the universal civil code can be viewed as a matter of religious freedom, as the ability to litigate matters of family law, for instance, if stemming from religion would constitute its free exercise. Religious freedom in India thus takes place within this complicated secular framework. Still, India's constitution is like Canada's and the US's, inasmuch as it is clear about religious freedom. Article 25 of the Indian Constitution states that "all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion." Like Canada's s.1, the Indian Constitution's article 25(1) includes a limiting clause: religious freedom is exercised freely except when "[s]ubject to public order, morality and health". The major controversial issue, apart from the universal civil code, is the "propogation" of religion (Pal, 2001) and there are some states which have passed laws prohibiting certain forms of proselytism which I will cover in the section thus named.

**Tying up Law's Loose Ends.** While the legal parameters of secularism, including religious freedom, are necessary, I believe, to fully contextualise FBOs, they are alone not

---

11 The law is referred to in short as "triple talaaq," according to which a man may divorce a woman by saying the word "talaq" three times; women cannot divorce men; naturally, this divorce law had received vociferous opposition from women, Muslim and Hindu, in India. During the editing of this dissertation a bill was passed nullifying this law with a punishment of three years in prison for any male who sought to divorce a woman this way (e.g., see Sherin, 2017 for a review and commentary on the future of the intersection between civil law and religious pluralism).

sufficient. As Berger (2015) writes about law, though to a slightly different effect, law is "always under pressure from the unruliness of experience" (p. 37). Consequently, I want to discuss some relevant issues in the extra-legal discourse on secularism and religious freedom that I think are important to bear in mind when studying FBOs. I have chosen two issues to discuss.

The first issue is that secularism and religious freedom are perhaps defined too narrowly, with a certain bent toward Western, Christian thought, or in a more critical tone, what Lori G. Beaman of Concordia University in Montréal, Canada calls "religious hegemony" in the Gramscian sense. The main criticism here is that religion is often defined and legally enforced as a property of the individual instead of the group, of ancestry, of land, and so on. Here the benefit accrues to Christianity and less so to the other major religions (see Berger, 2015 for cases relevant to Canada). Berger (2016) states that "Canadian constitutionalism is characterized, in part, by a structural tension between a deep regard for political and cultural collectivities and an emphasis or priority given to individual rights and liberties" (p. 19). One of those rights is, of course, the individual right to religious freedom. While there are instances of recognition of the importance of collectivities, Berger notes, there are several instances since the Charter was signed into law which strengthen the individual over the group. "By virtue of its informing political ideology," Berger states, the Charter "atomizes and pixilates human experience by prioritizing the individual as the primary unit of constitutional analysis" (p. 20). A number of court cases thus continue to privilege unreflectively the individual over the group. Berger (2016) notes several, while Beaman (2003), years before, discussed the individualism inherent in judgments about First Nations religious beliefs. Here Beaman (2003) points out the inability or unwillingness of the Canadian state to recognise First Nations religion as located in land and/or
between the individual/group and land.¹ Beaman’s (2003) paper was published 13 years and yet the same issue in a different case stood before the Supreme Court of Canada recently (see UC Observer, 2017). The judgment, rendered in November 2017, cited that "public interest" outweighed Indigenous religious rights, which would have protected contested land as sacred; the land is now going to be used for a ski resort (Kassam, 2017).

The second issue is that in the last two decades religious freedom has become a foreign policy directive of the US and Canada, another diplomatic lever among a constellation of such which purportedly support each country’s interests, but not without issue. As is typical of North American politics, the impetus for establishing religious freedom as a foreign policy directive comes from the US. Then-President Bill Clinton signed the "International Religious Freedom Act" (IRFA) into law in 1998, which established the Office on International Religious Freedom (OIRF), headed by the "Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom," within the U.S. State Department. The OIRF was, moreover, mirrored in the International Religious Freedom Act by another body, independent of the government, called the United States Commission on Religious Freedom (USCIRF), which was to serve as a kind of ombudsman for the U.S. State Department's OIRF and releases annual reports which rely on first-person accounts of the denial of the freedom abroad. These two together solidly established religious freedom as a foreign policy directive, as the offices together with the Ambassador served to engage foreign countries on matters of religious freedom.

While there are a number of scholars who wax positively, a sceptic might say uncritically, about this diplomatic quagmire (e.g., Inboden, 2008; Leo & Argue, 2012), naturally some have pointed out the issues with the OIRF/USCIRF. Among them are Allen Hertzke and

¹ Moreover, this inability or unwillingness is further amplified when claims to protect sacred spaces are dismissed in favour of "profane" commercial, capitalist interests.
Daniel Philpott who point out that the establishment of religious freedom as a state-level priority was influenced disproportionately by Christian organisations interested in protecting missionaries being targeted abroad in national contexts not sympathetic to proselytism (Hertzke & Philpott, 2000). Cozad (2005), in a more critical tone, affirms the influence of evangelical Christian groups in the establishment of the IRFA and criticises what she sees as the Christian bias in the entire endeavour. She states that "The language of the [USCIRF] reports reflects a disproportionate concern with the persecution of Christians and Christian missionaries as well as extremely forceful language concerning the protection of the right to proselytize" (p. 65). In fact, Cozad's (2005) paper was published in the India Review and focuses on India's reaction to the OIRF/ USCIRF's work. Among the voices Cozad (2005) quotes are those of the influential guru (i.e., Hindu spiritual teacher) and openly outspoken critic of proselytism and conversion, Dayandanda Saraswati, as well as the much-acclaimed Birks Professor of Comparative Religion at McGill University in Montréal, Canada, Dr. Arvind Sharma. (I will get to both of their critiques of proselytism and conversion in the section on proselytism and conversion below.) One other voice not mentioned by Cozad (2005) is that of an Indian Muslim, Tahir Mahmood, who, in a short tract in the usually-pro-religion journal The Review of Faith & International Affairs, criticises from an "Indian perspective" the U.S.'s work on religious freedom for relying on "misinformed or prejudiced sources" and highlights the "need to ensure that each report published by the State Department is based on inputs procured from unquestionably reliable sources and unbiased quarters" (p. 83). The subtext of this comment by Mahmood, who is a legal scholar in India, is that "misinformed or prejudiced sources" are the very missionaries which Cozad (2005) and Hertzke and Philpott (2000) highlighted as the movers of state-backed diplomacy to protect missionaries.
In 2011, then-Prime Minister Stephen Harper made the establishment of an office of religious freedom a campaign promise, which would be fulfilled if he and his administration were re-elected with a majority; they were, and on 19 February 2013 Harper established the "Office of Religious Freedom" (ORF) within Canada's equivalent of the U.S. State Department, which is now known as Global Affairs Canada (GAC). The establishment of ORF was overshadowed by a number of familiar issues, including concerns over a Christian bias or focus (Joustra, 2014); comparisons with the U.S. (Joustra, 2014), including some evidence to suggest a direct inspiration by the U.S. and the direct involvement of then-Ambassador-at-large for OIRF (Joustra, 2014); and indications of a personal motivation by Stephen Harper by the loss of a fellow Christian, Pakistani minister, Shahbas Bhatti, who had been assassinated in Pakistan only months after his visit to Canada (Wallace & Wiseman, 2013). Wallace and Wiseman (2013) note that "the shock of the [assassination] served to galvanize the Prime Minister, Minister Kenney, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs John Baird to create a Canadian ORF" (p. 53). The ORF died with the tenure of Stephen Harper, as the newly-elected government of Justin Trudeau folded the ORF on 31 March 2016, but it is hard to say if it will not return in some form under an increasingly evangelical Conservative party, a point on which I elaborate below (see McDonald, 2010).

Apart from providing important context, the direct relevance of religious freedom as a foreign policy directive to the study of FBOs here is that FBOs are implicated in this global dynamic between North American diplomacy and North American development mandates for the Global South. Both the U.S. and Canadian offices acknowledged the importance of FBOs in supporting and promoting religious freedom as part of their work. Scholarship seems to be following suit, echoing the need or unique capacity for FBOs to add to their mandates the
promotion of religious freedom (e.g., Farris, 2013). But, of course, FBOs supported by public money to promote religious freedom, particularly conceived in such a way as to disproportionately favour Christians and their missions abroad, is undoubtedly going to grind against the promise of secularism and the ethical mandate of Social Work, as we will see in the next fragment on proselytism.

**Fragment #4: Proselytism and Conversion**

Since the inception of the global movement toward the "principled" stance on religious freedom referred to by Moon (2014), the right to freedom of religion has included, at varying degrees of clarity, the right to proselytise and to convert from one religion to another. Yet few are the issues under the broad umbrella of religious freedom that generate as much controversy and notoriety as the issue of proselytism and its attendant outcome in conversion. Accordingly, the following few pages will outline the legal parameters of this specific aspect of religious freedom within Canada and India, and, as with the previous section, after the legal discussion I will "tie up" loose ends by presenting and discussing some of the scholarship that might be helpful in understanding proselytism and conversion in relation to my topic.

**Proselytism and the Law in Canada.** To start, when it comes to proselytism and conversion, some covenants openly state that freedom of religion entails the freedom to change religion. For instance, this is what the *United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) states: freedom of religion "includes freedom to change [one's] religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest [one's] religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance." This, Article 18, includes, of course, proselytism which would fall under "teaching," and, inasmuch as proselytism is a
Biblical injunction, "observance;" Article 18 also includes conversion, i.e., freedom to change religion or belief.

In Canada, however, s. 2. of the Charter states only that one has "freedom of conscience and religion" (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982). Rather, decisions subsequent to the Charter by the Supreme Court of Canada are what texture this otherwise general, initial formulation. Moon (2014) cites the most relevant case, from 1953, in which the City of Québec went to court against Jehovah's Witnesses over the former's disapproval of the latter's public solicitation for religious purposes - what we now all recognise as a part of Canada's door-to-door experience. The Jehovah's witnesses won and the right to proselytise became a part of religious freedom in Canada through legal precedent.

But the protection of proselytism is further contextualised. First, under the limitations of s.1, "[a]ny religious belief that denigrates and defames the religious beliefs of others erodes the very basis of the guarantee in s. 2(a)." That quotation is of comments made by a judge who was rendering a verdict in a case between a man in New Brunswick who had defended his anti-Semitic remarks under the canopy of religious freedom. The judge, however, pointed out that there are constitutional limits to religious expression (i.e., the propagation of religious beliefs) insofar as it consists of religious expression which denies others of a right under the Charter. Related to this point is the so-called "remedial section" of the Charter, s. 24(1), according to which "Anyone whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances."

Another limitation on proselytism strikes a note from the discussion on ethical social work practice above - namely, freedom from coercion and affirmation of autonomy. In a case
called *R. v. Big M Drug Mart* - the judgment of which is why Canadians are not legally obligated to take Sundays, the Christian Sabbath, off - religious freedom was defined with the "corollary" of freedom *from* religion (Berger, 2015, p. 114). The presiding judge, Justice Dickson, stated that "[W]hatever else freedom of conscience and religion may mean, it must at the least mean this: government may not coerce individuals to affirm a specific religious belief or to manifest a specific religious practice " (Justice Dickson cited in Berger, 2015, p. 81). Thus the absence of coercion, constraint, compulsion defines the appropriate limit between two sets of competing beliefs. Moon (2014) quotes Justice Dickson further, outlining that it is perhaps the end or effect of a circumstance which defines whether or not the right of freedom *from* religion is violated; in other terms, it is not simply the case that freedom from religion is violated when someone is *actively* required to do something, but also when they are *passively* prevented from doing something, too, as was the case with the legal enforcement of the Sunday Sabbath.

**Proselytism and the Law in India.** Contrary to the situation in Canada, Article 25(1) of the Constitution of India clearly indicates that religious freedom entails the right freely to “profess” or “propagate” religion. But as with Canada, there are limitations on this right – “[s]ubject to public order, morality and health.” It is within this set of limitations that a number of states, including the one from which my family hails, passed laws to prohibit or limit proselytism and conversion. The matter is contentious, to say the least, and the discourse around religious freedom emanating from the US is prominent (see Coleman, 2008 for what I think exemplifies this US bias).

**Tying up Law’s Loose Ends.** My personal opinion is that the legal references to and focus on proselytism in scholarship is far more limited, despite or perhaps because of its notoriety, than religious freedom more broadly conceived. I also believe that the literature is
further limited, consisting more often of unreflective acceptance of proselytism and conversion, even when certain objections to it seem rather reasonable. There are some important elements of this extra-legal discourse that I want to abstract and most of it is going to be rather critical of proselytism and conversion conceived in this unreflective manner. As with the above section on secularism and religious freedom I have limited this discussion to two issues that I think are of paramount importance.

First, like religious freedom, proselytism and conversion often assumes a "Western" and Christian frame of reference. In part, this is because the location of religious belief is, more often than not, the individual, and the broader collective or group is secondary to it. Religion and thus its alteration or "change" is a change that occurs at the level of the individual in much of contemporary discourse on religious freedom and proselytism (e.g., Grim, 2008). Accordingly, the individual is theoretically abstracted from his or her social, cultural, historical roots. Another criticism, particularly from Arvind Sharma (2011) of McGill, is that the definition of "conversion" as a wholesale change in identity is inherently Christian. He relies on evidence from India, Japan, and elsewhere to argue that in fact often multiple religious identities, or beliefs from different religions, can and do exist simultaneously. Others have noted the similar "syncretic" bent of North America's First Nations upon contact with Christians (King, 2012) and the Buddhist hill tribes in Thailand (Woods, 2012). But from the most dominant Christian standpoint, the idea that one must choose in an "either-or" fashion among religious options is an assumption that runs right through the discourse on proselytism and conversion. The third criticism of proselytism as a decidedly Western construct figures against the backdrop of the

---

I do not have space to discuss this point at length, but for good measure I provide the following sources: Wood (2012) discusses this point, though briefly on p. 446; DiIulio (2013), which consists of a discussion between two fairly conservative evangelicals, a Catholic, Robert P. George, and megachurch pastor Rick Warren, in which religious freedom is quite overtly defined as the freedom to proselytise without any consideration of its nuanced implications.
popular, almost all-consuming, conception of religion as a market commodity (e.g., Iannaccone, Finke, & Stark, 1997, Grim, 2008). According to this literature, religious freedom is understood as functioning best in a "free market," sometimes referred to as the "marketplace of ideas." One can raise the familiar objections here, too: to render religion as a "marketable commodity" is to assume every religion "markets" (i.e., proselytises or sells its product) and can "commodify" or package it's product in consumable form (i.e., individualise or "pixilate" religious identity to use Berger's, 2015 term). Others have made similar criticisms about the limitations of this model, now more than 20 years old (e.g., Chen, 2013; Hackett, 2008).

Second, there is certainly evidence to suggest that religion functions as ideology, and this is particularly true, I believe, of evangelicalism, a point on which I will elaborate below in the section thus named. What this means, of course, is that "conversion" to particular forms of religion is not simply a religious matter, but rather has implications for political, social, economic, and other matters relevant to social life (e.g., Brouwer et al., 1996) In this sense, religion can serve a "propagandistic" function, introducing in a manner akin to the Trojan Horse, a set beliefs and assumptions which are other than the apparent religious content which might be said to more directly inspire conversion. Hackworth's (2012) term to refer to the manner in which Christian Fundamentalism and neoliberalism are intertwined conveys forcefully this point - "Jesus Economics." And of course there are several other indications that accepting a religion "requires" accepting a number of other set of beliefs and practices; though one has to be cautious of conflating correlation with causation, it is still relevant to point out that in the U.S. and Canada "evangelicals" are more likely to oppose abortion, gay rights, assisted dying, and other social issues. In some studies I review below, evangelicals are quite proud of this fact and
recognise that "conversion" is a process which facilitates a "moral" shift, though more skeptical
and critical eyes might also wonder if such a process were not moral regulation.

Related to this, of course, is the "geography" of conversion referred to by Orlando Woods
(2012), namely, that some forms of institutionalised religion serve a nationalist function and
therefore conversion to a certain religion in some contexts can be a threat to the nationalist
identity of a state (e.g., Christian Fundamentalism's dominionism). This is already a problem in
the U.S. and to a lesser extent in Canada, as groups of Christian Fundamentalists with strong
Christian nationalist tendencies seek to influence the political sphere (e.g., Goldberg, 2007;
Hedges, 2007; McDonald 2007; 2010).

Fragment #5: Christianity as a Colonial Force

I think it is fairly commonplace knowledge, at least in the social sciences with a critical
bent, that Christianity has been inextricably linked to colonialism, primarily through missionary
work. In North America and India, this Christian missionary influence came primarily through
British Protestantism, though in Canada the French Catholic (Gould, 2009) and in India the
Portuguese Catholic influences are notable.

Historian Norman Etherington (2009) quotes J.A. Hobson's study of colonialism\(^\text{15}\) in
which Hobson summarises the colonial-missionary nexus thus: "first the missionary, then the
Consul, and at last the invading army" (p. 2).\(^\text{16}\) Another summary he shares with no reference:
"First they had the Bible and we had the land; now we have the Bible and they have the land" (p.
2). The sentiment behind each summary is, of course, that missionaries, as a whole, were not
innocent propagators of religion, nor even innocent social reformers, but in fact part of the

\(^{15}\) Hobson refers to imperialism. There's a distinction but for the purpose of this paper I am using only colonialism

\(^{16}\) Etherington quotes Hobson's summary disapprovingly, I should add. But it is out of the scope for me to tackle this
issue.
colonial machinery which subjugated peoples to the end of empire." Accordingly, Gould (2009) notes that in the "nineteenth century, Protestant missions to indigenous peoples featured prominently in the rhetoric of Britain's early modern expansion." With regard to India, the same has been noted by numerous scholars (e.g., Dirks, 2006; Moreland & Chatterjee, 1969; Sugirtharajah, 1999).

Moreover, something resembling the "dual mandate" of evangelical FBOs, i.e., the mandate to serve and the mandate to convert, defined Christian missionary work it would seem relatively far back into the modern era, all against the backdrop of the widespread view that "non-Christian societies [were] sinks of iniquity," both socially and spiritually (Etherington, 2009, p. 16). Hinduism, the dominant and oldest native religion of India, in particular was famously called a "stupendous system of error" (see Charkrabarty, 2000). While the colonial encounter is complex, not easily considered entirely bad or entirely good, and the same can be said of missionary work, the fact remains that many scholars in the Western academy still seem to wax positively or uncritically about colonial and postcolonial missionary work, supporting, at least indirectly and sometimes directly the unfortunately prejudicial equation of Christianity with civilization. Robert D. Woodberry (2006; 2012) of the University of Texas at Austin, for instance, argues in a seemingly convincing fashion that the presence of missionaries explains the presence of a liberal democracy and absence of corruption in the third world, but provides little commentary or context beyond the tacit assumption that the "light of the Gospel" is at work. And now as then, the critiques and arguments against missionary zeal seem less present in the academy, especially because some of the largest sources of funding and most powerful academic outlets, such as the Templeton Foundation and the Berkley School of Religion, seem decidedly

---

17 These summaries belie a complexity of course.
Good Works and the Great Commission

pro-religion in their affairs, a point begrudgingly noted by a prominent British atheist (Dawkins, 2006). This stands in stark contrast to the criticisms of postcolonial writers of the past and some today, as well as to the popular movements in India (e.g., Bauman, 2015a), which will define the remainder of this fifth fragment of my interpretive framework.

Anticolonial Critiques of Missionary Work. From the beginning of its presence in the colonies Christianity has faced indigenous backlash or critique in some form. Thomas King, in his (2012) book The Inconvenient Indian tells an early tale before the Westphalian transformation of either the US or Canada in which the Jesuits attempted to assimilate through conversion First Nations people by creating a small community in Canada designed to deliver religion, but also to "civilise" the "Indian" to "give up their nomadic ways." Yet "European religion and farming were not as enticing as the Jesuits had hoped, and, by the winter of 1649 [after 2 years], the population of [the community] was reduced to two men, both of them White" (p. 105). The primary use, by First Nations, of these villages were pragmatic - for service, such as food and shelter, but not for religion (King, 2012). Many of those who did convert did so in a manner which preserved elements of their Indigenous beliefs - a kind of "syncretism" that was often perceived as inappropriate and noted above (Gould, 2009, see Hobsbawm, 1987 for India). Gould (2009) notes an even less polite reaction: "At the Mohawk Castle in New York, one hapless priest wrote that Indians who attended his chapel went away 'laughing'" while "others tried to disrupt services by beating drums" (p. 22). Thus, "[w]hile the hardware of civilization...was welcomed [i.e., goods and service]," King notes, "the software of Protestantism

Though I will not comment on it here, it also faced intrareligious competition and the kind lifestyle changes of British colonists which inspired pejorative expressions such as "going native." I recall one colonial missionary source from the 19th century referred to this process as the "fatal flaw" of colonialism, noting that in India many colonial administrators would adopt Indian life, marrying Indian women, and even participating in Hindu religious customs. This threat coupled with growing irreligion at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution seem notable contributions to modern missionary zeal.
and Catholicism...was not" and this left the settlers "perplexed, offended, and incensed that
Native peoples had the temerity to take their goods and return their gods" (p. 24).

British Christianity was met with similar attitudes in India and missionaries similarly
sought to provide service and proselytism in tandem. And from the very beginning it seems that
missionary "zeal" was a problem (e.g., Brendon, 2007; Moreland & Chatterjee, 1969). Notable
uprisings, for instance, such as the Vellore Mutiny of 1806 and the so-called "First War of
Independence," the 1857 Mutiny, were both explained as reactions, in part, to Christian
missionary zeal. Brendon (2007) notes that in exploring the origins of the Vellore Mutiny one
officer marked the "common cry" at the time that the "missionary endeavour" was sowing seeds
of resentment among both Hindu and Muslim Indians, one of whom reputedly said, "you English
have taken the whole country & now you want the people to receive your religion" (p. 54).

Many contemporary figures with postcolonial histories or inclination have themselves
indicated opposition to Christianity's conversionary impulse or "triumphalism," which according
to religious scholar Scott Alexander (2016) is the essence of interfaith conflict. Fanon (1963), for
instance, famously and pejoratively compared Christianity in the colonies to the insecticide
DDT, which would root out all native elements in order to plant Christianity among the
colonised.

But among modern critics the most pertinent and prominent is Mahatma Gandhi, whose
admonition of proselytism stood against the backdrop of his often openly proclaimed multi-faith
orientation and admiration for Christ's message. The presence of the dual mandate figures
prominently in his writings on proselytism as do allusions to missionaries capitalising on
desperation as a wedge for proselytism. "I hold that proselytizing under the cloak of
humanitarian work is, to say the least, unhealthy. It is more certainly resented by the people
here" (Gandhi, 1947, p. 218). Elsewhere, he states that while the Christians had "the right to preach the Gospel" but that "every attempt to press material benefits or attractions in the aid of conversion should be freely exposed" and the vulnerable "should be educated to resist these temptations" (Gandhi, 1954). This, what I refer to as the dual mandate, figures in Gandhi's writings as the "modern method" of conversion (Gandhi, 1947). He regarded what he considered genuine spiritual conversion as acceptable, but not so the "business" of conversion: "I remember having read a missionary report," he said, which indicated "how much it cost per head to convert and then present a budget for 'the next harvest'" (Gandhi, 1947, p. 218). The most ethical means of conversion, therefore, occurs in the absence of destitute, for Gandhi, while the most ethical means of service occurs in the absence of conversion. "Why should I change my religion because a doctor who professes Christianity as his religion has cured me of some disease or why should a doctor expect or suggest such a change whilst I am under his [sic] influence? Is not his medical relief its own reward and satisfaction?" (Gandhi, 1947, p. 219).

More recently, Arvind Sharma (2011), quoting at length from multiple religious sources pointed out the problems which inhere in the relationship between service and proselytism. Among his arguments is the vulnerability of the targets often chosen by more powerful Western missionaries and the belief that aggressive proselytism militates against self-determination.

Touching on the work of Balagangadhara (1994), Sharma further notes that the conversionary impulse within Christianity aggressively projects onto its objects an unfounded assumption of the "cultural universality of religion," i.e., that perhaps Hinduism and First Nations beliefs and rituals don't constitute "religions" at all, but something else; conversion, thus, would mean something other than the simple rational choice for one "religion" over another in a free market of religions. And perhaps the impact of conversion, therefore, is far more serious,
with more cultural gravity than, for instance, if a middle-class Lutheran were to join a Pentecostal church; recently an Indian scholar from a province which faced widespread foreign missionary presence in postcolonial India has referred to this effect as "psychological trauma and disorientation" by a "total disruption" of the indigenous "law of life" (Thong, 2010, see also Thong, 2012).

This pattern has led another contemporary voice, Swami Dayananda Saraswati - a Hindu spiritual leader who acts in a way as a kind of public intellectual - to proclaim that conversion is cultural violence. Equating religion with culture, or at least shedding light on how the two are inextricably linked for Hindus, Saraswati (1999) argues that "culture cannot be retained if the religion is destroyed" through conversion (p. 10). Against the backdrop of non-proselytising religions, such as Hinduism and Judaism, Saraswati (1999) takes his claim of cultural violence a step further by arguing that conversion against religious groups who do not have the notion of conversion woven into their religio-cultural fabric is "not merely violence against people; it is violence against people who are committed to non-violence" (p. 12).

Of course Saraswati's (1999) claims, while purportedly new to the Indian scene (Bauman, 2015a), are nonetheless familiar elsewhere. Here in Canada the cultural assimilation of the Residential School System was designed specifically to inflict this kind of cultural violence on First Nations people (Milloy, 1999). Conversion to Christianity meant a deracination from First Nations culture. "I would have been tempted to hang the slogan over the entrance to every residential school in Canada and the United States," wrote King, "Kill the Indian, save the man."

In characteristic sardonic tone, he presses the reader further: "But I'd do it in Latin. To give it more import - Intermino Indian, Servo Vir" (p. 108).
In critiquing and analysing Saraswati's (1999) popular speech, religious scholar Chad Bauman discusses another type of violence which I think also helps to understand what, in an earlier paper, he refers to as "post-colonial anxiety" in relation to conversion (2008). Bauman refers to the problem discussed above, namely of allurements or coercion to convert as naturally a form of "systemic violence," because Christianity - Indian and Western - benefits from certain structural inequities in the global distribution of wealth and power." These inequities, Bauman asserts, "favor Christianity in various ways" - the most notable is the wealth distribution and favourable exchange rates which "inter alia, facilitate the transfer to India of around 1 billion dollars annually from Western donors for the support of Christian evangelism" (p. 184).

After centuries of tension between missionaries and their non-Christian "others," the problem, at least in India, has ballooned in the present day. It is not uncommon to hear of violent acts against Christians, often, at least putatively, in response to conversion attempts. The most heinous of these acts of violence still seems to me to be the 1999 killing of Baptist missionary Graham Staines, who was burnt alive in a car with his two young sons by a mob of Hindus (Banerjee, 1999). But Bauman (2015b), in his book, *Pentecostals, Proselytism, and Anti-Christian Violence in Contemporary India* notes: "All Indian Christians essentially agree that a significant factor in anti-Christian violence is the offense cause[d] by Christian evangelization and the 'anti-cultural' ethos of certain kinds of Christians" (p. 93). Foreign Pentecostals are Bauman's focus, a major sub-sect of modern evangelicalism, and they, Bauman asserts, "fall prey to anti-Christian violence" because they "are involved in, embody, enact, or motivate the provocations" (p. 91). It seems perhaps the "common cry" of the colonial era is echoing into the postcolonial one.

**Concluding Remarks on the Interpretive Framework**
In this section I have discussed the five fragments that I feel are necessary to understand my topic, and these together constitute one of two broad panels of the "background" against which I will discuss FBOs. What I have tied to convey, apart from the more obvious fact that there exist discursive elements related to the study of religious influence and service provision in FBOs, is that these discursive elements and their real-world manifestations bear on the functioning of FBOs and the social workers within them. The "dual mandate," as it were, occurs in a matrix of considerations, which cut across multiple domains, including those which I have discussed here, such as secular law, ethics, and colonialism. The connection between these and FBOs should get even stronger as we discuss the next broad panel of the "background" - evangelicalism.
Chapter 2: Evangelicalism

In the same way that the first chapter provided theoretical context, this chapter is intended to provide the sociological, or religio-cultural, context. It presents information which in some sense prefigures the very reality of evangelical FBOs in contemporary society. I begin with the "American Revival" of evangelicalism, presenting therefore the convincing evidence that modern American evangelicalism has crept into Canada, and, in fact, has been "exported" to the world (Brouwer et al., 1996). The structure of this section is designed to reflect this trajectory of influence. Thus after establishing certain factors in the emergence of US evangelicalism in the 20th century, I will discuss the evidence of its influence on Canada, and then its influence globally. And then after having traced this global focus of evangelicalism I will bring us back to the discipline of Social Work, illustrating how it is, in some ways though not all, a paradigm of this revival.

The American Revival

Origins. While there seems no single point in the past when modern American evangelicalism took root, there are a number of scholars who argue for certain historical moments which gave rise to it. One of these moments is the "split" within American Protestantism between modernising and conservative factions (Zakaullah, 2003, p. 445). Woodberry and Smith (1998) argue that this split between two strains of American Protestantism "developed between Northern evangelical leaders over Darwinism and high biblical criticism," both to which "[s]outherners remained unified in opposition" (p. 27). Consequently, the largely
dominant Protestant America had to respond to these challenges; simplistically understood, a segment of Protestants sought to modernise in the face of scientific discovery and biblical criticism, while a segment of it did not (Woodberry & Smith, 1998; Zakaullah, 2003).

Among the challenges in the mid- to late-19th century - a time of classical liberal capitalism - was the proliferation of social ills from rising economic inequality. With its emphasis on miracles and individual salvation, conservative Protestantism, which was and remains influenced by its affinity to Capitalism (see Weber, 2002), failed or at least came up short in addressing social problems. In contrast, the modernising faction sought to understand problems in social terms. In such an economic context, the split within Protestantism thus consisted of a split between the increasingly popular Social Gospel movement and the conservative Protestants who remained steadfastly against social solutions to the problems of the 20th century. The dawn of the discipline of Social Work within the Social Gospel movement, therefore, coincided with the diminishing influence of conservative Protestants, who reasserted their beliefs in the 12-part series called *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, but ultimately fell into disrepute and faded from the public sphere (Zakaullah, 2003).

The next moment in the emergence of conservative Protestantism would come just after the Great Depression. While many have studied the compliment between capitalism and Protestantism, among the most interesting and pertinent accounts is that by Kevin M. Kruse, a historian at Princeton University. In his book, *One Nation Under God*, Kruse (2015) seeks to establish "how corporate America made Christian America" - in other words, how the emergence of contemporary Christian Fundamentalism was meaningfully driven by American corporations. After the Great Depression, both conservative Protestantism and classical liberal capitalism suffered from waning public support. This materialised in FDR instituting The New Deal, a large
public stimulus package that would seek to establish a strong state and limit the unfettered market, which I mentioned above. It was in response to The New Deal that "leading industrialists and large business organizations bankrolled major efforts to promote the role of religion in public life" (Kruse, 2015, p. xv). Over subsequent years, the once-vanquished religious conservatism would incrementally re-assert itself in the public sphere with corporate support, including through the erection of religious monuments in public spaces; legal battles to re-institute public prayer in schools; the institution of the National Day of Prayer in 1952; the consecration of paper and coin currency with "In God We Trust" in 1954; and the addition of "One Nation Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance. Among the efforts to re-assert religion into the public sphere are also those that are arguably at least mildly nationalistic if not theocratic, i.e., dominionist. This included the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) influencing the signing by then-President Eisenhower and Richard Nixon of a document on the "seven divine freedoms" to "signify that the United States of America had been founded on the principles of the Holy Bible" (p. 91). It also included a legal battle for the "Christian amendment" to the constitution, which, if passed, would have stated that "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour, and Ruler of nations through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God" (Kluger, 1954 cited in Kruse, 2015, p. 95).

Many of the aforementioned public religious expressions are now taken for granted but find their origin, Kruse (2015) argues, in post-Depression and anti-New Deal efforts by religious conservatives and capitalists to push back against a society which denied the former of congregants (by state-funded social services) and the latter of free markets. And a familiar narrative around social problems, historically regressive and anti-Social Gospel, re-emerged, too. Billy Graham, whose "Washington crusade" to bring religion into the political domain, "insisted
that the poor in other nations, like those in his own, needed no government assistance. 'Their greatest need is not more money, food, or even medicine; it is Christ,' he said. 'Give them the Gospel of love and grace first and they will clean themselves up, educate themselves, and better their economic conditions!' (p. 53). Statements such as the above were echoed by many religious and political leaders re-affirming publically their belief that the material success of the US rested on moral, i.e., conservative Christian, foundation. Thus, the social solutions to social problems were once again being rebranded as individual problems in a manner consistent with classical economics; and the Social Gospel began to give way to "Christian Libertarianism" (Kruse, 2015) or "religious neoliberalism" (Hackworth, 2012) as the Republican Party began to change and shift to become increasingly religious vis-à-vis the specter of nearly 20 years of Democratic dominance of the White House, and the country's first and only serious encounter with democratic socialism.

Finally, the third moment of the emergence of evangelicalism in the US pertains to a series of legal and social developments which woke what Zakaullah (2003) calls the "sleeping giant," i.e., the laity, within American Protestantism (Zakaullah, 2003, p. 450). While the developments discussed by Kruse (2015) seem to chronicle the incipient stages of the now-formidable religious right in the US, it seems that many members of the public, presumably those outside of the halls of power, were animated not only - or perhaps not primarily - by the economic changes in the country or a sense of Christian nationalism but rather by social or "moral" changes. Zakaullah (2003) states that "[a]lthough the fundamentalists had been committed to a policy of non-involvement in politics, the events of [the] 1960s and 1970s made many of them change their minds" (p. 450). In fact, the changes started earlier, with the famous McCollum v. Board of Education case before the Supreme Court in 1948, in which religious
education in public schools was effectively ended. Thereafter, as Kruse (2015) notes, many of the lay people were disillusioned by a series of legal losses to reinstate prayer in public schools in the 50s. Zakaullah (2003) cites the next event as the 1964 Civil Rights Act (CRA), which effectively ended segregation between African Americans and European Christian Americans; many "white" denominations struggled to reconcile their segregationist policies with the CRA (e.g., see Horowitz, 2012). Another moral impetus, perhaps the most influential, was the second wave of feminism and in particular the decision of Roe v. Wade, which, it seems, is thrust onto the centre stage of American politics each election cycle; "Roe v. Wade" legalised abortion in 1973. Other sources of moral consternation were the emerging "godless" communism, which presented both a theological and economic threat to religious neoliberalism and the still-developing gay rights movement. In short, these social changes, and others, seem to have jolted many previously recluse conservative Christians into the public sphere.

**Contemporary Expressions.** By the 1980s, the Republican Party had become effectively yoked to the re-emerging conservative Christian movement, with figureheads of the movement, such as Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority, even claiming responsibility for Ronald Reagan's victory (Bruce, 1990). The marriage of neoliberalism and "evangelical Christianity" within the party and within the US had matured, with no shortage of "leaders who 'talk Christ but walk corporate'"

---

* One could also speak about The ScopesTrial here, but the victory in that case, at least legally, was won by conservative Christians.
* A testament to how live and contested these issues are: while editing this draft for the dissertation defence a vacancy on the United States Supreme Court was made and Donald Trump was tasked with selecting a replacement for an otherwise "moderate" (by Trumpian standards) Republican. The short-list was claimed to be clearly slanted toward the right in a fashion that caused many to claim that the 1973 decision which gave women the right to abortion could be overturned (see, for instance, Smith, 2018). The ultimate pick, Brett Kavanaugh, seems an uncertain choice with respect to Roe v. Wade (see Kwong, 2018). And, of course, Fox News and Christianity Today, both sound pieces for the religious right approved the pick as he is "another religious liberty defender" (Jackson, 2018) and that "we can trust Judge Kavanaugh with the defense of our first and most sacred right" (i.e., religious liberty). That meant ruling against "attacks on the pledge taken 'under God' by our presidents and against the "contraception mandate in ObamaCare" when applied to religious organizations. "Kavanaugh dissented and stood for religious freedom" (Shackleford, 2018).
(Frank, 1952 cited in Brown, 2006, p. 702). In 1981, outside the party was established the Council for National Policy, a kind of "think tank" which engages in private policy meetings with the seemingly express purpose to bring together (right-leaning) evangelical leaders and (right-leaning) wealthy donors (Goldberg, 2007).

This ultimately led to the institution of a type of welfare reform which would pacify both fiscal and religious conservatives. The aptly-titled Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996) (PRWORA), mentioned above, rolled back state services but also contained the much-discussed Charitable Choice (CC) provision which, as a compliment to the continued devolution of state services, sought to bring faith-based organisations into the government's fold and thus back into the public. John Ashcroft, an evangelical, used the argument that Christian groups were discriminated against by the secular state in funding social services (Daly, 2010; Wineburg, 2007). The Charitable Choice provision permitted FBOs previously considered "sectarian," i.e., too fundamentalist, to receive public funds without having to alter or remove religious components of the services they wanted to offer if they wanted to use public funds.

The attention to faith in politics only attenuated as the most openly religious President since Eisenhower (see Kruse, 2015) took office, George W. Bush - a devout evangelical with a born-again experience which "saved" him from alcoholism (Sager, 2011). Bush's legacy is the formalisation of the Charitable Choice into the Faith-Based Initiative, a government initiative to engage FBOs in the provision of social services on new terms. While many have lauded the success of the FBI and Charitable Choice, several scholars have criticised it for being a dogmatic or political maneuver (e.g., Sager, 2010; Wineburg, 2007). Wineburg (2007), for instance, called the FBI and CC a "marriage of government and evangelicals" (p. xv).
Of course, one must understand these criticisms of the FBI and CC against the backdrop of broader criticisms of the "Christian Right" in the US, too (e.g., Brouwer et al., 1996; Goldberg, 2007). These criticisms highlight not only the sometimes uncritical reliance on faith which comes up in the scholarship on FBOs (e.g., Sager, 2010; Wineburg, 2007; 2010), but also the implications of socially regressive attitudes and uncompromising religiosity of the religious right.

One of the most vitriolic of these criticisms comes from journalist Chris Hedges, who himself identifies as Christian, holding a M. Div from Harvard. In his book, with a title that exemplifies the vitriol, *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America*, Hedges tellingly begins with Umberto Eco's distillation in 14 points of "Ur-Fascism" or an eternal or generic fascism. Throughout the book, Hedges takes the reader deeper into aspects of "Christian Fundamentalism's" political or public face, including its anti-intellectualism, sexism, and homophobia. In a chapter on conversion Hedges visits a Florida church to understand its evangelistic impulses. Here he observes what might make any critic or supporter of the FBI or CC wince:

> The most susceptible people, we are told in the seminar, are those in crisis: people in the midst of a divorce; those who have lost a job or are grieving for the death of a close friend or relative; those suffering addictions they cannot control, illness, or the trauma of emotional or physical abuse. We are encouraged to target the vulnerable...It is easier to bring about a conversion when the person being proselytised is in crisis (Hedges, 2007, p. 59)

The election of Donald J. Trump to the White House has, I think, presented the most robust expression of religious neoliberalism or the revival of the once-discredited conservative
Protestantism. Though Trump himself seems, at best, a non-devout follower, his cabinet is a virtual orgy of the religious right, many of whom are extremely wealthy and have supported religiously the free market model. This includes Betsy DeVos, the billionaire Secretary of Education who wants to defund Planned Parenthood and privatise public schools (Strauss, 2017); Mike Pence, Vice President, who follows the "Billy Graham" rules according to which he refuses to dine alone in the company of a female colleague (Turner, 2017); and Ben Carson, a retired neurosurgeon who believes in the literal six-day creationism of the Book of Genesis (Eder & Belluck, 2015). In addition, Trump boasts the largest support among white evangelicals of any President before him, including George W. Bush (Bailey, 2016). And his nominations to the Supreme Court have been decided under the shadow of the religious right (e.g., Smith, 2018).

Canada for Christ

In Canada, there seems to have been a similar "split" within Protestant churches. Around the 1960s, most churches began moving toward a "mainline" social and political orientation, and in terms of missions, began to "NGO-ize" in response to the secular, scientific discourse which has remained dominant since (Brouwer, 2010). Today, several of the mainline churches continue to move "forward," for instance, by admitting to the past abuses of the Residential School System (e.g., Anglican Church of Canada, 1993) or dealing with difficult questions such as whether or not belief in God is necessary to fulfill pastoral duties (see Vosper, 2008). Though not a Protestant but a Catholic, Michael Coren - once a megaphone for religious Canadians in

---

Gretta Vosper is an Anglican pastor who has publically indicated that she is an atheist. While the United Church of Canada has threatened to defrock her, the issue has illustrated the complex questions she raises about the importance of belief versus conduct. See CBC News (2016) for coverage of her story and The Star (2016) for the public's conflict over her position. Later, Rev. Beverley Burlock, a retired Minister of the United Church, came out in defense of Vosper's potential defrocking by requesting she too be defrocked (see Perkel, 2016), suggesting a groundswell of progressive (or heretical) thinking among mainstream churches.
opposition to marriage equality and gay rights - publicly changed his opinion in 2015 (see Coren, 2015a on his changing position and Coren, 2015b on the "right-wing backlash" to this change).

But scholars such as Rawlyk (1995) cautioned that the progressive secularisation in Canada was contradicted by a "noteworthy residue of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century pietism and orthodoxy" in the form of Evangelical Christianity (p. x). Put differently, many former members of today's mainline churches fled, and presumably continue to do so, as those churches became and become more and more socially progressive. Just over 20 years since Rawlyk's observation, that "residue" which remained scattered for a while has been organised and animated by a sympathetic US evangelicalism.

To date, the main source in Canada chronicling this development seems to be journalist Marci McDonald's (2010) book, The Armageddon Factor. Together with her article in The Walrus (see McDonald, 2007), McDonald's works remain the first and still main works to raise critical questions about what this movement means for Canadian society and politics. Her observations are all the more interesting in light of the fact that she professes to be a Christian, though not a conservative one, and that she spent considerable time in the US working as a journalist covering political and social developments that became increasingly religious through the 1980s and 90s. In fact, it was upon her return to Canada in 2002, after a substantial absence, when she noticed a change in Canadian public discourse that seemed sprinkled with a decidedly US flavour that she thought to investigate.

Through interviews, phone calls, research, and attendance at events, she found that the Canadian conservative Christian tradition has been directly influenced and modelled after the US tradition since about the mid-90s, right around the time Rawlyk published his work. McDonald discusses a number of trends, including the development of mega churches, the increase in
Christian homeschooling, greater anti-scientism and anti-environmentalism, the dismissal of evolution in favour of creationism, theological changes which emphasise the elements mentioned above, including missions; and, most importantly, an increased dominionism which sought to fasten religion into the centre of the public sphere.

McDonald (2010) seems to note two main ways that Canada's conservative evangelicals have "copied" or "mimicked" the dominionism now inherent to US politics. The first is to engage in electoral politics, i.e., to engage in the public sphere as religious actors with a dominionist bent. Thus the major political foci of her work are Stephen Harper and the then-new conservative party in Canada - the *Conservative Party of Canada*. Tracing the development of Stephen Harper's evangelical faith and his courting of the emerging evangelical base in Canada, McDonald (2010) shows how Harper, under the tutelage of Preston Manning, remodelled and united the right under the CPC in a fashion more akin to the US Republican Party with its combination of "neo-con" and "theo-con" bases. With the success of the party in securing seats and ultimately minority and majority governments, a number of members of that pietistic "residue" became fixtures in Canadian politics. Among them are many likely to be familiar to those politically conscious Canadians: Stockwell Day, an Albertan politician whose public admission to a belief in Young Earth creationism became a focus in the 2000s (The Globe and Mail, 2000); Gary Goodyear, another creationist who was appointed the Minister of State for Science and Technology; Darrel Reed, part of Harper's core team within the Office of the Prime Minister of Canada, and former President of Focus on the Family Canada and thus ardent advocate of the "traditional family" (Picazo, 2010); and Jason Kenney, former Minister of Citizenship, Immigration, and Multiculturalism. One estimate of the number of "evangelicals" in Harper's administration was 50% (Todd, 2008).
The second way that evangelicals seem to have mimicked American dominionism is through a network of "lobby" groups, many of which are, in fact, directly tied to or modelled after their US equivalents. These groups constitute an organised and concerted effort to influence politicians and ultimately policies to remain consistent with a theo-conservative agenda, much like the Moral Majority or the Christian Coalition, though less robust and less mature. The primary method is to open a branch or location in or close to Ottawa to position lobbyists to apply pressure to Members of Parliament through religious and non-religious means.

One example McDonald (2010) considers at length is TheCRY, a non-demonational evangelical organisation modelled on and tied to the US's TheCall. Though not McDonald's (2010) characterisation, TheCRY is an organisation which engages primarily in "prayer evangelism," the attempt to pray a shift in Canada's political landscape toward theocracy and eventually in fulfillment of The Great Commission (TheCRY, 2017a). From 2006 to 2016, TheCRY led mass prayers in cities such as Ottawa, Toronto, Montréal, Edmonton, Vancouver, and has moved internationally to Hollywood and Israel (TheCRY, 2017b). But TheCRY and its leader, Faytene Kryskowe, are not limited to praying outside of Parliament; with their headquarters in Orillia, Ontario, they claim regularly to meet and pray with MPs inside Parliament, with Kryskowe even having received a personal letter from Harper commending her for her faith-based advocacy (McDonald, 2010).

Another notable example is Canada Christian College, an evangelical institution of higher education in Toronto which regularly campaigns for theo-conservatism with its leader Charles McVety at the vanguard, who once boasted about his ability to influence Harper not unlike Billy Graham influenced US Presidents (McDonald, 2010). The CCC has a "Masters level" program in "Christian Leadership," which is designed to address the "desperate need for impactful moral
leaders in our nation" and "believes there is an urgency to train, develop, and release leaders...in order to bring about transformational change within our society." (Christian Leadership Program Description, 2017).

The National House of Prayer is another example. Situated in Ottawa and in the comfort of Biblical inerrancy, the NHOP is like TheCRY - designed primarily to engage in prayer evangelism to effect change at the governmental level in the direction of their interpretation of Christianity. Recently, Rob Parker, co-founder and director with his wife, released a short tract called We Have a Voice: Equipping to Effect Change in the Public Square. It contains advice on how to engage on matters such as religious freedom, abortion, euthanasia, and "family matters." It contains also answers to more political questions such as "Should I only vote for a Christian Candidate?" and "Doesn't God establish government?"

The most impressive organisation, in terms of size and scope, is the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada (EFC), whose mission is to unite "evangelicals to bless Canada in the name of Jesus." With an office in Ottawa, too, it hopes to be a "positive contributor to public policy." "Bringing together Christians with expertise in a variety of areas," states their website, "the EFC develops resources such as background and position papers, fact sheets, and government submissions and forums" (Evangelical Fellowship of Canada Mission Statement, 2017). They also publish a magazine, Faith Today, whose March/April 2017 issue published while writing this literature review discussed "Is Christ relevant to politics?," though I should point out the issue contains some balance of voices.

TheCRY, CCC, NHOP, and EFC are just four examples of the types of political organisations of which McDonald writes. She states that up to the time of her book nearly a "half-dozen" such organisations emerged in Ottawa alone."Almost all are modelled on the
institutions that the religious right planted in Washington three decades ago, designed to ensure that theo-cons have a lasting voice in the national debate no matter who happens to be in power" (p. 49). A few other notable ones include the Promise Keepers Canada, and Focus on the Family Canada (Jeffrey, 2015). She also importantly points out that Stephen Harper met with the Council on National Policy - that private organisation of religious and economic conservatives mentioned above - in 1997, a further tie between the US and Canada.

Perhaps not surprisingly, McDonald's (2010) book was received with negative and at times vociferous reaction from the right-, centrist-, and left-leaning media outlets. Associate Professor Molly Worthen of the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill quipped in The Globe and Mail that "McDonald sees Christian nationalist conspiracy everywhere she looks" (Worthen, 2010). Paul Wells of Macleans called her act of authoring such a book "irresponsible" in an article with a tacitly dismissive title: "Hey look: There's a faith war? Sign me up!" (Wells, 2010a). On the same day but in another article Wells called her book a "blend of screaming hysteria" (Wells, 2010b). A right-leaning newspaper from Toronto chronicled briefly an evangelical FBO in its review of McDonald's "hysterically titled" book, concluding that "evangelicals clean up the mess" [by evangelising, according to Goldstein] and that clearly "Armageddon's been postponed" (Goldstein, 2010). Ezra Levant, who rightly pointed out some errors in her book, called McDonald, with unconscious irony, a bigot, albeit an "anti-Christian" one. The Canadian Broadcasting Corportion (CBC) purportedly received direct threats from the PMO for launching a "faith war" and "foment[ing] religious division" by covering the book on its flagship nightly news program The National (Doyle, 2010), and so later it seemed to engage in a kind of reactionary ambush of McDonald on another show, Power and Politics, during which she was accused of "demonizing" Christianity by its host (McDonald, 2010).
Part of the criticism of McDonald’s work is warranted. Though I shudder at the use of the subtly sexist "hysteria," McDonald's writing is sometimes inflected in the spirit of investigative journalism and thus at times at least seems to sacrifice balance. This inflection can make her writing seem conspiratorial, but her point is that she had witnessed the germination of the religious right in the US and is cautioning Canada on what she perceives to be a similar pattern under US influence. Thus, the other part of the criticism is unwarranted, I believe, because it is a reactionary misreading of her text. She does not, according to my reading, claim an equivalency, but rather a parallel process between the two countries with verifiable ties between the two movements. It seems the major problem was with McDonald's writing and not her thesis or research. This was demonstrated in May 2010 on The Agenda, during which one of the show's guests, a long-time Member of Parliament (MP) and evangelical Christian Peter MacKay, started by saying that at first he thought the book was a "hyperventilating left-wing screed" but over the course of the book Marci does a considerable service to highlight the depth and growth of evangelical and Catholic movement in Canada...she's done a tremendous service...the press either doesn't know or doesn't care about the faith views of about 4 or 5 million [or 15% of] Canadians. (The Agenda with Steve Paikin, 2010)

Importantly, McDonald's (2010) arguments about the similarities between US and Canadian evangelical movements are supported by academic work, which, perhaps because of its relative inaccessibility and its less political nature, does not get as much attention. American scholars, Hoover, Martinez, Reimer, and Wald (2002), found that at the level of belief and policy, a uniform evangelicalism bridged the "continental [sic] divide." A year later in 2003, Sam Reimer, a professor at one of Canada's private Christian universities, Crandell University, published a book arguing much the same; the level of similarity between US and Canadian
evangelicals bridging that divide he dubbed a "subculture." After McDonald's 2007 piece in *The Walrus*, Jonathan Malloy, seemingly influenced by McDonald's work which he cites, published two papers. In one, Malloy's (2009) arguments mirror McDonald's closely, but seek to parse out some of the differences between Canada and the US. In his 2011 work, Malloy (2011) expands, noting that the "first decade of the twenty-first century Canadian evangelicals have become noticeably more politicised" which he portrays against the backdrop of the 20th century (p. 324). Cautioning readers not to draw "strong conclusions" prematurely, "[o]verall," he states, "we see distinct shifts in Canadian voting behaviour that suggest an American-style association of evangelicals with the major party of the right and clear polarizations on issues of sexuality and reproductive rights," the galvanising issues of the American right (p. 328).

And it seems that time was on McDonald's side, as two years after achieving a majority government, an article in the CBC revisited her book, conceding despite threats to its funding from Harper that "the past two years of majority government has made it clear that faith-based politics and policies are clearly a factor in today's Ottawa, much more so than in the past" (Basen, 2013). Numerous journalistic pieces have been published since Harper's majority, elaborating on McDonald's points, and often crediting her for her prescient work (e.g., Nikiforuk, 2012; Pelletier, 2014). Most recently, Brooke Jeffrey, Professor of Political Science at Concordia University in Montréal, Canada, cites McDonald's book as showing "in painstaking detail" that "the interconnections between various evangelical organizations and interest groups and the membership and operation of the new Conservative Party are complex and legion" (2015, p. 65). Sections of Jeffrey's (2015) book on the connection between evangelical groups and the CPC seem virtually identical in their conclusion to McDonald's (2010) and Malloy's (2009; 2011).
Implicit in the above, therefore, is that the evidence which served to vindicate McDonald and validate her cautionary note was most palpable in the accumulated policy changes enacted by Harper over his 10 years of government, which together chorused "theo-con" policy leanings of the Kryskowes and McVetys of Canada: increased funding for evangelical FBOs operating internationally (Audet et al., 2013, but see Vander Zaag 2013; 2014 and Audet 2014); defunding of KAIROS, a left-leaning Christian FBO (Clark, 2011); over $20 million in grant funding to at least 13 private Christian universities, a first for Canada (CBC News, 2013); dramatic reductions in spending for the Status of Women Canada (McDonald, 2010); cancellation of the national daycare plan, arguably viewed as both a moral and economic overreach of the secular state (McDonald, 2010); cancellation of funding for the Court Challenges Program, which "had allowed a range of minorities, including women and the disabled, to appeal injustices under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms" (McDonald, 2010, p. 43); raising the age of sexual consent from fourteen to sixteen (CBC News, 2008); cancelled funding for non-Christian chaplains within the correctional system (Mahoney, 2012); institution of the global "gag" rule (a.k.a., the Mexico City policy) which meant no Canadian international funding for abortions being carried out abroad (Delacourt, 2010); defunding Toronto Pride (CBC News, 2010); "gagging" federal scientists (Woo, 2015); an anti-environmentalism, which included not only the aforementioned gagging of federal environmental science, but also deregulation of environmental protections (Smith, 2014); and, as stated above, the establishment of a US-style Office of Religious Freedom with a $5 million annual budget and a devout Catholic at the helm.

The main, and noteworthy, exception was that Harper did not formally open up the abortion debate, much to the chagrin of some of his evangelical base. But many of his MPs have made public comments pleading the evangelical base to open this issue up informally from
outside of Parliament so that MPs could act from inside of Parliament. As the dust from McDonald's (2010) book settled toward the end of 2015, the harsh reality of Harper's policy changes confirmed what many scholars have, in fact, noted in a general sense, that belief can predict policy positions (e.g., Hoover et al., 2002; Woodberry & Smith, 1998).

Since McDonald's (2010) work and the victory of the Liberal Party of Canada in an election many considered more anti-Harper than pro-anything, the discourse on faith-based politics has subsided. Yet this is, in my opinion, more a function of selective attention (remember MP Peter MacKay's comments), or perhaps a welcome respite, on the part of journalists and academics than reality. It is also a function of the electoral cycle - for now Canada is ruled by the Liberal Party of Canada and Alberta, for the first time, is governed by the New Democratic Party, the latter's success came in part as a function of the fragmentation of the right in that province. But Jason Kenney, a member of Harper's administration, is now leader of the United Conservative Party in Alberta in fulfillment of his pledge to unite the right in Alberta the way Harper did nationally. And days before this dissertation was submitted for review, the Ontario Progressive Conservative party was elected with a majority win. Moreover, most of the organisations cited by Jeffrey (2015) and McDonald (2010) seem active and thriving. TheCRY, for instance, during the writing of this dissertation engaged in a centennial prayer and fasting event, to commemorate Canada's 150 years as a Westphalian nation.

Furthermore, there are other indications that the "sleeping giant" of evangelicalism which once awoke in the US has only hit snooze in Canada. In 2016, Sam Oosterhoff became the youngest MP to be elected to the provincial legislature as a member of the provincial Conservative Party; then a home-schooled 19-year old from Niagara Region in Canada, he was "nominated with support from the religious right as the party's candidate," running on rhetoric...
against the controversial sex-education programme of Kathleen Wynne. In 2018, he was elected to another four-year term. Trinity Western University (TWU), which received $2.6 million from Harper's government (see CBC News, 2013), took its ongoing legal battle with several law societies to the Supreme Court over its desire to open a Christian law school; it's the largest private Christian university in Canada and its controversial "covenant" requires incoming students to agree, in line with their interpretation of Biblical precepts, to avoid sex outside of male-female marriages, including same-sex relationships. TWU's dominionism seems clear; its stated goal is to create "godly Christian leaders" with "thoroughly Christian minds" and to grow "disciples of Jesus Christ who glorify God through fulfilling the Great Commission" (Trinity Western University, 2018b). All so that they may have "transformational impact on culture" through affecting "the dynamics and institutions of our society on the basis of biblical principles such as justice, mercy and hope" (Trinity Western University, 2018a). Most recently, a Harper-appointed Senator, Lynn Beyak came under fire from the media for claiming that some members of the Residential School System (RSS) had "good intentions" (Tasker, 2017); but again, initially the media was sleepy, as there was little coverage of the religiously inspired nature of her speech. "Good intentions" was placed within a speech that consisted of a kind of faith-based defense of the RSS complete with allusions to how converting could be beneficial based on her arguably romanticised portrayals of Christian Indigenous people who were, she said, "filled with the same spirit of God and the love of Jesus that I and many others share" (Beyak, 2017). Eventually, her defence of the Residential School System led to her being fired by the newly elected CPC leader,  

---

22 There is an irony about someone who has not had a family, and based on his conservative beliefs, likely hasn't had sex of any kind to have an opinion about sex-education and family planning.  
23 Another instance of the ebbs and flows inherent to this work, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled against TWU, 7-2 (Harris, 2018)
Andrew Scheer, who stated quite pointedly, "racism will not be tolerated" (Tunny & Lofaro, 2018).

While it seems true that Canadian conservative evangelicalism is not as powerful as, nor identical to, its US counterpart, especially in this, the Trumpian era, there seems sufficient evidence that there are parallel developments which can have serious implications for public policy positions, including for social services. "The fact that there's a government that's more sympathetic is good," said Darrel Reid after Harper's first win, "but the government won't be there forever. That's why we need to be there for the long haul" (McDonald, 2010, p. 49). Some of the struggles to appreciate the influence of US evangelicalism in Canada are mitigated, I believe, once one situates American conservative evangelicalism globally, on which I will comment briefly now.

Global Christianity

It is no secret and no object for debate that the US has sought global influence after World War II and especially after the dissolution of the Soviet Union; nor is it much of a debate that its global influence crystallised or consolidated under the much-contested term "globalisation" (e.g., Steger, 2000) Accordingly, American evangelicalism would seek to expand its influence. But the "globalisation" of evangelicalism, of course, not just about the importation of religion or an innocent adoption by the third world of a superior spiritual truth (e.g., Brouwer et al., 1996); although there are certainly some academics (e.g., Freston, 2009; Jenkins, 2011) who seem to share some variant of this, what might be considered a relatively bright-eyed position. The globalisation of American evangelicalism seems to support the importation of American culture, broadly conceived. In true Gramscian hegemonic fashion, Brouwer et al. (1996) correctly assert, the conventional narrative of globalisation (e.g., Harvey,
2005; Steger, 2000; Stiglitz, 2000), "gives appropriate credit to the aggressive spread of American business and media culture, but neglects the ways in which religious cultures are also enmeshed in the process" (p. 3). In other words, American evangelicalism often serves as a vehicle or conduit for post-communist "Americanism," broadly conceived, but also is itself "globalising" across the developing world. This process Brouwer et al. (1996) called with conscious allusion to capitalism the "exporting [of] the American gospel."

However, according to Robert Wuthnow (2009), "[r]esearchers have paid so little attention to the transcultural activities of American churches that it has until recently been difficult to answer even the simplest questions about what is currently being done" (p. 22). But the "mandate for Christian congregations to engage in ministry beyond their immediate locale is expressed most clearly in the New Testament teaching known as the Great Commission (Mark 16:15)." One of the major impetuses for the fulfillment of this mandate, and of seemingly mythic importance to some evangelicals, was the First International Congress of World Evangelization, or "Lausanne Congress," held in Switzerland in 1974 and led by Billy Graham, father of one of the most prominent public evangelicals in America, Franklin Graham. At the dawn of the postcolonial era, Billy Graham, who had unparalleled access to U.S. presidents (see Kruse, 2015 or Wacker, 2014), "developed a passion to 'unite all evangelicals in the common task of the total evangelization of the world'" (The Lausanne Movement, n.d.[a]).

The movement provided a theological foundation for this unity in global mission, expressed in the "Lausanne Covenant," to which 150 nations were party. In 15 points, the Lausanne Covenant lays out a strict or "fundamentalist" view of Christianity with the majority of points focused specifically on world evangelization. Of particular relevance to this work is the confession that historically Christians too often treated as separate two sides of the coin of
Christian witness - service and evangelism. The parties thus expressed "penitence" for having presumably engaged in misconduct by regarding "evangelism and social concern as mutually exclusive". Thereafter, "evangelism and sociopolitical involvement," or the dual mandate if one squints a bit, becomes an American Christian duty with global scope. New Christian converts, those who are "born again into his [sic] kingdom [sic]," are called upon to engage socially, for "Faith without works is dead" (The Lausanne Movement, 1974). Wuthnow (2009) tellingly - though perhaps unconsciously - refers to this change as indicative of postcolonial Christianity.

The Lausanne Movement's second global gathering in the Philippines oversaw the reaffirmation of the Covenant in the Manila Manifesto. On the eve of the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the document is stronger in some ways in its wording about Christian exclusivity and the need to expand globally, yet there appears new language about human rights, love, and a more reasoned persuasion in evangelising. Again, service and evangelism figure in the document. For instance, under the banner of "whole gospel" Christians are provided with a biblically-based reasoning of the value of the "good news" for the spiritually and materially "poor" among the world. Again with language similar to the Lausanne Covenant - "The Gospel and Social Responsibility" - the Manifesto states that as Jesus proclaimed and acted, so too were Christians "called today to a similar integration of words and deeds. In the spirit of humility we are to preach and teach, minister to the sick, feed the hungry, care for prisoners, help the disadvantaged and handicapped, and deliver the oppressed" (Manila Manifesto, 1989). As if in response to incredulity, the changing secularisation of development work, or the ghost of the Social Gospel, the Manifesto rebuts that the "commitment to social action" is not a mistake, but rather in keeping with Biblical precepts and a recognition of the social relevance of Christianity. But then the catch: as with the Lausanne Covenant, the signatories acknowledged that the past
"narrowness of our concerns and vision has often kept us from proclaiming the lordship of Jesus Christ over all of life, private and public, local and global" (The Lausanne Movement, 1989).

The third and most recent gathering would happen 21 years later in 2010 in Cape Town, South Africa; with discernible difference, such as a clear mention of racism and a more lucid acknowledgement of the problems inherent to intercultural missions, The Cape Town Commitment again reiterates a focus on service and evangelism (The Lausanne Movement, 2011). The context changes, in other words, but the message remains the same.

This string of rhetoric in these three documents is recognised as a progression to "holistic mission" or "integral mission" - the pairing of service or social responsibility and evangelism - considered, according to the Lausanne Movement's website, largely a function of its work. But establishing that there was a Biblical basis for The Great Commission and for "holistic mission" was only part of the goal of the Lausanne Movement. The other was to define the target, which the Lausanne Movement dubbed "unreached people groups" within the "10/40 window" (Lausanne Movement, n.d., [b]).

The most articulate and organised expression of Lausanne's stated target came in 1995, when an organisation now called The Joshua Project was founded. The Joshua Project, whose motto contains a certain post-colonial itch - "bringing definition to the unfinished task" - defines the "10/40 window" as the "rectangular area of North Africa, the Middle East and Asia approximately between 10 degrees north and 40 degrees north latitude...[also known as] "The Resistant Belt" and includes the majority of the world's Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists" (What is the 10/40 Window, n.d.). With a sophisticated data management system, presentations, videos, online support, books, a mailing list, and even a new iPhone and Android app, would-be missionaries, or just the curious doctoral student, can gain access to information about how the
global missions movement is doing. It is easy to mark, immediately, that success is defined not in "holistic" terms, but rather as a function of the number and extent of American evangelical influence, i.e., the number of "souls" which can be won. Countries, including Canada and India, are categorised by number of "people groups;" percentage of those reached and unreached; largest religion; whether or not a people group is indigenous; population of evangelicals; and even a colour-coded "progress scale" which measures the influence of evangelicals within a "people group." Among the people groups in Canada are, of course, its various First Nations, almost all of which are given a green, for "evangelicals have a significant presence." Canada's Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, and Muslim populations all receive a disappointing red, for "Few evangelicals [among them] and few who identify as Christians. Little, if any, history of Christianity."

It is hard to tell how such global Christian movements translate into actual converts. As Wuthnow (2009) pointed out, not much is known about the global work of churches, congregations, and even faith-based organisations. I will try to address some of this in subsequent sections when I look at the work being done internationally by US and Canadian FBOs. But the rhetoric of social service provision is not for nothing. If funding is indicative, then it seems the movement is at least gaining traction. In 2006, Giving USA estimated that nearly US $93.2 billion was given to religious organisations; the updated figure from 2016 is $119.30 billion, which is just under a 10 billion dollar increase after inflation. Regarding Western donations as a whole, about $1 billion a year, Bauman (2015a) reports, goes to India, which in rupees amounts to about 65 billion INR.

---

24 On a personal note, while I was in India in January 2017, I received on my Android Joshua Project app notice about my own "people group" - the “Gujaratis.”

25 Unfortunately, I wasn’t able to get more recent numbers.
Moreover, studies, such as Brouwer et al.'s (1996), Wuthnow's (2009), and Bauman's (2015a), as well as others (e.g., Manji & O'Coill, 2002), some of which I will note below, have begun to trace the influence of American Christianity into various parts of the world, including the Philippines, South Korea, Liberia, Kenya, and, of course, India (see also Vasquez, 2003). The marriage of service and evangelism, while not always present in these discussions, is nonetheless notably present as the Lausanne documents assert, and occurs often with socially regressive attitudes on the part of conservative evangelicals (e.g., Ahmed, 2005; Sharlet, 2010). These attitudes often clash with Social Work, the last domain to discuss with respect to evangelicalism.

In Social Work, A Site of the "Culture Wars"

In an almost prophetic paper, two social workers, James Midgley and Paul Sanzenbach, published their views nearly 30 years ago on this, then-nascent, Christian conservative movement in the US and its principled and potential conflicts with Social Work. Midgley and Sanzenbach (1989) noted that while Social Work had derived much value from organised religion historically, it would face a somewhat different religious entity in “fundamentalist evangelicals” than to what it had been accustomed. They went on to identify conflicts between this emerging fundamentalism and (a) the discipline’s values, (b) its scientific epistemological orientation, and (c) its professional practice. Christian “Fundamentalism’s antipathy to social work’s values, scientific knowledge and professional[ism]” they contended, “needs to be appreciated by the profession, debated and addressed” (Midgley & Sanzenbach, 1989, p. 285). They concluded that “[t]he resurgence of fundamentalism in the modern world poses a challenge for social workers” and yet “[i]t is curious that in spite of several recent publications on the relationship between religion and social work [e.g., Canda's work], little has been written on the question of fundamentalist theology, and its implications for the profession” (p. 285).
Since the publication of Midgley and Sanzenbach’s (1989) paper - in fact, just over the last 15 years - Social Work has become a sort of paradigm for the emergence of a conservative evangelicalism that has continued to demonstrate an increasing friction between its precepts and those of a secular, scientific, and professional Social Work. In this section I am going to review a number of themes in the Social Work literature that have emerged over the last 10 years which signify a growing current of conservative evangelicalism from within the discipline. Generally, these themes overlap, but for organisational clarity I divide them into three broad themes: (1) calls and arguments for the “Christianisation” of Social Work; (2) a related discussion as to the compatibility of conservative evangelicalism and Social Work; and (3) the claim that evangelicals within Social Work are oppressed.

**Christianisation of Social Work**

For most of the early part of religion’s re-surfacing within the field of Social Work, religion was considered important for its practical value in clinical settings. The argument goes like this: The clients of social workers can and do turn out to have religious traditions or metaphysical queries that influence their lives in significant ways; it would behove any social worker, therefore, to gain at least some degree of competency. The field was less likely to offer this competency under a modernist secular-scientific paradigm with an almost pathological aversion to religion. This argument is still present today and it is generally considered, including by me, to be meritorious and sound and that religion as a practical consideration for clinical practice is something social workers cannot and should not ignore. This is what might be considered a “pragmatic” integration of religion or Christianity and Social Work, such that the integration of religion in Social Work is limited to its pragmatic value in clinical and educational settings.
The "Christianisation of Social Work" that I refer to is entirely different. The “integration” of Christianity here is not pragmatic, but rather fundamentalist (i.e., altering the fundamental constitution of the field) or even dominionist. In fulfillment of Midgley and Sanzenbach’s (1989) prophetic warnings, there are now a number of self-identified “Christian social workers” who organise, publish, teach, practice, and research in ways that intentionally or unintentionally work to uniquely alter the discipline in fundamental ways. This is, I believe, the disciplinary analogue to the otherwise similar social and political movement by conservative evangelicals to “integrate” their version of Christianity into the foundation of U.S. American and Canadian societies so as to fundamentally alter the constitution of each.

Perhaps the most prominent source and example of this desire for fundamental integration is the National Association of Christians in Social Work (NACSW), an organisation that claims to “equip its members to integrate Christian faith and professional social work practice” (NACSW, 2017). To understand better, to texture, what it means exactly to “integrate” Christian faith with Social Work one need look no further than what the NACSW defines as “Christian faith.” Its definition of Christian faith, while relatively broad at the peripheries, is fairly well defined at the core with adherence to the “Apostles’ Creed,” the “Nicene Creed,” and a statement of “faith and practice” unique to NACSW that contains some decidedly "fundamentalist" concepts and language.

Among the first group of tenets pertaining to this statement of faith one finds that Christian faith for the practising social worker “calls [to] all Christians to be a caring community and corporate witness to faith in Him” (NACSW, 2017) and a belief that “God works in and through people in the person of the Holy Spirit” (NACSW, 2017). The second group emphasising “human relationships” also consists of subtly conservative language. For instance,
in a point about the “uniqueness of human beings and the distinctiveness of social groups,” the following are considered: “age, gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, life philosophy, family, culture, and economic and social structures.” The absence of the hot-button issue (for fundamentalists) of sexual orientation as a marker of noteworthy individual and group identity is conspicuous here, even within Social Work where it has been a focus of conflict as I will discuss below (see Todd & Coholic, 2007; 2012). Perhaps even more conspicuous is the absence of "religion" itself, an omission that is also particularly ironic in light of the several papers which argue for evangelicalism’s inclusion in social work on the basis of “religious diversity” (e.g., Hodge, 2005), and stands apart from the American and Canadian Codes. This section of tenets ends with a less-subtle, staunchly dominionist claim, by now familiar to the reader, that “Jesus Christ is Lord over all areas of life, including social, economic and political systems” (NACSW, 2017). The final group of tenets emphasises “vocation” and here it is that one finds the tenets which might more directly affect practice (and thus FBOs). While there is a qualifying claim that Christian social workers should “support and submit themselves to the highest standards of professional education, practice, and ethics,” this is outflanked by statements such as “Christians in social work ought to examine and evaluate all human ideologies and social work theories and methods as to their consistency with the Bible, their consciences, social laws, and professional codes of ethics” (NACSW, 2017). To this one could add the injunction that Christian social workers should work for the “temporal and eternal well being” (i.e., holistic) of their clients and “for the redemption of human communities and social institutions” (NACSW, 2017).

While to some it might still not be obvious, there are several elements of this foundational statement of the NACSW, to which all its members must agree at least in principle, which grind viciously against the tenets of Social Work. The exhortation for the Christian Social
Worker to judge all “human” ideologies, implying that religion is not such, against the Bible and against the conscience of the Christian social worker is precisely the type of conservative language one observes in the “religious freedom” laws in which doctors, business owners, and more claim to be acting on “conscience” or in keeping with Biblical teachings when they deny service to gay and lesbian couples and members of the transgender community (Portney, 2016). The belief that Jesus is “Lord” over all social, economic, and political systems is a clearly theocratic belief one observes in Millenarian politics and scholarship seeking to hasten the Second Coming of Christ and his “dominion” over the Earth in a newfound Christendom, a narrative in which members of other religious groups do not fare well. The call to address not only “temporal” but “eternal” well being betrays the belief that religion and spirituality from within Social Work, in essence only Christianity in Social Work, is not merely a practical consideration, a tool for the social work professional in understanding and aiding clients, but a paradigm supported by a singular divine ontology, i.e., a belief that the client can be “saved” from sin, nay, that to be saved is the ultimate service.

Still, perhaps if this statement were the only indication of the NACSW’s conservatism - or if it occurred without the extra-disciplinary homologues covered above - one might be less justified in suggesting the impulse of evangelicals to shift the discipline. But there are several other examples of published work which further support this argument. The NACSW holds annual conferences and houses the now-popular peer-reviewed journal Social Work & Christianity, each of which consist of several examples of this “fundamentalist integration” of Christianity and Social Work (e.g., see Hugen, 1998).

One popular form of this desire for fundamentalist integration within the published literature is sandwiched between the now oft-repeated reminders that Social Work is, historically
speaking, a Christian discipline. Parenthetically, while it is historically accurate to point out Christianity’s influence on Social Work, its relevance is not always clear to me, indeed it would be hard to talk even about the history of science without referring to religion or Christianity, and yet a history book on Newtonian physics might not mention Newton’s own obsessions with the Hebrew Bible; moreover, this influence of Christianity is often so glowingly positive in social work papers so as to take on a more political, apologetic flavour; it also misses the important distinction between the modernising and conservative factions of 19th- and 20th-century Protestantism, between the Social Gospel and its opponents. But more problematically and to the main point, to this historical argument often are appended claims of fundamentalist integration, a romantic vision of a return to the putative origins of a now [spiritually] lost discipline. Consider the following lengthy but pertinent passage by James R. Vanderwoerd (2011), Professor of Social Work at Redeemer College in Hamilton, Canada, made in a paper on the lamentable minimisation of Christianity’s influence on the field, published within NACSW’s flagship journal, *Social Work & Christianity*:

Speaking now personally as a Christian to other Christians in social work, I would argue that our task is to heighten our awareness of the influence of the secularization paradigms and thus be better able to challenge and refute the secularization narrative...are we prepared to make the claim that our story – what we would argue is actually God’s story really is the ‘true story of the whole world’...To historians, I would humbly submit that we must be bold: we say that the biblical story is true, and if we don’t claim it as so, we reduce the power of God’s word to just another dusty historical manuscript. There is no

---

* This strand of social work scholarship smacks of a sub-text not unlike that which one can observe in the U.S. and Canada by Christians claiming that each country was “founded on Christian principles” or even is a Christian nation, or that we must “put Christ back in Christmas.”
point to the biblical story unless one claims that it is true. As theologian N.T. Wright argues (2006), Christianity only makes sense if one reads the biblical story as a *grand* narrative, not just one narrative among many. What we need, then, is to tell and retell the story so that we begin to take up our calling to join in God’s great work of redemption and reconciliation in which he is making all things new (Isa.65: 17; Rev. 21: 5). Anything less is a capitulation to some other story in which we fail to love God with all our heart, soul, and strength, and instead put our trust in human efforts to save us. (p. 261)

That such a passage could be published in a peer-reviewed journal within a publically funded and regulated profession and academy, each with a secular, scientific focus would easily give some pause. But perhaps more likely to alarm some are the fundamentalist and triumphalistic claims inherent to the passage: that Christianity only makes sense as a “grand” narrative; that it alone is the “true story of the whole world,” that to recognise the validity of “some other story” [i.e., secular Social Work’s] is to “capitulate" and "fail to love God;" and most problematically, that human efforts to solve social problems are insufficient – all of these are clearly at violent odds with Social Work as we know it, including the three aspects mentioned by Midgley and Sanzenbach (1989)

And yet, if such arguments were limited to the NACSW, one might *again* be less justified in making this argument. But such sentiments have been published outside of NACSW’s flagship journal. For instance, a paper published in Social Work’s marquee journal for all things religious or spiritual, the *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, published a piece by Chan & Lap-Yan (2000), in which existing welfare “ideologies” including the concept of social citizenship are critiqued from a supposedly Christian perspective. In the stead of secular welfare these Social Work scholars place a “Christian welfare ideology” rooted in the beliefs that
relations between God and human beings are the basis of human relations [including welfare]” and that “in order to free human beings from sin and re-establish an intimate relationship with God, who sent Jesus Christ to the earth [sic] to spread the news of salvation,” we must reclaim God’s love as the basis of human welfare. They conclude that “we might have to re-examine the value base of modern welfare systems by making them more compatible with [Christianity’s view of] human nature” and that “Christian values are likely to provide us an alternative basis for the development of human welfare in the modern world (p. 71). Even the prestigious and notoriously selective *British Journal of Social Work*, a “secular” outlet, has published similar works by Graham Bowpitt (1998; 2000). In his 2000 paper, Bowpitt lays out a fully “Christian paradigm” to Social Work, including a view of human nature which states that we, social workers and clients, are created by God and, by divine origin, are sinful.

The most recent expression of fundamentalist integration, and the last that I will expand upon here, is also by Professor Vanderwoerd. In his 2016 paper, also published in *Social Work & Christianity*, Vanderwoerd discusses the “promise and perils” of anti-oppressive social work, and calls for a “re-ordered AOP.” The “re-ordering” of this essential feature of contemporary Social Work is done almost precisely as the NACSW advises: Vanderwoerd (2016) “judges” the “human ideology” of AOP against the [purportedly not human] “Christian worldview.” The outcome consists of underdeveloped and vague statements that can easily be taken as not only different from Social Work, indeed much of contemporary liberalism, but antithetical to it. This includes the vague and Biblically-justified suggestion that inequality can lead to “flourishing” among people (though it has a secular analogue in Rawls's (1993) "difference principle") and that submitting to authority and power, a major focus of AOP's critical sight, is desirable.
What these and other examples illustrate, I believe, is a growing impulse for a more fundamentalist integration of Social Work and conservative evangelicalism. Associated with this impulse for fundamentalist integration is a discussion which strikes notes similar to those struck in the ethics discussion above about the potentially uncouth juxtaposition of religion and profession in the term “Christian Social Work” (e.g., Neagoe, 2013), to which I turn next.

The (In)compatibility of Conservative Evangelicalism and Social Work.

This theme is perhaps a more accurate reflection of the specific concern expressed by Midgley and Sanzenbach (1989), namely that the encounter between conservative evangelicalism and Social Work is likely to give birth to potentially interminable conflicts. Apart from scattered concerns about the potential for evangelicalism inside and outside the field to militate against Social Work's traditionally and inherently pro-state stance (e.g., Belcher, Fandetti, & Cole, 2004; Horsburgh, 1988), the major theme of conflict in the literature pertains to the protection and/or denial of human rights to sexual minorities. Numerous studies show that conservative evangelicals tend to be homophobic (e.g., Chonody, Woodford, Smith, & Silverschanz, 2012), a term Vanderwoerd (2016) indicates a personal contact of his disliked as “hurtful and derogatory” (p. 168).\footnote{This demonstrated connection between conservative evangelicalism and homophobia, while important, is merely an empirical validation of the almost endless stream of subtle and explicit homophobia one can observe in the U.S. and Canada. (e.g., Portney, 2016)}

\footnote{For more from within Social Work, see Harris (2008) on integrating Christian faith with practice or Milner (2014) and Adams (2014) on the emerging discussion of developing Christian virtues in Social Work students. From outside of Social Work, see the OINTF (2017) document on “The Christian Social Work Model.” One could also spend considerable time analysing what the term “Christian Social Worker” means exactly; here the dual mandate is also relatively strong.
\footnote{See this interesting religious perspective (Cruz, 2014)}}
In the U.S., this specific conflict between Christian Fundamentalism and Social Work has materialised over the years when the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE) has clashed with religious colleges over a 1982 policy the former had adopted. That policy recognised, as is now well accepted in the field, that human rights should be protected on the basis of sexual orientation and its “[p]roponents wanted to require every social work program to state that they would not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation” (Ressler, 1998, p. 99). At least twice, once in 1995 and once in 2000, the policy was deemed to be “illegal” and in violation of the religious freedom of Social Work schools with a conservative orientation; thus to this day the policy is more or less dormant and colleges in the U.S. remain in a position to exercise their religious freedom in a manner which denies members of the LGBTQ community protection from homophobia and discrimination (Ressler, 1998). At present, there does not seem to be a similar conflict in Canada as far as Social Work programs go (Todd & Coholic, 2012), but the same conflict has emerged in the field of education and law with the British Columbia-based conservative evangelical Trinity Western University, which I discussed above (CBC News, 2017). However, the antagonism between Social Workers committed to an anti-oppressive framework and what one gay man from an Adventist church referred to as "religious homophobia" (Cruz, 2014) has begun to emerge in Social Work classrooms at publicly-funded, secular universities in Canada (Todd & Coholic, 2007; 2012).

Perhaps the most alarming instance of homophobia, albeit veiled, comes in the form of a journal article written by Dr. David Hodge, Professor of Social Work at Arizona State University. The article is based on the premise that “evangelicals” are “marginalised” in Social Work and thus the perspectives of “people of faith” on “homosexuality” should be included in the field in the name of inclusivity of religious diversity, a professed value of the field. “[T]he
range of views [on “homosexuality”] should be increased,” argues Hodge (2005), “…toward a balanced and inclusive profession that is more demographically representative” (p. 207).

Presumably to allay fears and initial reactions of horror, Hodge (2005) assures the reader that “Gay men and lesbians are no more and no less animated by human turpitude than others” and that they are “invited to join the Christian community, and as an expression of their relationship to God, all believers are called to exhibit Christian values” – one of which he states just a few sentences earlier is the value of “sexuality expressed in monogamous male-female dyads” (p. 208). But again, to further allay fears of the iniquity of such an arrangement Hodge (2005) adds that “just as heterosexual Christians are called to abstain from sexual activity outside of marriage, so too are homosexual Christians. Just as heterosexual individuals can abstain from sexual activity through a relationship with God in conjunction with the support of the community of believers, so too can lesbians and gay men” (p. 208).

The article is published in one of the foremost journals of the field, Social Work. I doubt there is any difficulty in perceiving the gravity of such a paper, but in case there is, consider for instance what the identical paper, but with another marginalised group, would yield in terms of reactions. A "religious racism" or "religious sexism" or "religious anti-Semitism" would, I gather, not be published in any Social Work journal. Even if those phrases were not used, conceive of how an article arguing in the name of inclusion that religious social workers be able to keep and express openly the sexism justified by many Bible passages or to keep and express openly anti-Semitic attitudes based on comments made by Jesus about the Pharisees.

Interestingly, the journal Social Work is published by the NASW, whose own ethical code is likely to render Hodge's (2005) paper inadmissible. Not surprisingly, therefore, Hodge's (2005)
paper generated considerable upheaval, starting with a response in Social Work by Melendez & LaSala (see also, Dessel, Shepardson, & Bolen, 2011)

The Oppression of Evangelicals

The third theme I want to discuss only briefly, as I am not entirely convinced about its direct relevance to my topic and to FBOs, but as far as the number of publications goes, this is by far the most contentious materialisation of the encounter between Social Work and conservative evangelicalism and therefore not easily ignored; moreover, it has an interesting analogue in the American political sphere.

This third theme pertains to the “premise” upon which Hodge’s above claims are based, specifically, that Social Work, as a discipline “marginalises” or “oppresses” “evangelical Christians” and/or “people of faith.” The number of papers which make this argument at first seems staggering (e.g., Hodge, 2002; 2003; 2005; 2006; 2007; Ressler, & Hodge, 2003; 2005) but really one notices the theme surrounds one academic, David Hodge, mentioned above. The argument, generally speaking, is that Social Work must, on the grounds of inclusivity, accept or admit evangelical Christianity but it doesn't, and so evangelical perspectives and students and presumably professors are "oppressed." The number of responses to this thesis are equally impressive, both direct (e.g., Bennett, 2003; Canda, 2003; Denasi, 2003; Kaufman, 2003; Liechty, 2003; Melillo, 2003; Tower, 2003; Van Wormer, 2003) and indirect (e.g., Dessel & Bolen, 2014; Dessel, Sphardson, & Bolen, 2011; Todd & Coholic, 2007; 2010). The suggestion that evangelical Christians are "oppressed" raised many hackles, leading two Social Workers to ask "Who's oppressing whom?" in the title to their paper (Melendez & LaSala, 2007) and another to state, with direct reference to American politics, that he was
at a complete loss...to understand just why compassionate conservatives want to become social workers in the first place....there is already a job category that meshes rather well with their sociopolitical and religious ideology. It's called "missionary."

(Denasi, 2003, p. 273)

Others, such as Dr. Sarah Todd and Dr. Diana Coholic (2007) were more tempered but remind us that there might have to be "limits on inclusivity" and suggesting rightly that there's a false equivalency between the potential mistreatment of evangelicals or conservative religious students in Social Work and the "oppressive experiences of those...who endure sexism, heterosexism, racism, and/or colonialism" (p. 279). Apart from the illustrating just how influential conservative evangelicalism has become in a discipline, the discourse on oppression was precisely how the FBI and CC were passed in the US (Wineburg, 2007). The evangelical base appropriated "civil rights" language, states Wineburg, to forward the argument that the exclusion of fundamentalist FBOs and congregations in the provision of social services was discriminatory. The argument, of course, was sold, and the CC was instituted into law.

**Concluding Remarks on Evangelicalism**

Hopefully, the above gives a relatively clear, albeit partial, picture of the state of a strain of contemporary Christianity which has morphed into a formidable force in contemporary society. Animated in large measure by the argument touched upon by Berger (2015) - that perhaps religious belief cannot be "privatised" - adherents of evangelicalism seek increasingly to integrate or infuse, and in some cases remove, patches of the secular, scientific blanket which has comforted parts of the Western world from the threat of earlier expressions of conservative evangelicalism. Those seeking comfort include not only stereotypically irreligious secularists trumpeting Enlightenment values, but more significantly, the vast majority of religious
adherents, including the vast majority of Christians, who fall outside of the narrowly conceived boundaries which define "the Body of Christ" or "the Kingdom." The birth of this movement in modern times seems inextricably linked to American economic and social conservativism, of which conservative evangelicalism seems the most powerful marriage. It's procession into Canada seems to signal both economic and social policy directives (however, see Hoover et al., 2002) as does its expansion globally, while its emerging presence in Social Work has broad implications for its clash with the field's foundational assumptions and ethics. That clash, according to Neagoe (2013) is most likely to be felt in the FBO, which is the topic I turn to next.
Chapter 3, Good Works and The Great Commission: Religious Influence in Evangelical FBOs

Above I attempted to sketch the background to my research by providing an interpretive framework and an exposition on evangelicalism's growth. Here I will provide the "figure" - i.e., the main subject of my research - the dual mandate of the FBO. To jog the memory, the dual mandate refers to the simultaneous presence of (a) the Biblical mandate to convert non-believers and (b) the secular mandate to provide social service to members of civil society. The following review will thus consist of a summary of the literature on FBOs with an eye to drawing out the dual mandate.

Before I begin the literature review, however, I want to comment on a few things. To start, there seem to me to be roughly three types of literature and I made an effort to "manage" these types. The first type is the type I will not discuss at length but do cite occasionally, usually in support of the other two types; this type of literature consists of studies in which there is a passing reference to "proselytism" (e.g., Bielefeld & Cleveland, 2013; Cnaan & Boddie, 2001; Lambert-Pennington & Pfroom, 2010; Sharp, 2010), usually couched in a broader discussion of Charitable Choice or secularism. These references usually tell us no more than that some form of religious influence could be occurring and usually only strike a cautionary note that if it is occurring there might be cause for the Social Worker's concern (e.g., Redwood-Campbell, 2008). More importantly, they offer little if nothing which isn't covered by the other two types. Therefore, I have decided to spare the reader the cumbersome duty to read, and myself the uninspiring task to write, sentences designed to convey prosaically these passing references. They are important inasmuch as they draw attention to the problem, but the second and third types of scholarship I will discuss are more central to investigating the matter.
The second and third type of literature are the studies which focus more explicitly on the issue of proselytism in social services. The second variety is the more-or-less "empirical" study, most of which have been carried out by scholars in the last 10 years, while the third type is the more-or-less "theoretical" study of the issues. In some cases, such as Unruh and Sider's (2005) book *Saving Souls, Serving Society*, these two types are intertwined. In others, the author(s) provide either an empirical look without providing an evaluation or theoretical analysis of the matter or they analyse the issue of the dual mandate in the absence of any primary research. I am going to discuss one major strand of the "theoretical" literature before getting to the empirical work - the fact that there seems to be a spectrum for evangelism, FBOs, and mission orientations. The remainder of the theoretical scholarship will support the empirical along the way.

**The Spectrum of Evangelism, FBOs, and Mission Orientations**

We can perceive already something about FBOs with the information above pertaining to whether or not an FBO is conservative evangelical. But there are three important distinctions I want to make to further clarify the topic. First, there are multiple types of FBOs. Unruh and Sider (2005) share five types, with the important caveat that "[r]eal organizations and programs rarely fit into ideal types (p. 22). The type that I will discuss most often is the "faith-permeated" FBO, in which "the connection with religious faith is evident at all levels of mission, staffing governance, and support" (p. 109). Moreover, faith-permeated FBOs contain programs with "explicitly religious content" which are "believed to be essential to the program's effectiveness" and therefore these elements tend to be mandatory or central" (p. 109). The other type of FBO I will discuss is the "faith-centered organisation," which is a step down in religiosity, so to speak. These FBOs contain "explicitly religious elements" and the most significant distinction between
them and the faith-permeated FBOs is that conceivably participants can "opt out of religious activities and still benefit from the program" (p. 109).

Second, there are multiple types of "evangelism," and this is discussed by Unruh & Sider (2005) as well as Sider and Unruh (2001). They draw an important distinction between the ways in which religious elements of a given FBO are perceived or presented. Here I want to draw a simpler distinction than they do, between a kind of overt evangelism and a "passive" evangelism. Other euphemistic terms exist, including "relational" and "low key". From Unruh and Sider, here is a quote by a social worker at an FBO

"Low-key approaches are preferred, such as forming friendships with non-Christians, talking about one's religious experiences rather than emphasizing doctrine, and inviting acquaintances to "bring-a-Friend Sunday." (Unruh & Sider, 2005, p. 47)

The important point to capture here is that evangelism is not always, in fact, not often it would seem, an overt, "in your face" type of activity, but rather "passive" and "implicit" in the program.

Third, there are different so-called mission orientations, again developed by Unruh and Sider (2005), which refer to the manner in which evangelism and service coincide in an FBO. This typology ranges from FBOs which engage almost exclusively in service or "serving society" to those exclusively focused on converting people or "saving souls." I will most often refer to the "holistic" mission orientation wherein both service and evangelism are important and "dynamically connected", i.e., an organisational distinction is not always strongly made.

**Contemporary Empirical Scholarship on Faith-Based Organisations.**

*In Canada Operating Domestically.* Unfortunately, very little is known about the local presence of Canadian FBOs, though as Paul Bramadat (2008) noted about a decade ago, this seems to be changing slowly. Canadian scholarship, in this regard, seems about 25 years behind
the US, and remains beholden to the research on FBOs in the US. Moreover, apart from Bramadat's work, which comes out of the University of Victoria's Centre for Studies in Religion and Society, whose own annual reports don't tell us much about FBOs, most of the work I found seemed to be either directly connected to or funded by religious organisations or universities. Further, most of these studies are centred around only one person, Rich Janzen - a former student at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Canada who completed his doctoral dissertation on the work of local congregations.

That dissertation was part of a broader evaluation related to the Canadian Conference of Mennonite Brethren Churches (MB), of which he is a member (see Janzen, 2011), and whose creedal statement online includes an allusion to inerrancy (e.g., the Bible as "authoritative") and a recognition of The Great Commission: "We believe the mission of the church is to make disciples of all nations by calling people to repent, be baptized, and love God" (MB Confession of Faith, 2017). Janzen's (2011) doctoral research was focused on carving a part of the program theory of the MB's then-new "outreach" strategy, embedded in a logic model, called "Regenerate 21-01," information about which was published in the same year by Janzen and Wiebe (2011) in *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*. The logic model's short-term outcomes include "need-oriented evangelism" and a focus on church planting and, again, at a level not common to logic models after long-term outcomes, or rather above it, is placed the "spiritual realm" according to which the program theory is somehow to pertain to "God's kingdom coming and God's will being done more fully in local communities in Canada" (Janzen & Wiebe, 2011, p. 11).

While the information on the logic model is vague, Janzen's (2011) dissertation, titled *Reaching out to Multicultural Neighbours: Stories that Encourage and Evaluate Innovative*
Church Outreach, is a little more informative. The dual mandate figures throughout, though at times in an almost consciously inconspicuous way, starting with Janzen's (2011) own formulation of the dual mandate as entirely Biblical:

The church by its very nature and mission is outreach (the "Great Commission" of Matthew 28:16-20 sends Christians worldwide to make disciples). Yet this outreach is to be governed by the imperative of love (the "Great Command" of Luke 10:25-37 directs followers of God to love their neighbours as they love themselves). (pp. 7-8)

Janzen's work with three MB churches in Vancouver, Toronto, and Winnipeg uncovered the pairing of service and evangelism. Examples from each church demonstrate "spiritual outreach" or "giving hope," i.e., evangelism whereby members of a local church seek to serve immigrants, children, people with addictions, and those suffering with mental illnesses, but with the goal to "make disciples" - desiring that people would freely choose to follow Jesus. "It's a personal investment in the neighbourhood," said a church leader, "again serving rather than proclaiming, spending time with people, rather than just going out there and telling them [about the Christian gospel]" (p. 96). The overall desire to rejuvenate the church in a multicultural, "post-Christian" Canada with increasing levels of Muslims, Buddhists, and Hindus meant that "the church-goer and the congregation became relevant by weaving themselves into the fabric of their neighbours' lives and into community life" (p. 112). The congregations did so with a panoply of programs, including a "two-week wilderness summer camp...[whose] stated mission is to 'take kids out into the wilderness to tell them about the love of Jesus through stories" and a revitalised AA/NA addictions program called "Freedom Session." On its website, the program boasts of a "divine anointing" of the 12-step programme, which consists of almost all explicitly Christian steps. Step 2 indicates that "through a personal relationship with Jesus Christ, we can
be healed [of addiction]" and Step 3 that "We made a conscious decision to turn our lives, our pain and our will over to the care of God and the leadership of Jesus Christ" (12 Steps of the Freedom Session, 2017).

Still there were some participants who indicated a desire for evangelism to be more prominent over service: "some members saw a connection [to be made between the church and neighbourhood residents] as being limited to sharing the Christian gospel message so that their neighbours would make a commitment to follow Jesus." The Toronto church seemed to lament the "weaker" emphasis in "providing spiritual hope" to people with mental health issues and indicated that it would seek to

"strengthen the spiritual emphasis of their church outreach...[by] more small Bible studies throughout the neighbourhood, emphasizing spiritual training and discipleship, emphasizing prayer, distributing multilingual Jesus DVDs, and simply being more intentional with sharing faith in relationship with others." (p. 72)

In fact, there are several other examples, all of which illustrate a struggle between the provision of social service and proselytism in some way, shape, or form. One gets the impression that for some the evangelism was the "Id" constantly kept in check by the "Superego" of service and a recognition that an unmitigated evangelism was "counterproductive":

"Some interview participants noted that occasionally the church had a focus on conversion as an outcome of outreach, without attuning to the process of outreach. Such a focus on outcome at the expanse of process was viewed to be counter-productive. (p. 97, emphasis mine)

\[\text{\textsuperscript{29}}\text{See Kraft (2015) for this type of dynamic in Lebanon among Syrian refugees.}\]
Still, the "outreach" seemed to be working for some organisations as "participants noted that some [clients] had now become attendees or member of their (or another) church, some had made a decision to become Christians" (p. 98). This includes a "woman who was Buddhist before, and had just lost her husband...and then two months later gets cancer...[and heals] believing with all her heart that she was healed by God" (p. 120).

As far as my one and only reading of the dissertation could tell, Janzen's (2011) analysis doesn't admit of any type of ethical problem. Instead, throughout there seem to me to be multiple examples of a kind of untenable contradiction between the aims of evangelicalism and those of a more cosmopolitan era. For instance, cultural sensitivity is admitted as important. Janzen even discusses potential stereotypes held by white congregants as a problem. Yet this cultural sensitivity seems subsumed under the ostensibly contradictory belief that all must be Christian. Here Janzen speaks about a congregation's struggle with cultural difference and an ultimate resolution through "cultural humility," which in a kind of strange loop brings one back to the tyranny of sameness. "Such an attitude of cultural humility was the basis for the congregation to negotiate a new culture together - a new cultured guided by the Biblical teachings of Jesus Christ (p. 94). Another prominent example is the absence of discussion about the situational stressors that might predispose one to convert (à la Chris Hedges). Instead desires to fulfill The Great Commission in the context of the client's difficult situation seem oddly paired with other attitudes. One comment, for instance, indicates that the church is "respectful of others" and that they are "not coercing them in any way" because "God isn't pushy. God gives us the free will to decide what we want to do...you have to be very accepting" (p. 95).

Janzen's next work was published in the *Review of Religious Research*. Janzen, Chapman, & Watson (2012) write about some of the findings from a major project on churches
"welcoming" immigrants. Despite a sample which "skewed toward a greater proportion of Protestant (particularly non-mainline) denominations," not much information was provided on evangelism. But Janzen et al (2012), taking a cue from Unruh and Sider (2005), refer to evangelism as a part of the "range" of programs for immigrants. The most telling piece of the work in this vein is a survey question: "We hold evangelistic activities that are specifically targeted for recent immigrants"; to this question 145 or 70% of congregations responded with "seldom/never," while 46 or 22% responded with "occasionally," and only 16 or 8% responded with "always/generally."

The project from which the above study comes was entitled "Beyond the Welcome: Churches Responding to the Immigrant Reality in Canada (Janzen, 2010)," and it sought to understand how churches were involved in settlement across multiple cities and hubs of multiculturalism (Toronto, Montréal, Vancouver, Hamilton, and Winnipeg). The report, which was released by the secular organisation at which Janzen is Co-Director, is a little more descriptive about the place of missions in "intercultural" ministry. For instance, a "National Key Informant" (i.e., an anonymous participant) stated that "we need an awareness of Biblical truth...and recognize our theological mandate to go to all nations...the church as a house of all nations." "Others spoke," Janzen (2010) writes, "of how their relationships with immigrants helped them to be 'more outward looking' and 'less self-centred,' including a renewed interest in overseas mission" (p. 20). Another participant from a focus group referred to a "motel ministry" for refugee claimants: "There are two low income motels close to our church and we serve every Saturday night a meal for everybody who lives there...so we have a big team there trying to show the light of Jesus to these people" (p. 21). The provision of shelter, as well as other "basic settlement needs" seem at times, though not always, to be tightly intertwined with evangelism,
including English and French language services through Bible study. And yet this interpretation of what is written in the report seems contradicted by Janzen (2010), who seems to refer to the 70% figure noted above (Janzen et al., 2012) to conclude that "survey findings showed that the majority of churches seldom or never provided...evangelistic activities or programs for recent immigrants" (p. 25). While technically true, the 30% reported by Janzen et al (2012) still seems significant or notable to me, especially alongside the qualitative evidence he forwards.

Interestingly, two other studies on immigrant and refugee settlement, one by Janzen, Stobbe, Chapman, & Watson (2016) and another by Reimer, Chapman, Janzen, Watson, & Wilkinson (2016), provide little if any mention of evangelism. Janzen et al. (2016) briefly comment in the discussion of their findings that the "dual motivation" of churches, one religious and the other secular, could be something to consider. The religious motivation they acknowledge includes the "sharing [of] the gospel message" with immigrants and refugees settling in Canada (p. 402). Moreover, there's some vague indication that churches were involved in "spiritual support" (p. 405), but what this means was left to the imagination. Reimer et al. (2016) is equally ambiguous with respect to proselytism, save for a mention of the offering of an ESL program "based on reading the bible together" (p. 504) and an acknowledgment that the influx of new immigrants and refugees meant a "competitive" environment for new congregants for dying Canadian churches is emerging (p. 506).

One important caveat with respect to the above is that very little information is given about the religious orientation of the clients and in some cases, it seems that at least some were in fact religious Christians to begin with. In fact, it might be that immigrants and refugees were pushing local congregations to be more faith-based than they are naturally inclined, reducing the "need," as it were, to evangelise the immigrants and instead experiencing what is sometimes
referred to as "reverse mission." Certainly, some of the comments in the Janzen (2010) report suggest this pattern: "I go from church to church to find what we had back home. We had zeal to pray and seek God" or "Immigrants wonder how to function in a godless society when they were raised in a Christian society" (p. 17).

Another important point about all of the above studies is their connection with conservative evangelical organisations and churches. The project by Janzen (2010) was funded by the evangelical Tyndale University's Tyndale Intercultural Ministries Centre (TIM) and World Vision. The former's "vision" is described as "The church from all nations bringing Christ to all nations" and their mission is to "act as a catalyst to mobilize the intercultural Christian faith community towards a more intentional and effective engagement in local and global missions" (Tyndale University, 2017). World Vision Canada, while relatively faith-inspired, still shares the broader canopy of World Vision within which evangelism takes place (e.g., Bornstein, 2001).

Mark Chapman is a "lay leader" at a Kitchener-Waterloo church, the "statement of faith" of which seems chalk full of conservative evangelical language, such as an expression in inerrancy of the Bible and, of course, the admission that the "universal church" has been "commissioned by Christ to go into all the world as a witness, preaching the Gospel to all nations" and that the "local church" is to "testify in word and deed to the good news of salvation both locally and globally." Michael Watson is a professor at Trinity Western University, the one with a decidedly dominionist leaning and that fought and lost a legal battle to protect its anti-gay covenant before the Supreme Court of Canada. Other organisations represented are the Salvation Army, the Canadian Council of Churches, and the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada. And Janzen's own denomination, the MB, I've already noted has conservative inclinations; in addition, Janet Clark of Tyndale University was on Janzen's doctoral committee.
The CCBR, Janzen's centre, has recently been granted a 2-year research grant from the federal government, under the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), to "study partnerships among faith-based and government-funded settlement organizations" Janzen is leading a group of "project partners" which includes Muslims, secular government providers, secular NGOs, and Victoria Esses, a prominent social psychological researcher of prejudice and discrimination. But there is a strong evangelical presence, too, including Tyndale University, Institute for Christian Studies, World Renew, Booth University College, and The Salvation Army.

The only other study of note came out of a Christian university in Edmonton, The King's University, whose most notable alumnus will perhaps be, with beautiful irony, Omar Khadr (Mouallem, 2016). Hiemstra's (2002) paper in the *Journal of Church and State*, written against the backdrop of the increasing devolution of state social services, used data from 20 years ago, at the dawn of the evangelical movement in the Canada (see McDonald, 2010). He found that among the 79 surveyed FBOs in Alberta, 63% offered "voluntary religious activities," while 11.8% had mandatory religious services. But the distinction between voluntary vs. mandatory is unclear as 39.5% of FBOs had "spoken prayer at meals" (which might not be considered voluntary) and 23.7% "engage in efforts to encourage clients to make personal religious commitments" (i.e., proselytism or conversion) (p. 32). To further confuse the distinction between voluntary and mandatory, about 60% of FBOs indicated that "their staff openly and directly make informal references to religious ideas." Hiemstra (2002) comments directly on "proselytism" elsewhere, too, though referring to it again as "encouraging clients to make personal religious commitments"; here, in apparent contradiction to the reference of 11.8%
above, "just over a quarter (27.1 percent) say they openly and directly encourage clients to make personal religious commitments" while "16.7 percent do this subtly or indirectly" (p. 35).

The entire sample consisted of a maximum of about 20% "evangelical" churches. If we look further into the 27.1% or "just over a quarter" of agencies who encourage clients to convert, about half of those were evangelical FBOs. Taken together with the subtle or indirect efforts to evangelise, all but one of the twelve evangelical FBOs, or over 90%, who filled out this section of the survey either make direct or indirect attempts to convert. Mainline churches, Hiemstra notes, were the least likely to proselytise behind Catholic and mixed churches. Moreover, among the 10 evangelical churches who responded to questions about hiring practises, 7 indicated that they directly or indirectly sought out those "in agreement with your religious perspective," which might suggest the exclusion of social workers or volunteers with a secular outlook on the provision of social service, Christian or not. In sum, despite the contradictory or at least confusing presentation of proportion in Hiemsta's (2002) paper, it seems evangelism and service did figure in the work of FBOs in Alberta.

Overall, the Canadian domestic studies seem to be dominated by research tied to a group of scholars funded by or associated with, at least in part, a number of conservative evangelical groups in Canada. Apart from Hiemstra's paper, evangelism is almost curiously absent in the peer-reviewed published work. Buried deep in Janzen's dissertation, as well as the CCBR report, however, there seem to be suggestions that evangelism and service coexist among these FBOs. But so far, no debate regarding the implications thereof, much less a serious one, has emerged.

**In Canada Operating Internationally.** Things get more interesting, however, when we look at the scholarship on work of Canadian FBOs operating abroad. While that scholarship is still similarly anemic, there are some extremely interesting and telling pieces of work, including
one exchange between two sets of Canadian scholars and another historic-but-nearly-forgotten exchange between the Government of Canada and Christian FBOs.

Last year, the Government of Canada released a discussion paper called the "International Assistance Review" on its intentions for international development work (Global Affairs Canada, 2016). While the paper acknowledges the important role of FBOs within global civil society and Canada's ambition to putatively respond to the "moral imperative" in the face of global poverty and strife, it nonetheless reads as a stanchly secular document, and is couched in language and imagery that would be less likely to figure in conservative tracts - climate change, women's rights, pluralism; in fact, the introductory chapters seem to hint at the ideological differences between the 10 years of Stephen Harper's international policies by presenting data on federal international assistance from just those 10 years and "rebranding" in the following chapter the country's post-Harper approach as "Renewing Canada's International Assistance."

These subtle-but-noticeable rhetorical shifts belie what Andrea Paras (2012) of the University of Guelph has drawn attention to as the "secular fiction" of Canadian FBOs working abroad. While her discussion of the secular fiction is too broad to discuss fully, of relevance here is the argument and evidence that Canadian Christian FBOs and federal international aid has not always been as thinly sliced as the aforementioned discussion paper by the Trudeau government would lead one to believe. Relying on archival research and interviews with key informants, Paras (2012) forwards evidence that the Canadian International and Development Association (CIDA) "recruited a lot of ex-missionaries" during its formative years. "Bill Janzen, [not Rich Janzen] a long-time staff member of the Mennonite Central Committee," she notes "wryly recount[ed] that '[i]n the late 1970s and early 1980s, [CIDA] was full of missionaries'" (p. 237). CIDA even had a "Churches Division" until the "mid-1990s - an unintended reflection of the
development industry's inheritances from the era of missionisation" (p. 238).

Interestingly, the decoupling of religion and international aid in Canada, including the removal of the Churches Division, seems to have occurred in the shadow of conflicts stemming from the dual mandate of FBOs. CIDA officials observed that some FBOS were "actively using development as a wedge to proselytise" (p. 238) and in the early 1990s CIDA "officials discovered that CIDA funding had been used improperly," for "religious activities such as bible distribution or teaching" and for giving "preferential assistance to Christian recipients." The latter case was purportedly tied to an unnamed Canadian FBO which was supporting a project with CIDA funding that had actually begun in 1949, before even CIDA's founding, and considered therefore by a CIDA official as support for "overseas parishioners" instead of development partners (p. 238). In quotations from two of Paras's footnotes telling of the climate at the time, one person recalled that "CIDA officers were going out and doing institutional evaluations and finding all kinds of suspicious activities like development work attached to church planting and evangelism to the same communities. The other quotation, from someone at World Vision, reads, "We had this problem. Some Christian organisations, and to this day I don't know who it was, used CIDA funding, bought bibles and had this big bible distribution. How stupid is that!" (p. 246).

These tensions culminated in a series of dialogues and conferences which in turn culminated in a final report published in October 1995 by CIDA (1995), two years before Hiemstra's data on Albertan FBOs was collected. The report, called "Christian NGOs and CIDA: Guiding Principles, Understandings and Affirmations," reads to me like a pragmatic attempt to "manage" an otherwise unwieldy but perhaps necessary partnership in international development. A series of "guiding principles" sets the stage for a post-1995 partnership between Christian
"NGOs" and federal development monies. The dual mandate figures as one of the six main issues discussed over the preceding two years and a clear guiding principle for it is laid out. The document states that "Christian NGOs recognize [sic] and agree that CIDA funds are not to be used for programming designed to convert people from one religious faith to another, or to build up church and ecclesiastical structures apart from relief and development programming" (p. 4).

Interestingly, apart from the concern about the misuse of funds the document seems to signal the emerging multiculturalism that would have taken root during the previous decade. Of concern, the document notes, is that "changes in religious beliefs may undermine local cultural values and the necessary cultural conditions for development" (p. 4). The document thereafter introduces the notion of "culturally sustainable development" which contains agreements between the Christian NGOs and CIDA to recognise, among other things, that imposition of cultural change is problematic and that "cultural diversity is important, and should be valued and strengthened" (p. 5). In addition to these "agreements" another is added which foregrounds the importance of maintaining a clear administrative distinction between evangelism and development work so as not to give new life to the problems mentioned above.

Almost nothing seems to have been published since this 1995 report, until about 2013, after which a somewhat contentious exchange occurred in the Canadian Journal of Development Studies regarding CIDA funding. In a 2013 issue of the journal, Ray Vander Zaag (2013) from Canadian Mennonite University and François Audet, Francis Paquette, and Stéfanie Bergeron (2013) of Université du Québec à Montréal analysed federal aid data. Vander Zaag pointed out that while the average amount of money for an FBO was greater relative to a secular CSO by about $500,000, the aggregate amount of funding for FBOs did not change from 2005-2010, hovering in and around 30% of the total aid budget. "[A]nd so there does not appear to be
increasing or decreasing government sentiment to funding [FBOs]," he states, "despite changes in the governing political party in Canada.

In the same issue, Audet et al (2013) forwarded a slightly different conclusion. They included Paul Martin's Liberal government's full 5-year term from 2001-2005, whereas Vander Zaag included only the year 2005, and they made a distinction among FBOs - those that proselytise and those that do not. They found, contrary to Vander Zaag, that during the first five years of Harper's government when compared with Martin's full five years (2001-2005), funding for all FBOs went up by about 42%, and driving this increase was a 74.6% increase in CIDA funding to "proselytising" FBOs. In other words, separating the FBOs by whether or not they proclaim to proselytise - a distinction tied to theology and to whether or not an FBO is likely to be "fundamentalist" - the non-proselytising FBOs experienced an increase of 27.8%, down from 42%, while the proselytising organisations seem to have been favoured, as depicted in a reproduction of Audet et al.'s (2013) figure below (i.e., Figure A).

Figure A. Audet et al.'s (2013) representation of funding by secular development organisations, non-proselytising (i.e., "religious NGO") and proselytising FBOs compared by Prime Minister Paul Martin's 2001-2005 and Prime Minister Stephen Harper's 2006-2010 caucuses.
The dust kicked up by this pair of studies, in fact really only by Audet et al.’s (2013), was made evident when the editor of the journal had to issue a note of clarification (and thus veiled apology) as a preface to another pair of articles by Vander Zaag (2014) and this-time only Audet (2014) (Harriss, 2014). Five organisations mentioned in Audet et al. (2013) as "proselytist" seem to have emphatically contested the moniker. The bulk of the statements by these FBOs seem haunted by CIDA's (1995) document - all of them, even the ones which proselytise, clarified that they do not use federal monies to proselytise and they conduct themselves in a manner respectful of other cultures and faiths. The theological orientation of the five FBOs who complained, does seem to suggest a mildly though not extremely conservative leaning; in other words, it seems plausible that while they might seek to convert, they are less likely to do so in a zealous and urgent manner akin to the Pentecostal groups discussed in Bauman's (2015b) book. Moreover,
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these complaints and relevant critiques by Paras (2014) and Vander Zaag (2014) seem to indicate that perhaps Audet et al's (2013) classifications were not entirely accurate. Although Audet (2014) defended his methodology by saying simply that he and his colleagues did not have much choice, as religious organisations would tend not to reveal to just anyone their religious activities, I think Vander Zaag (2014) and Paras (2014) have a strong argument about some of the classifications; in other words, it is likely that some of the organisations in fact do not proselytise when they were considered "proselytist" and others make an organisational distinction as they pointed out to the editor of the journal. However, the broader point implicit in Audet's defense (2014) is something I will discuss below - called the "fungibility" argument, which while not deployed by Audet (2014) is nonetheless important to consider.

Overall, the 2014 exchange does little to clarify the position of the dual mandate in FBOs as both Vander Zaag (2014) and Audet (2014) argue about the aforementioned and other issues tied to methodology. The exchange and the editor's annotation do, however, highlight the contentiousness of the matter - even in, or perhaps especially in, Canada, "proselytism" remains the elephant in the room of charitable work. Perhaps that is why it is absent from the Rich Janzen oeuvre.

But the exchange prompted Paras (2014) to ask a question - Can it be possible to distinguish between missions and development; in other words, is the dual mandate to which I have referred only one? She sought to ask "senior staff members" from "seven Canadian Christian organisations" questions about how they managed this distinction. Her findings, presented in a few pages, seem to indicate that among the organisations she considered, the distinction between mission and development was complicated. On one hand, it seemed at times that individual members of the FBOs could not and/or did not distinguish between mission and
development in practice. On the other hand, many of the organisations received CIDA funding and did so based on their strict organisational separation - i.e., that CIDA funding was on the books for development while missions and church-planting was done, if at all, by a sister organisation. These findings, of course, both clarify and obscure Audet et al's (2013) classification method, for how can an organisation separate "missions" and "development" in any substantive way if the employees themselves literally do not understand the distinction. It does seem that the organisations reviewed by Paras (2014) were aware of the importance of the distinction, but I did get the impression from reading this paper that sometimes the distinction might be more to allay fears on the part of CIDA, now Global Affairs Canada, than it is to actually ensure a strict (and difficult to achieve) separation.

This ambiguity, this tension is perhaps more apparent in Rick Hiemstra's (2017) recent study for the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada. In a study examining "short-term" missions and the work they engage in, the dual mandate is apparent. For instance, it figures as one of the main things churches do when away on missions, third only to vacation bible schools, which are a form of child evangelism, and development work. Although it is not possible to compare properly with Paras's (2014) data, Hiemstra did say there was "certainly a tension" related to a disproportionate focus on service provision over proselytism.

Here is a quote from a participant illustrating the tension:

My concern is that people will not really hear the Gospel, that they will go out and build a building or whatever and have a good time with them, and make a friendship, and not ever make [sic] around to talking about Jesus and why He came and what He did and what they need to do in response. And that I don't think should be ignored. (p. 27)
This tension within FBOs with respect to the dual mandate becomes even clearer when we look at the case of the US, to which we turn next.

**In the USA Operating Domestically.** Naturally, the breadth of scholarship which I could use for my analysis of the dual mandate was far greater when I looked at the US. Fortunately, for a number of reasons - its proximity to Canada, political and economic co-dependence, the influence of American evangelicalism noted above - the US scholarship should at least tell us something about what might be happening or could happen among the comparatively under-studied Canadian FBOs operating domestically. Still, when considering the breadth of work on FBOs after the Charitable Choice provision became law, researching for the issue of proselytism specifically was not unlike finding a needle in a haystack.

The earliest study to refer to this issue in the post-Charitable Choice era is David Hodge's (2000) study on client autonomy and self-determination. Hodge (2000) looked at both faith-based \(N=32\) and secular \(N=16\) residential treatment programs in the US and administered surveys through program directors to clients \(N=68\) and staff \(N=48\) to find out how they felt about "client autonomy" vis-à-vis the CSO in question. Relevant questions such as "The staff attempts to force a certain belief system on me" (client survey) and "I have never applied direct pressure to a client to have them appropriate a particular belief system" (social worker survey) were answered on a 4-point Likert scale. Results yielded no significant difference in autonomy or client self-determination between faith-based and secular programs.

But the picture changes slightly a few years later when Hodge & Pittman (2003) reported results from an exploratory study conducted in 2001 on Texan faith-based alcohol treatment programs \(N=30\). The intent of the study was to consider the "faith-based elements" of the programs in question. One of those elements was the "philosophical" orientation of the program,
93% of which were Christian. In response to the question "What is the primary purpose of the program?" about 20% (or 5 out of 25 respondents) indicated that "salvation from the power of sin and addiction through a relationship with Jesus" was that purpose. For another question similar to the first but with respect to the organisation's treatment philosophy "the most prominent responses were salvation transformation (N=9), scripture (N=6), and Christian based cognitive therapy (N=3)" (p. 27). From Table 1 below one can observe the frequency of each "service" which undergirds this philosophical orientation. Note that it isn't indicated whether or not the "individual counseling" or "group counseling" was Christian or secular. However, about 60% of providers indicated that there were no qualifications required to be a counselor. Consequently, the troubling question of whether it is worse on the part of the FBO administration not to require qualification or worse that 40% of its employees were qualified and yet still might have employed faith-based solutions instead of what they were qualified for is palpable.

Table 1. Faith-based elements and percentage of offering in Hodge and Pittman (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential service</th>
<th>Percent offering service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual counseling</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counseling</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible studies</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family or marital counseling</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical dependency education</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer meetings</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church services</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devotional time</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relapse prevention</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer work inside program</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting classes</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian 12-step program</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment training</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED or adult literacy</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer work outside program</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA or NA groups</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a study of 500 FBOs within the welfare-to-work sub-sector, Stephen J. Monsma and Carolyn Mounts (2002) discussed the issue of proselytism somewhat ambiguously. They state that among the directors and staff they interviewed it seemed clear that evangelism occurred, but as an "indirect or secondary goal" (p. 17). One comment to support this contention seems to highlight the multiple ways in which the term "proselytism" can belie a semantic complexity necessary to capture the nuance of "indirect" evangelism: "Our call is for life transformation; we do not proselytize, do not say if you get saved everything will be OK. But we say you are precious - you reflect God's image and that you need to find the good work that God created for you to do" (p. 18).

But juxtaposed alongside this evidence for indirect evangelism is also an important distinction pertaining to the geographic location of evangelism for which Monsma and Mounts (2002) unfortunately do not provide clarification. It seems that at least for one provider, whose comments are used as illustrative of a larger group, inner city work seems far less stringent than suburban work, rendering "irrelevant many of the Washington and academic government-funding debates" for the former, according to the authors (p. 18). Said the provider, "My theory is that in the inner city nobody really cares what you do. One can evangelize, etc, without persons asking questions. This is different in the suburbs - there the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union] would be all over you" (p. 18). Monsma and Mounts (2002) close the discussion on evangelism by referring to an interview in which the relationship between government funding policies and evangelism in FBOs was described as "don't ask; don't tell." Thus, it is clear from their study that evangelism occurs, but there seems to be some ambiguity about whether it is, in fact, an "indirect or secondary goal" among the 500 FBOs studied or
whether FBOs are strategic about where they practice in the shadow of a tacit don't-ask-don't-tell agreement with public funders.

Another, considerably smaller, study on poverty-to-work programmes was published the year after by William Lockhart of Baylor University, a mid-sized, private Baptist university that publishes quite a bit on FBOs. Lockhart's (2003) study was similar to Hodge's (2002) inasmuch as the main research goal was to determine the difference between secular and faith-based programs. However, Lockhart (2003) was more specific with respect to the type of FBO he used in his comparison, focusing on "faith-saturated" (i.e., faith-permeated) programs instead of just faith-based programmes generally, which might partly explain his divergent findings.

Construed as categorically positive and not problematic by Lockhart in a section entitled "The Added Value of Religion," he clearly indicates that a type of divinely-infused faith-based solution to poverty is at work: "The faith-based programs strengthened [clients'] teachings on 'life skills' by infusing them with the divine: it is God who teaches these values and behaviors in the Bible" (p. 507). The confluence of religion and "workplace culture" forwarded by the program is highlighted by a seemingly enthusiastic client: "I learned that everything you need is in the Bible. Even if you're talking about work and being on time and being of a good spirit, it takes me right to Scripture. Every class, everything takes me right towards Scripture in the Bible" (p. 508).

Lockhart's (2003) characterisation of what occurs above, as "religious cultural capital," foretells one of the other "added values" of religion in these types of programmes - "religious social capital". It seems clear that the programmes studied seek to integrate participants into the social fabric of a religious community. The knowledge of "Scripture," thus, becomes "cultural capital" inasmuch as it becomes necessary, or at least useful, in navigating through the social
fabric of a religious community that finds all or most answers in the Bible. The method of integration is presented as fully "ecological," reminiscent though not identical to Janzen's work with the MB churches (Janzen, 2011; Janzen & Wiebe, 2011). First, clients of the programme are integrated into the social and relational dimension at the programme level, which consists of "creating and maintaining rituals and values that promote social ties," including ostensibly mandatory corporate prayer (p. 509). Second, clients are integrated at the congregational level "through formal support covenants, more informal relationships with volunteers and pastors, or through encouraging regular congregational worship" (p. 509). Third, at a level Bronfrenbrenner (1977) did not see, "faith-saturated programs seek to develop their clients' relationships to God, described as the ultimate vertical and supportive relationship" (p. 509).

Lockhart does not comment on any of the ethical dimensions which inhere in the client-programme interactions. While highlighting that programmes provide a form of social support needed by the clients, and suggesting programmes might help with poverty and job-acquisition - though no information is given on programme effectiveness - clients are presented as fully independent and not under situational duress from poverty (except maybe spiritual). Moreover, the focus on "divinely infused" life skills gives one the impression that poverty might be construed at best as an individual moral failing and at worst in a manner akin to Calvinist predestination (i.e., spiritually, cosmically inevitable). Here the ideology of the market seems to hide behind the programmes' religiously-fashioned curtains.

The programmes also seem to stagger the support at each of the levels; that is, it seems that the higher along the ecological ladder one goes, the greater the social and material support available - it starts with soups and dinners and group prayers, and then moves to pastoral and congregational social and material support, all the way to God, who provides scriptural
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validation for functioning in the workplace. Whether or not this is a type of allurement is a matter not discussed by Lockhart. But it does seem to work regardless as "in every group of twelve to twenty people who have gone through the program there has been at least one who has 'committed his or her life to Jesus Christ" (p. 510). Yet one leader stated:

We don't tell a person, "You've got to become a Christian." What we do is, we show them our curriculum; they have to make a choice...We show them our textbook [pointing to the Bible], but as far as saying, "Hey, you've got to convert to Christianity," no we do not do that. What we do when a person enters, we tell the person that this is our curriculum, this is the course that we offer, and this is the way that its taught. (pp. 509-510)

Thus, as with the Chicago-based pastor from Monsma and Mounts's (2002) study, evangelism is presented ambiguously, as neither present nor absent, with no agency, save for maybe divine.

Perhaps it was this ambiguity that prompted Helen Ebaugh and colleagues to publish a pair of papers to determine, with greater specificity, whether or not proselytism could be measured and, moreover, predicted within FBOs. Though their measures are still in part self-report, they are less vulnerable to any type of impression management, suggested by Monsma and Mounts' (2002) study but also, if you recall, Audet's (2014) defense for his method in classifying "proselytist" FBOs in his study with colleagues (Audet et al., 2013).

In their first paper, Ebaugh, Chafetz, and Pipes (2006a) analysed data from 656 faith-based organisations throughout the US and found that religiosity within organisations "loaded" on three statistical factors: service, staff, and organisational religiosity. Table 2 below, from their paper, presents 18 items, culled from 21 (3 items did not load) and their factor loadings. Ebaugh et al. (2006a) state they are explicitly focusing on proselytism and it shows from the items. In the shadow of ambiguous statements about proselytism noted above, it is perhaps noteworthy how
strongly the item "Program requires religious conversion" loads on a factor with a soaring alpha of .949 and with items like "helps clients join congregations," "prays with groups of clients," and "use religious beliefs to instruct clients." But more interesting than that is what the authors found by way of correlates, presented in Table 3 below, which contains the results of how various predictor variables regressed onto the three factors.

Table 2. Adapted from Ebaugh et al. (2006a), items and factor loadings for a measure of organisational religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity Measure</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Service (a = .949)</td>
<td>Staff (a=.744)</td>
<td>Organisation (a=.520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute religious materials to clients</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps clients join congregations</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray with individual clients</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray with groups of clients</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use religious beliefs to instruct clients</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage client religious conversion</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use religion to encourage clients</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide info about local congregations</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs require religious conversion</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy re: religious discussion w/clients</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray at staff meetings</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor religious job candidate</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put religious principles into action</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate God’s love to clients</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire clients’ faith via staff’s actions</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiouly explicit mission statement</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leader ordained clergy</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred images in public spaces</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Adapted from Ebaugh et al. (2006a), factor loadings for service, staff, & organizational religiosity

| Predictor Variables: | Service Religiosity Beta | Std. | Staff Religiosity Beta | Std. | Organisation Religiosity Beta | Std. |
Most noteworthy here is that we can predict the extent to which proselytism is a goal by service, staff, and organisational religiosity, and with impressive probability levels. In other words, the ambiguity of self-report highlighted by Monsma and Mounts (2002) and by Lockhart (2003) - the "We don't say 'convert', but..." approach to faith-based programming - is theoretically bypassed, or at least contextualised by knowledge of service, staff, and organisational religiosity.

Of secondary importance, and perhaps less impressive, is that the evangelism scale, which determined whether or not a congregation was evangelical or not was predicted by the three factors, also. It is hard not to think of the Rich Janzen scholarship here, as most of the organisations seemed to be evangelical and at least 30% of them provided religious services yet the presence of evangelism was characterised as "seldom or never."

From the same data set but in a different paper, Ebaugh, Chafetz, and Pipes (2006b) provide further statistical evidence that proselytism can be indirectly determined. Below is Table 4, this one constructed by me from the seven tables in their (2006b) paper; the table presents the statistical measures associated with proselytism as an organisational goal.
Table 4. *Statistical measures associated with proselytism as an organisational goal from Ebaugh et al. (2006b)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Correlate</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service Religiosity</td>
<td>Pearson R</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staff Religiosity</td>
<td>Pearson R</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisational Religiosity</td>
<td>Pearson R</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evangelical Congregations in Coalition (All vs. None)</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>All (3.67) vs. None (1.97)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attitude toward government funding</td>
<td>Pearson R</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Applied government funding (Yes vs. No)</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Yes (2.0) vs. No (2.5)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Received government funding (Ever vs. Never)</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>Ever (2.01) vs. Never (2.66)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percentage of government funding</td>
<td>Pearson R</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three should be familiar, as they are the same "predictor" variables from their (2006a) paper but these are presented as Pearson correlations. While the probability levels for all three are as high as possible to represent, the correlation statistics show that, "[p]roselytizing as a goal is especially strongly associated with service religiosity, namely, policies and practices that permit or encourage religious expression in interactions between staff and client" (p. 387). These correlation statistics, of course, further render in a different light the ambiguous or indirect proselytism that I have discussed so far. And the relatively high correlation between service religiosity and proselytism as a goal of the programme means that, with caution, service religiosity is a potential "proximal" measure for proselytism.

The fourth row displays a measure of evangelical influence, which the authors achieved by categorising "coalitions" into two groups - whether or not the coalitions consisted of all evangelical congregations (N =22) or none (N =78). The mean differences between these two groups was significant, again with an impressive probability. However, by their own admission this was a rather crude, but unfortunately necessary, measure of evangelicalism (i.e., "all or
none"); I include it as it does provide some more information about the influence of conservative evangelical or theology on proselytism in FBOs.

The fifth to eighth rows are all measures of government funding, and consequently touch on the issue of secularism. Ebaugh et al. (2006b) found that the more likely an organisation was to consider proselytism a goal, the more negative was their view toward public funding for their work. This might seem obvious, given that proselytism with public monies is illegal and that a persistent concern and animating impulse behind Charitable Choice was the ability of FBOs to keep their religiosity in the presence of public monies. Additionally, it's not just the view of government funding but also the percentage an organisation received (row 8); that is, the more likely an organisation was to have proselytism as a goal, the lower their percentage of government funding. Moreover, it's not just the amount, but whether or not they applied for (row 6) or received funding (row 7) which seems to texture the relationship, too - that is to say, among the proselytist FBOs studied, they were significantly more likely not to apply and not to have ever received funding from the government, as well as to have received less funding overall.

It was around the mid- to late-2000s, the reader might recall, that David Hodge and a few others from within Social Work began to publish more decidedly evangelical content. In response partly to Hodge, Michael E. Sherr and colleagues at Baylor University - a private Baptist university in Waco, Texas - conducted a case study highlighting explicitly for the first time in a Social Work journal (i.e., Social Work) the potential for proselytism to grind against ethical social work practice (Sherr, Singletary, & Rogers, 2009). Noting the "void of articles that specifically investigate when service delivery is consistent with ethical social work practice and when it becomes an opportunity for proselytizing," they uncovered in the course of their work some dubious practices of a FBO working in the addictions sector (Sherr et al., 2009, p. 157).
Primary among these practices was the absence of a workable organisational mechanism, which would preclude ethical trespass by way of the power imbalance in the social worker-client relationship. Accordingly, one participant said they were "willing to say or do anything to change" their life. Another participant's quote seems to further texture the client's attempt to manage a more fervent religiosity in the social worker:

I'll have to admit that I didn't understand what they meant by God sightings. I didn't grow up attending church. It was all rather foreign to me. For quite a while, when [the social worker] would use that expression, I kind of mentally substituted in my mind "coincidence" and I just thought it was a different title that he preferred to use (p. 162).

Moreover, participants such as those referenced above were required to participate in "spiritual family meetings" which were supposed to function in a seemingly democratic way. But Sherr et al. (2009) found that participants felt differently, that often the conformity to the direction in which social workers were leaning was tacitly expected. Sherr et al. (2009) state that these meetings "require [participants] to attend church." A participant commented thus:

I was required to belong to a church. I'd miss a Sunday and then it would get easier to miss the next Sunday and then before you know it I hadn't been to church in three weeks. I'd been to my spiritual family meetings but not to church and then they'd say, you know, you haven't been to church in three weeks, what's up? You need to be going. Why weren't you in church?

The authors also made some interesting observations about the FBO's work with "non-Christians" which further highlights the primacy of faith over service. A number of "key informants" from within the FBO shared that being non-Christian would be an obstacle for them to work with the client. "I think if they are not believers, it wouldn't work for me," said one.
Others were more opportunistic about fulfilling The Great Commission: "I would shift into an evangelistic mode and that would be one of my first goals." (p. 163)

The same opportunism emerged in another study on FBOs working in victim services. "I think they're trying to force religion on us," said one participant, "I think they're trying to promote religion" (DeHart, 2010, p. 368). This problem of "opportunism" seems to have been foretold by a "speaker at a media event [who] mentioned that the [victim services programme] might be an opportunity to help people find God" (p. 368) - much to the chagrin, notably, of other self-identified, but moderate, Christians who were part of the programme.

Sherr et al.'s (2009) concerns, however, are not universal in Social Work. Hugen and Venema (2009) conducted a review of 1107 privately funded CSOs in Michigan who completed a survey for a particular award between 2004 and 2007; unlike Sherr and his colleagues there is very little discussion of concern about social work ethics and proselytism. In fact, while the study discusses what is, in essence, proselytism, one could argue it reconceptualises proselytism under the less contentious "participant exposure" to "faith-related elements" of the programmes.

Among the 960 FBOs (out of 1107 CSOs), for about 46%, or 444 FBOs, "faith is an explicit and critical" component of the work. Of those 444, about 160 made faith a mandatory element of the programme. Presumably among the 444 (they don't specify), about 279 programs said client "exposure" to "faith-related elements" was measured either by "faith-related practices" or "spiritual outcomes"; these two seem to echo the process and outcome of proselytism and conversion. Table 5 below, from Hugen and Venema, outlines these practices and "spiritual outcomes" for clients.

Table 5. Measures of faith-related practices and spiritual outcomes among FBOs in Michigan, adapted from Hugen and Venema (2009).
Involvement in Faith-Related Practices (n = 215 programs with at least one faith-related practice element)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church/Worship</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering/Service</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Study</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession (testimony)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repentance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spiritual Outcomes (n = 160 programs with at least one spiritual outcome element)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Faith</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Spirituality (nonspecific faith language)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Experience/Decision to Follow Christ</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Lifestyle</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having belief</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While most of these would satisfy at least one of the gradations of evangelism discussed by Unruh & Sider (2005), the "spiritual outcomes" (middle of the table) are most explicitly indicative of proselytism and conversion. The following are rather large tables so I ask the reader's forgiveness, but I do think they are important. Tables 6 and 7, adapted from one table in Hugen and Venema (2009) present examples of how programs among these 279 FBOs operationalised and measured these "spiritual outcomes."

The outcome most obviously connected to proselytism is "salvation experience/decision to follow Christ." But a glance at the tables' contents makes it clear that proselytism isn't isolated to this most explicit and categorical of "conversions." "Growth in Faith," for instance, measures conversion, too, with at least the first and second outcomes. And when conversion is considered more a "graded" phenomenon, many more of these outcomes seem to be attempts to alter the constellation of clients' beliefs, attitudes, traits, behaviours, etc. Under "behaviour/lifestyle," for instance, we find both the outcome and measure of one program to be "faith-based lifestyle;" under "growth in faith" we find the "life skills program" as a measure of "restoring the lost," a
combination of outcome and measure which highlights the divinely driven industriousness reminiscent of Lockhart's (2003) work; and perhaps most striking is the outcome "saving the mothers and saving the babies" under "salvation experience," the measure of which is "every woman who comes to the Crisis Pregnancy Centre hears the plan of salvation. If she is saved, then the baby is saved from abortion[Presumably that is the measure]. To date we have over 1300 salvations" (p. 420). While it wasn't their stated purpose, it is, nonetheless, hard for me to conceive of how especially the last sentence could pass by two social workers, and the peer review system of the *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work*, without any contextualisation whatsoever; the ethical mandate of social work and the code of ethics clashes rather violently with the CPC movement, to say nothing of the anti-oppressive model.

Table 6. *The spiritual outcomes of "growth in faith" and "behaviour/lifestyle" among 279 FBOs in Michigan, from Hugen and Venema (2009).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth in Faith</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>“To develop a strong relationship with God through Jesus Christ and to learn to live out a Christian testimony that is above reproach.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>“In addition to the Bible studies and counselling mentioned above, we have regular weekly prayer breakfast. We strongly encourage local church attendance and participation in local Christian events.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>&quot;An enduring relationship with Jesus Christ&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>&quot;Observable spiritual growth, attendance, and involvement with a church outside of the program. Voluntary service for Jesus&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>&quot;Build a solid spiritual component.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3</td>
<td>&quot;Do we see growth in the faith journey...progress not destination.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>&quot;Restoring the lost.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4</td>
<td>&quot;Through spiritual growth, or life skills program.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5</td>
<td>&quot;Improved spiritual well-being.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5</td>
<td>&quot;Number attending churches or small group ministries, such as Alpha.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6</td>
<td>&quot;Spiritual growth.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 6</td>
<td>&quot;Subjective and relationally based. Staff and volunteers are in mentoring relationships with youth, encouraging positive choices and spiritual growth.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behaviour/Lifestyle**

| Outcome 1 | "That the students be alert to hear God’s voice and when God sends them somewhere be willing and able to go." |
Measure 2  "When God calls."
Outcome 2  "Students complete biblical study, teaching and reflection focused on service to the poor and seeking justice for those in need."
Measure 2  "Complete curriculum that teaches and addresses a holistic Christian worldview. After review, make a personal commitment to consider these views in light of their vocation choices. Commit to a lifestyle and possible vocation that will be part of positive social, political, and spiritual change within NYC urban communities."
Outcome 3  "Faith-based lifestyle."
Measure 3  "Faith-based lifestyle."
Outcome 4  "Changed life patterns resulting from understanding and accepting Biblical sexuality."
Measure 4  "Database statistics showing that women understand abstinence is a healthy alternative."

Table 7. The spiritual outcomes of "general spirituality," "salvation experience/decision to follow Christ," and "having belief" among 279 FBOs in Michigan, from Hugen and Venema (2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Spirituality (non-specific faith language)</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>&quot;Increase in positive faith attitudes.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>&quot;Evaluations and QuickConnect computer evaluation tool.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>&quot;Spiritual changes.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>&quot;Observation and questions.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>&quot;Greater interest/participation in spiritual matter.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>&quot;Exit interview; enrollment and participation in afterCARE Program.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Measure 3  | "All that we pray we do is line up with God's will in feeding His needy people."
| Measure 4  | "We pray with those who request prayer, and try to send cards to those who haven't been through the food line in awhile. Our aim is to let the Light of Jesus Christ shine through each one of us volunteers. If we can help just one person, through an encouraging word, a smile, a prayer, then we've achieved something wonderful." |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salvation Experience/Decision to follow Christ</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>&quot;For the program participant to achieve an outward commitment and salvation through Jesus Christ.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>&quot;First by his [or her] verbal testimony that he [or she] believes in Christ, has accepted Him, has repented of his [or her] sin and has a desire to change.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>&quot;To make a life-changing difference in clients lives by leading them to a personal relationship with Christ.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>&quot;By praying with clients and offering them the message of salvation, we&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having Belief

| Outcome 1 | "Clearly understand what it means to be a Christian." |
| Measure 2 | "Students are able to explain what they believe and why they believe." |
| Outcome 2 | "Better understanding of God and Bible." |
| Measure 2 | "Daily verbal quizzes." |
| Outcome 3 | "Does the participant know who Jesus Christ is?" |
| Measure 3 | "Participants are polled by a show of hands with data collected and charted. 70% responded they knew who Jesus Christ was and what He represented."

We get a deeper look at just how the CPC movement integrates faith and social service from Kelly's recently (2014) published manuscript of a 2-year ethnographic study of a CPC centre in the "southeastern United States" (p. 428). Kelly (2014), a gender studies professor at Mississippi State University, provides a broader picture of the antagonism between evangelical beliefs and service, and doesn't let the ethical dimension slide. She stated that, "[t]aking action in ways consistent with their evangelical beliefs can mean activists [i.e., CPC volunteers and staff] fail to see clients' actual needs, and instead redefine them in terms of activist' priorities" (p. 447). This is how the need for an abortion on the part of a client, a Mexican mother supporting six kids in Mexico through remittances, was, through a rather salty exchange with a CPC worker, recast as indicative of moral failure, while breach of confidentiality, a potential misrepresentation of abortion as illegal, and race and class bias by the CPC worker who interacted with the Mexican mother, went unaddressed.

See Schneider, Polk, and Morrison (2010) for another study on the CPC movement in which they, too, find the same problematic connection between service and evangelism.
As with the CPC in Hugen and Venema (2009), there is a focus on evangelism and conversion is a stated goal among the CPC; also similar is the goal of moral regulation such as "change their minds about abortion" and "choose abstinence" (Kelly, 2014, p. 432) or "parenting classes or Bible study" (p. 446). Evangelism takes place amidst the fog of what Kelly (2014) considers "social myopia," which included a lack of awareness of the conditions in which clients were placed, categories of oppression, service ethics, but ironically also the CPC's effectiveness in realising its own goal, namely of preventing abortion. That is perhaps the most important thing to note with respect to these two glances at the CPCs - the people entering them are not decidedly pro-choice, and might even be leaning pro-life to enter a CPC in the first place; and yet their experiences are at times soured by the taste of evangelism. For instance, Kelly (2014) tells a story where a grandmother came to the CPC to exchange clothing for her grandchild, and left frustrated after she was denied an exchange without fulfilling the condition of entering parenting classes or Bible study; the grandmother protested that she knew how to parent and that she was already Christian and went to her own church. To Kelly (2014), this "social myopia" was further exemplified by a CPC volunteer's description of an exchange with a client. Kelly (2014) recounts:

Jana summed up this perspective when she explained to me why she was not discouraged when a pregnant client challenged Jana's focus on proselytizing during their counseling session. According to Jana, the client, upset about the positive pregnancy test, asked Jana if she really thought religious faith was the most important factor the client should consider. Jana described her own feelings, telling me 'I totally just give it to God and that's it...That takes a huge burden off my shoulders...That's not my job, to convince people and change their minds. God puts the desire in their heart" (p. 447-448).
The agent behind both success and failure, notes Kelly, is considered to be God - not the CPC staff or clients. Conversion isn't a function of power, of influence, of the care-giving relationship, but rather of divine grace; all the CPC workers do is "facilitate this process by garnering resources from other evangelicals and creating opportunities for clients to convert or to reject abortion (p. 432). Thus, one could suggest that the client's "choice" or "freedom" here are employed to mask their potential lack of either.

Sager's (2011) study explored how people experiencing homelessness felt about a similar "drop-in" programme. She sought to understand the "goal" of recipients in attending an FBO and how the faith-based component of FBOs impacted "client reception of service." Sager revealed some interesting insights from the client's vantage. Among her findings, the least problematic, though no less telling perhaps, is that 71% of clients who mentioned the religious component rated the religious component of their respective FBOs as their least favourite aspect of programming. Any thought that this posture toward religious services reflected a morally unambiguous preference or indifference disappears as Sagar delves deeper, uncovering a more striking picture than might meet the eye at first. I share this rather long quote because it is extremely telling:

At two of the six [programs], receipt of food was contingent upon participation in religious activities...in one case clients were required to listen to a sermon in order to get a meal [while] in the other, the sermon was required to receive second helpings or dessert. The willingness of these two organizations to meet a client's physical needs was predicated upon the client's willingness to hear a religious message; this is a strong indicator that these groups valued moving clients toward religious salvation or
conversion, perhaps more than they valued meeting [goals specific to their experience of homelessness] (Sagar, 2011, p. 206).

The participants themselves, if they were not already sympathetic to the message of evangelical proselytism, experienced the religious component of FBOs in the study as an "invasion of privacy," which presumed that "we're not Christian already." The "most frequently expressed view" at 53% was that the "religious content was coercive." Interestingly, the two FBOs in the study which offered service contingent upon religious participation were characterized by "more than one" participant as a "price" or "cost" of service. Thus, some of these clients almost literally had to sing for their supper.

The most recent study I found that directly tied evangelism and service was published in the *Journal of Social Work* by Kristen Trotter Davis (2014), who studied 28 faith-based and 27 secular addictions programs in the US, similar to Hodge (2002) and Lockhart (2003). Her findings affirm what seems to be the case - service and evangelism go hand in hand in a holistic way to "cure" addiction. But she notes importantly that "both secular and faith-based programs provide religious activities," something others have not noted (p. 250). Table 8 below is reproduced from Trotter Davis's (2014) paper.

Table 8. *Comparison of prevalence of religious program component between faith-based and secular programs.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Faith-based (n = 28)</th>
<th>Secular (n = 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory religious practices</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow staff to pray with clients</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use religious instruction</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen staff for religious beliefs</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen clients for religious beliefs*</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage client conversion</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute religious materials</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help client join a congregation</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72% (but n =22)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement contains religious terms</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Absolutes numbers not percentages.
** "The variation in sample size is due to missing response," according to Trotter Davis (2014).

While the absence of mandatory religious practices in secular organisations is expected, the high percentage of secular agencies which "allow staff to pray with clients" and "use religious instruction" or "distribute religious materials" seems to grind against the notions of secularism and social work in ways the FBOs certainly do not. And the high percentage of agencies which connect clients to congregates raises the question as to which congregation and what the policies and social implications of that process are.

**In the USA Operating Internationally.** We come to the final section on the empirical literature. Like Midgley and Sanzenbach's prescient concern in Social Work, Paul Gifford (of Brouwer, Gifford, & Rose, 1996) issued a sharp-tongued warning about "Christian fundamentalism and development" in (1991). At a time when the US evangelical base was still young, Gifford (1991) warned of its dispensational theology which leans toward an interpretation of "all kinds of hardship and deprivation as foretold" and that since "these disasters are ordained by God, they are by definition unavoidable" (p. 11). Instead, to "this Christianity, nothing matters but evangelisation" to prepare for the imminent return of Jesus. (p. 12).

Gifford would expand on his worries with a series of vignettes in chapter length in his book with Steve Brouwer and Susan D. Rose. (Brouwer et al., 1996). While the book's main focus is on understanding and tracing out the details of the expansion of "fundamentalist Americanism and Christian Fundamentalism," the presence of the dual mandate invariably comes up, if sporadically. Brouwer et al. (1996), with their characteristic forthrightness - though one could say polemical - draw attention to, for instance, the involvement of American evangelicals in the aftermath of Rios Montt's coup d'etat during the Guatemalan Civil War. As Montt, himself a Pentecostal, attempted to secure his position, evangelicals began to offer "food,
The heightened nature of inter-religious conflict meant that many Catholic native Guatemalans, such as the Nobel Laureate Rigoberta Menchu, had to flee. Many who chose not to flee instead "made a pragmatic decision to convert" (p. 57). "The principle reason," said one Catholic, was "that they didn't want to die." Similar entanglements of political strife and the then-new American evangelicalism in Liberia and the Philippines occur in a context of destitution where the movement is given fertile ground in which to sow seeds with service.

A year later, Fred Kniss and David Todd Campbell (1997) published a paper that started to ask questions more characteristic of FBO literature, centred around the importance of theological orientation in FBOs. With a sample of 63 American FBOs with operations abroad, Kniss and Campell (1997) found that about 25% of those 63 "drew little or no organizational or budgetary distinction between" the religious and service-related elements of their programming, while 10% were involved "primarily in evangelization or church extension and only occasionally engaged in relief or development as a peripheral activity (p. 97). Analysing the data further at the level of denomination, they found that those organisations with an evangelical orientation were more likely to engage primarily in relief work in the face of disaster (60%) than they were to engage primarily in sustainable development of the areas in which they worked (20%). Evangelical organisations also accounted for the bulk of the 25% who "drew little" distinction between religion and service - 13 of the 15 FBOs who didn't draw this distinction were evangelical. Moreover, of the evangelical FBOs, none had no religious component and less than 30% made a separation of religion and service. To go even further, "in examining the evangelical organizations more closely, we find that most of those who support local initiatives in relief and development are in fact primarily church planting organizations who engage in relief and
development as an ad hoc peripheral activity" (Recall the CIDA, 1995 paper). The language of the Lausanne Covenant and Joshua Project emerged in qualitative data here, as Kniss and Campbell quote a participant who saw that FBOs were an "opportunity to go and witness and serve in His Name, especially among peoples where Christ is unknown or little known" (p. 101, emphasis mine). Also from the Lausanne's Covenant is the acknowledgement that "care for spiritual and physical needs are mandated in the Bible" (p. 101.).

Over the subsequent decade not much substantial research seems to have been done on American FBOs working abroad. Some journalists, however, did raise concerns about evangelical missionaries entering Iraq in the aftermath of the 2003 invasion (e.g., Goodstein, 2003; Thaut, 2009), which was particularly significant in light of the involvement of Blackwater, a private military outfit founded by Erik Prince, a devout and wealthy member of the Christian Right in America who Jeremy Scahill (2007) described as a "Christian supremacist." In fact, Prince's sister is Betsy DeVos, the Trump-appointed Secretary of Education mentioned above whose vow to privatise public schooling seems clearly related to the conservative evangelical trend toward private home-schooling. A number of scholars and journalists also wrote concerns about what one referred to as "disaster evangelism" in the aftermath of the 2004 Tsunami (e.g., Jayasinghe, 2007; Matthews, 2007).

In a kind of strange similarity to the Canadian scholarship, things picked up again in the late 2000s, starting with London School of Economics Professor, Mathijs Pelkmans's (2009) anthropological case study on proselytism among FBOs in Kyrgyzstan. The same theme throughout Brouwer et al.'s (1996) book emerges for Pelkmans - the destitution wrought by neoliberalism and globalisation "created the institutional space for evangelical missions to operate, while the collapse of the welfare system produced a need for the services offered by
evangelicals" (p. 425). Also echoed here is the "ideology" of the market of religions and the role of FBOs in advocating for religious freedom. Peklmans quotes one medical volunteer from Texas who stated that "[Our] goal is for everyone to have a chance to hear about Jesus. And this is a place where they were not allowed to hear...Now it is easier and I guess as Christians we want to tell everyone" (p. 431). In contrast, a Kyrgyzstani diplomat complained about the "attitude of evangelical missionaries: They come here and only want to talk about religious freedom. They only talk about rights, rights, rights!" (p. 429). The "holistic" services, too, are noted by Peklmans, standing in stark contrast to the perception that combining, particularly in unscrupulous fashion, aid and proselytism was a "misuse" of the former.

But Pelkmans's (2009) analysis is what I found to be most unique. He takes a balanced view but at the same time plays with the notion of deception on multiple occasions, particularly with the analogy of "transparency." To render something transparent, Pelksmans argues, is simultaneously to make the interior of that object visible but the surface - through which one looks but which once was opaque and thus visible - disappears from plain sight. Here, the rights-based language of religious freedom, the appropriation of "secular development discourses," the logic of market-based solutions, aid or social service and all its accoutrements render the opacity of missionary work transparent and thus invisible. This is, in part, how funding is justified to missionary-turned-FBO-organisations. The analogy renders even more problematic the tendency to make secondary - or "ad hoc" - service to evangelism, because in this case service is less than secondary, but rather a strategic manoeuvre to hide evangelism in plain side. This is painfully evident in the following passage of a Lutheran FBO, in which service seems intentionally used as a "wedge" or "pre-evangelism." Note the Lausanne/Joshua language, too:
Many villages in Kyrgyzstan are Christless and churchless. Church planting is needed to bring Christ to empty hearts and homes. Pre-evangelism contacts are made through programs like Mobile Medical Trailer, Eyeglass Clinic, Teaching of English, Healthy Moms, and Humanitarian Aid. Then visits are made by evangelists. Bible study is begun in the home of a receptive villager and conducted weekly. Catechism is then taught and newly confirmed members start a new church in that village (p. 435).

Elsewhere, Pelkmans (2009) notes that the Machiavellianism of some of the evangelists did not register as ethically dubious because if "God had 'opened the door'" to evangelism then "careful strategizing was required to keep the door open" (p. 432).

Though Pelkmans's (2009) study focused on FBOs generally, a collection of studies have examined specific areas. For instance, Horstmann (2011) and Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2011) both looked at refugees vis-à-vis the evangelical FBO. In Horstmann's (2011) study of the Karen refugees proselytism was evident and, as is consistent with much of literature reviewed, seen as inextricably linked to service delivery. Moreover, in the case of the Karen, proselytism took place in a kind of church-camp complex for refugees in which "[t]he influence of the church in the refugee camps is all-encompassing," diminishing the value of self-determination all the more.

Regarding refugee camps, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2011) observed the presence of a set of "scripts" to investigate, it would seem, the presence of a kind of tacit "quid-pro-quo" between the FBOs and the refugees. Similar to Pelkmans's (2009) implied criticisms of the religious freedom discourse, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2011) observed that scripts of "tolerance" according to which the recipients who did not or could not (e.g., because of a language barrier) ask hard questions or exercise a sense of self-determination seem to have been given access to the "behind-the-curtains" affairs of the work of FBOs in the camps that might have raised concerns. Thus, "[w]e
must concurrently question to what extent power imbalances and dependence upon external support *condition* refugees' potential responses to diverse donors and initiatives" (p. 542, emphasis mine). Nowhere is this quagmire of the imbalance of power more evident than in the co-handling of children. The Polisario Front, which represents the Sahrawi, seems to permit the children to function as "ambassadors" for the Sahrawi people, as they, the Front, work with evangelical FBOs, presumably for the benefit of the Sahrawi people. In turn, the FBOs seem to engage in a type of child evangelism, often in the form of short or long-term absences from the camps, including trips to the US. "During their time in the US children stay with members of evangelical churches, regularly attend church with their host families, and participate in high-profile demonstrations" and the evidence given seems to indicate that this works to at least warm the children to evangelical Christianity (p. 543). But the parents don't seem to know, and their ignorance occurs under the "tyranny" of these scripts of tolerance and the power of the FBOs to offer aid. Almost helplessly, one interviewee said "The Sahrawi delegates outside must pay attention to these children [abroad] so that they maintain their links with the Sahrawi culture and its people" (p. 543). Recently Kraft (2015) has drawn attention to many of these same concerns in Lebanon among Syrian refugees.

Another study examines HIV/AIDS work, under the shadow of G.W. Bush's Presidential Emergency Plan for Aids Relief (PEPFAR). Casale, Nixon, Flicker, Rubincam, and Jenney (2010) discussed four tensions which emerged at the intersection of service and faith for AIDS groups working in South Africa. The fourth they listed as the "ambiguous relationship between church and state" in public schools in the administration of these programmes. Some of the data they gathered indicated a central and seemingly unavoidable role of scriptural references, and attempt to "impart lessons" from them; construal of events as "God's will;" and Bible
distribution. These concerns are cushioned between two others with decidedly faith-based content - the focus on a divinely encoded abstinence as a form of prevention and unhelpful messaging about condom use, both of which have been a focus of the criticism of PEPFAR's ideological inclinations (e.g., Cooper, 2015). Melinda Cooper (2015) has also criticised the PEPFAR for institutionalizing the presence of "US evangelical or Pentecostal and African Pentecostal charismatic churches" in AIDS work (p. 55).

What these recent studies suggest is that the dual mandate figures in the US FBOs operating abroad. This is confirmed by a recent survey of US FBOs working internationally which found that up to 51% of them were "combining elements of aid provision and evangelistic charity" and about 26% "combine political activism and evangelistic charity" (Mitchell, 2015, p. 1888).

**Conclusion Remarks on The Dual Mandate in FBOs**

With all of these studies, Canadian and US, domestic and international, a clear, albeit initial, picture seems to emerge - the dual mandate is a very real part of social service provision and it occurs in the context of a rising evangelicalism. But the relative size of the scholarship directly focusing on this topic in comparison to other areas of social service (e.g., the Faith-Based Initiative) is telling of an implicit bias, what Monsma and Mounts (2002) called, albeit in a different context, "don't ask; don't tell." Nevertheless, a number of empirical (e.g., Audet et al., 2013; Kraft, 2015) and argumentative pieces (e.g., Agensky, 2013; Ahmad, 2005; Bradley, 2009) have begun to draw attention to the matter at both national and international levels, and in multiple disciplines (see Messinger, 2015 or Redwood-Campbell, 2008 for brief comments). The presence of the dual mandate is supported, too, with a number of other sources, which comment

---

*Somewhere, I have seen Paul Bramadat of the University of Victoria refer to Canadian scholarship with this phrase, too, but maybe not with the same meaning.*
on its presence or uncover it peripherally (e.g., Adkins, 2010; Hackworth, 2012). And this does not include several studies which have pointed to the dual mandate internationally but operated by non-US or non-Canadian FBOs (e.g., Berger, 2003; Hovland, 2008; Paristau, 2011).

What the above scholarship also illustrates is that FBOs are involved in almost every sector, including immigrant and refugee settlement; refugee camps; pregnancy centres; HIV/AIDS programs; homeless shelters; poverty programs, and brief references indicate that this is an issue in prisons (Persky, 2008) and child welfare (Howell-Moroney, 2009), too. Moreover, they are at times funded by government but at other times not, but from the collection of studies a chorus sounds - that the devolution of the state has facilitated, informally and formally, access to social service provision denied to evangelical FBOs in such unregulated fashion since the pre-New Deal era. Another important point - foretold by Saperstein (2003) - is that the dual mandate seems "unregulated" and so potential ethical problems seem to get by many. There is no greater indication of this than a published work within Social Work advocating for Rick Warren's evangelising "P.E.A.C.E." Plan (Tangenburg, 2008).

In the next section, Part II, I will comment on how this literature makes space for a more direct exploration of the dual mandate and how I hope to fill that space with the present work.
PART II: METHODOLOGY

The reader will recall from the introduction that this study examines religious influence in evangelical service settings across two national contexts, Canada and India. Accordingly, in order to explain how I did that, in this section I will outline the following elements: (a) research questions and purposes; (b) methodology; (c) methods of data collection; (d) sources of data collection, which includes information on my participants; (e) sampling strategies used; (f) desired and actual sizes of the samples by method; (g) method of data analysis; and (h) ethical concerns.

Research Questions & Purpose

There are four research questions and two overarching purposes of the present work. The first two research questions are the primary ones, while the latter two are secondary, for reasons I'll explain later.

From the literature review we established that in Canada and the US, concerning research on domestic activity, most of the studies I reviewed did not explicitly research the dual mandate. Instead I took elements related to the dual mandate from studies on FBOs and wove them together. Moreover, the Canadian studies are also heavily weighted toward religious organisations, individuals, and universities, and none of these made but a passing reference to the
dual mandate. Concerning the international research, I reviewed several studies which suggested a near similar absence of an explicit look at the dual mandate. Moreover, of these international studies, none discussed the matter of evangelism in service settings in India, despite the contentiousness of the issue as observed in the section on the interpretive framework and the focus of evangelical organisations on India, which sits in the 10/40 window, which as the reader might recall from the literature review refers to the geographical "window" within which the most "unreached" people live (i.e., between 10 and 40 degrees north latitude). Therefore, the first overarching purpose of the research was, naturally, to explore the topic as directly as possible in Canada and India.

Accordingly, my first two research questions seek directly to investigate the pairing of religious influence and service. While these questions have gone through multiple iterations the following were the final and most precise ones: Research Question 1.1: What is the nature and extent of religious influence in evangelical social service settings? and Research Question 1.2: What are the outcomes of religious influence in evangelical social service settings? Note that the first number refers to the fact that it is a primary research question, while the second number after the decimal point refers to the fact that it is the first or second among the primary research questions.

Concerning the secondary research questions, the first of these, and thus the third research question overall, was intended to prod me into connecting my research topic to three domains: (a) social work; (b) social welfare; and (c) social policy. The intention behind selecting these three domains was not only to add an element of pragmatism to the dissertation, more firmly grounding it within social work scholarship, but also to serve as a foundation for future research, i.e., these three domains would constitute part of a longer-term research programme.
Thus, Research Question 2.1 was: What are the implications of religious influence in service settings for social work, social welfare, and social policy?

For clarification, the following are definitions of these three domains. By "social work" I mean to refer both to the broader practice of "social work" including but not limited to the discipline of "Social Work" - relying on the same capitalisation scheme from my literature review above to create the distinction. The main consideration here was the individual or relational level of analysis. By "social welfare" I mean to refer to the system of welfare provision. The main consideration here is the idea and phenomenon of the FBO, which is the part of that system in focus in my work. By "social policy" I mean the legal and non-legal regulations which structure the social welfare system and by implication social work; I include also the ideational or discursive content of such regulations.

Moving onto the final research question, itself also a "secondary research question," there are few comparative investigations of FBOs across national settings (e.g., Mask & Borger, 2008; Paulson & Menjívar, 2011). Among these, none from what I can tell, either directly or indirectly investigated anything like religious influence. Moreover, only one study I read made mention of Christian FBOs working in India; this study was also one of only two comparative works on India, but looked at Nairobi and Los Angeles (see Ferguson, Dostzbach, Dyrness, Dabir, & Spruijt-Metz, 2008). Therefore, it seems any work on Christian FBOs working in India might be relatively new, as would the comparison with Canada, and moreover, my conducting research in both countries naturally leads to this last question. Research Question 2.2 is: What are the similarities and differences between Canada and India with respect to religious influence in service settings?
The last two research questions, the "secondary" ones, are secondary for two reasons. The first reason is that answers to these questions are contingent, to varying degrees, on the answers to the first two research questions. When I respond to the question about the implications, for instance, while I do rely on unique and novel data from certain questions on the measures, I also refer to the findings from the first two research questions, out of necessity. When I respond to the question about comparison, I have no choice but to rely on the findings from the first two research questions.

The second reason these questions are secondary is to satisfy the second purpose of the research, which was to help plant a seed for further research beyond the dissertation. In other words, while my work in the near future would likely further investigate the central topic of religious influence, my work further into the future ideally would be broader and thus move beyond the "good works" and The Great Commission. The three domains I've outlined provide a framework for that future work, the seed of which is planted here. The same goes for the comparative work. With the research questions in hand, what about the methodology?

Methodology

I relied on a descriptive or observational research methodology, meaning I attempted to describe or observe the object of my two studies, religious influence in evangelical service settings. The observational or descriptive methodology relies on a degree of objectivism, i.e., that there are elements of an objective reality that exist outside of the observer's subjective experience and that this observer can meaningfully describe and accurately capture elements of that reality for others to observe. Consequently, there is space for a multitude of methods, so long as they facilitate observation or description.

Accordingly, I adopted a mixed-methods research design, consisting of quantitative and
qualitative methods, aimed at gathering data from five sources, each accomplishing something slightly different but together serving the function of data triangulation. I’m referring specifically to the “Convergent Triangulation Design” discussed by John Creswell (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Plano-Clarke, 2011). Citing Morse (1991), Creswell and Plano-Clarke (2011) state that the "purpose of this design is 'to obtain different but complimentary data on the same topic' (Morse, 1991, p. 122) to best understand the research problem" (p. 62, emphasis mine). They go on to state that the "intent in using this design is to bring together the differing strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of quantitative methods (large sample size, trends, generalizations) with those of qualitative methods (small N, details, in depth)" (p. 62).

In this case, it seemed appropriate to use both quantitative and qualitative methods because some information would more easily be captured by quantitative questions, while other information more easily be captured with qualitative questions, and yet other information better captured through documents or observation. This set of methods, however, also meant that I have smaller sample sizes and limited generalisability than a typical quantitative study but greater depth and detail; on the other hand, I might not have as much depth as a purely qualitative study but a larger sample and greater generalisability. It also means that I had less determination in advance than a typical quantitative study, but far more than a typical qualitative study. In fact, one of the main struggles associated with mixed methods research for me is the level of determination or detail that can or should be provided in advance. Typically, quantitative research designs determine the bulk, sometimes all, of the details from the start. In contrast, when using qualitative methods the definition of the research design is often open, as per convention, and does at times occur concurrently with other research functions, such as data
collection and analysis; this has prompted one researcher to refer to qualitative design as a "dance" (see Janesick, 1994).

I personally don't like this more or less ad hoc approach, yet I couldn't anticipate everything, and feared pigeon-holing myself with too much specificity. Therefore, I tried to strike a middle-ground - a pragmatic point between the two seemingly disparate worlds. Consequently, I attempted to provide as much detail as possible without sacrificing all flexibility. If we were to go with the dance metaphor, it was more a waltz, than a salsa or freestyle. In the subsequent few pages, I will discuss the major changes I made as the data collection was taking place, which was naturally the phase during which all the changes happened.

Methods of Data Collection

Moving on to the sources of data within this mixed methods design, the only source of quantitative data was a survey that I administered to staff of FBOs in Canada. The survey also consisted of some qualitative questions, too, namely those which were either expedient to ask within the survey or that did not warrant the level of detail for which the more powerful qualitative methods were suited. Of the other four sources of data, two were conventional qualitative methods, focus group discussions and interviews, while the third was document review of the FBOs and the fourth was my own research observations. Below is more detail, in the form of tables, each of which presents the entire research design for each study and also in the form of written elaboration on each of the five major components of my research design, listed in the first row of the table below. The prose is not broken down by study.

Method 1: Survey. I designed surveys for clients (Appendix A) and service providers (Appendix B). As I mentioned above, the surveys consist of quantitative and qualitative questions, but rely more heavily on the former. The surveys were intended primarily to give me a
broader picture of the topic. Certain questions (marked with an asterisk in Appendix A and B) in the survey were adopted or adapted from Ebaugh et al. (2006a). While they were used by Ebaugh et al. (2006a) to measure either staff, service, or organisational religiosity, the content of them and their high correlation with proselytism in their study both suggest these items can be used to measure religious influence. I decided against developing essentially the same questions but with different wording, when there were already existing questions which might serve.

Method 2: Focus Group Discussion. This was intended to be the primary source of qualitative data and was suggested by Dr. Caragata, whose own work with lone mothers suggests that the collective and intersubjective nature of focus groups facilitates sharing of thoughts and experiences and guards against an overreliance on one person, as is the case with interviews. The discussion guide for the focus groups is attached as Appendix C.

Method 3: Interview. The interview was intended to supplement the survey and focus groups, which while providing sources of quantitative and qualitative data, do not capture the level of depth typical of interviews. I intended the interviews to range between 20-60 minutes and was open to conducting them in person or over the phone.

Method 4: Document Review. The public image conveyed by FBOs is important and figures in a few studies as a potential obstacle (e.g., Audet et al., 2013). Moreover, documents are likely to contain "official" information which may not come through in the survey, focus group, or interview. Therefore, I included these where relevant, i.e., where they told me more than the other methods or were given to me.

---

This is also a relevant critique of the work by Ebaugh and colleagues, namely, that the correlation between proselytism and the measures of religiosity might be fueled in large measure by the fact that much of the latter seems to measure proselytism, too. In other words, there doesn't appear at face value to be a difference between a significant portion of the staff, service, and organisational religiosity measures and what we might imagine for a measure on proselytism itself.
**Method 5: Researcher Observation.** Finally, I included my own observations among the data. This method was intended to function as a kind of epistemological "safety net" in order to capture any data that is not captured by Methods 1 through 4 but which seem significant to the research questions. I didn't intend to, therefore, and ultimately didn't rely on this method heavily, but included it, as I said, to account for the unplanned. This was particularly useful in India.

**Source of Data**

Sources 1 and 2 below - staff and clients - were the main or primary sources of data. Sources 3, 4, and 5 were to be the supplementary or secondary sources of data. Furthermore, Sources 1 and 2 were more likely to be affected by social desirability on the part of the FBO and the people associated with it, while Sources 3 to 5 were intended, at least in part, to round out this effect (another reason to use a triangulation methodology). Using methods this way is, again, a bedrock of mixed methods research (see Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011, chapter 4).

**Source 1: Staff.** Here I would have included volunteers, paid front-line workers, managers, administrators, and any other category of person who is employed by or fulfills the duties of the FBO. In the end, no volunteers were included in the study, but staff from all other categories participated.

**Source 2: Clients.** Clients included anyone who used or participated in a service at the FBO for any duration of time at least once.

**Source 3: Key Informants.** This category of participant and source of data was intended primarily to involve those who are neither staff nor clients but who might be able to speak to the topic. This could have included people in evangelical or non-evangelical FBOs, secular service providers who work with evangelical FBOs, and public funders. Ultimately, I spoke to two key
informants, one in Canada, a Christian who worked for an FBO, and another in India, a practising Catholic who'd also worked as a social worker in FBOs.

Source 4: FBO Documents. My definition of "documents" included but was not limited to websites, brochures and flyers, and social media posts. These were intended to provide information about the FBO at the organisational and/or public level which might be of importance but which might not have emerged because of social desirability in research settings or some other reason. In the end, the vast majority of the documents I included were those given to me by my participants and those included primarily brochures or reports. I included also financial statements I obtained from their websites, content on their websites, and a logo.
Table 9. Canadian Study’s Research Design, including Method, Data Source, Sampling Method, Desired Range for Number of Participants (N), and the Method of Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Sampling Strategies</th>
<th>Desired Size</th>
<th>Actual Size</th>
<th>Method of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N&gt; 30</td>
<td>N=22</td>
<td>Descriptives/Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N&gt; 30</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N=2-4</td>
<td>N =1(3)*</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N=5(18)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N ≤ 10</td>
<td>N=21</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Informants</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Observations</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>N=22</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number in parentheses represents the number of participants. While the other number, before the parentheses represents the number of focus groups.
Table 10. *Indian Study’s Research Design, including Method, Data Source, Sampling Method, Desired Range for Number of Participants (N), and the Method of Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Sampling Strategies</th>
<th>Desired Size</th>
<th>Actual Size</th>
<th>Method of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>$N&gt;30$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Descriptives/Frequencies Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>$N&gt;30$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>$N=2-4$</td>
<td>$N=4(9)^*$</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>$N=1(2)^*$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>$N \leq 10$</td>
<td>$N=13$</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>$N=5$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Informants</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>$N=1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>$N=5$</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Observations</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>$N=18$</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number in parentheses represents the number of participants. While the other number, before the parentheses represents the number of focus groups.*
Source 5: Researcher Observations. Finally, I kept notes of my observations in order to include information that was important to answering the research questions. These were primarily written, though once in India I made an audio/video note. I tried my best to keep these organised but given the chaos of the data collection process this wasn't always possible. Therefore, there's variation, some are hand-written and others typed, some are detailed others not, and so on.

Sampling Strategy

Overall, I relied on three non-random or non-probability sampling methods. First and foremost, I relied on purposive sampling at the organisational level, i.e., in selecting FBOs. This is explained in further detail below and is not indicated in Table 9 or 10 above. Second, at the level of human participants, once the FBOs had been determined, I relied on convenience sampling, which simply meant that I initially included those willing to participate in my study. Third and finally, to supplement convenience sampling of participants, I used snowball sampling, which meant that I included those suggested or referred to me by existing participants originally recruited by the convenience sampling method. An important distinction, however, is that for staff and clients, snowball sampling supplemented convenience sampling properly in this way - i.e., I included those who were willing to participate but gave them the opportunity to refer someone else to the study; for key informants, on the other hand, snowball sampling functioned as the sole sampling method. To put all of this more simply, I selected organisations that were evangelical (i.e., purposive) and then included participants who were willing (i.e., convenience) and later asked them if they would refer me to others (i.e., snowball). Below is more detailed information on how these sampling methods were applied.
**Purposive Sampling of FBOs.** I sampled from FBOs which satisfied the following four criteria. First, they must have been reasonably viewed as evangelical. Here I didn't think it was necessary to stay too close to the existing sets of criteria from academic (e.g., Brouwer et al., 1996) or religious sources (e.g., Smietana, 2015), but intended to use them more directly. But in practice, this proved very difficult, so I relied, as much as possible, on self-identification. Second, the FBOs had to work in urban settings. This criterion was particularly important for India, where the contrast between urban and rural settings is still rather marked so as to make comparison difficult. Third, the FBOs must provide some form of social service, where social service is defined as service provided to members at least initially outside of the congregation (i.e., to citizens of civil society) and in fulfillment of a social problem. Fourth, that social problem I limited to urban poverty. Urban poverty is a fairly discrete sector, but it is constituted by an overlap of several types of programmes or sub-sectors, including those designed to address homelessness, food scarcity, and addictions. The focus on poverty here I think is fitting in light of the expertise on my committee, as well as the content of the literature review (e.g., "religious neoliberalism" among evangelicals or neoliberalism as a welfare policy).

**Recruitment of Staff.** Once the FBOs were selected, the primary way I recruited staff from those FBOs was by emailing them. Initially, I included a link to the survey, which was to be the primary or first data collection method. But ultimately things took a more organic turn. I began to realise very quickly that most staff wanted to meet with me first, which was why the interview went from a secondary data collection method to the primary one. It seemed most natural for staff to meet me and ultimately to engage in conversation before anything else. This was true of Canada and India.

---

"Though admittedly rural India is likely where most of the interesting, news-worthy events occur."
Recruitment of Clients. With respect to clients, I intended to recruit in person by approaching FBOs and inviting clients to participate. But here things also took an organic turn. In Canada and especially in India, staff were the first point of contact; this meant that I often wasn't able to get "access" to clients without staff permission and organisation. Thus, virtually every single client who participated in the study did so by way of staff, often though not always in their direct or indirect presence.

Recruitment of Key Informants. The two "key informants" in the study were approached by email or telephone. They were both recommended to me.

Desired and Actual Number of Participants

Surveys for Service Staff and Clients. As per Tables 9 and 10, I indicated originally an N of 30 as the minimum number of participants in part for its statistical utility but also because it seemed feasible for me to obtain 30 responses to the survey administered to clients, and certainly, staff of FBOs. Of course, this was the minimum number and I did what I could to gain as much participation as possible within the timeframe indicated in my timeline, Appendix F.

However, in reality, as I alluded to above, obtaining surveys was far more difficult than anticipated. First, with the Canadian sample, I had a total of 7 clients fill out the survey. Many clients declined in favour of focus group discussions, or because of the length of the survey, or because of problems with literacy and comprehension. One client who was an active member of a focus group simply looked at the survey and said, "That's too long, man." Thus, eventually, after many attempts, I resigned to the methodological reality that many or most clients were simply not interested in the survey, especially when a focus group discussion was occurring as well.
There are 22 respondents to the survey in Canada (i.e., who completed the survey). These, too, were difficult to obtain. Most organisations did not circulate them widely. Second, by the time I had started the Indian study I was already cautious about the value of the survey, and additional unique challenges caused me to decide against administering the survey. I made the decision in consultation with Dr. Caragata; Dr. Neela Dabir of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences in Mumbai and my host supervisor; and one of my participants, who was kind enough to provide some insight.

While I think a greater response could have been achieved, this would be possible only through a revision of the instrument and with greater time, resources, and stronger relationships with organisations. For example, many organisations in both samples could have offered the survey up to their clients, but didn't, I assume, because of the time commitment but also because of the absence of a relationship with the researcher. Many staff acted to protect clients from any intrusion and a survey from someone they didn't know certainly would appear to be such an intrusion. I elaborate further on the problems with the survey in the comparison chapter.

**Focus Group Discussions with Staff and Clients.** Consistent with the trend, then, while the quantitative survey received tepid response, the first qualitative method received favourable responses in both samples. Initially, I aimed to conduct between 2 and 4 focus groups per sample. In practise, I ended up with 6 in Canada and 5 in India. However, in contrast to Patton's criterion I wasn't able to get between 7 and 12 people per focus groups; focus groups ranged between 2 and 6 people, which seemed more than enough within the hour's time typical of a focus group (Patton, 2001).

**Interviews with Staff, Clients, and/or Key Informants.** The interviews also went over very, very well. I had not indicated a desired minimum number here as it was really contingent
upon necessity and opportunity. But the maximum I indicated was 10, as this seemed to be a reasonable threshold for a research study of this size and duration. In practise, however, as I noted above, the interviews, particularly with staff, served as the primary and most common method used here, a kind of "entry" point, likely because to interview someone is very much like a conversation and this is more socially acceptable in both countries. In the end, this method was the most common one. I interviewed 23 staff, one client, and one key informant in Canada and 15 staff, 5 clients, and one key informant in India. However, again I had to depart from convention given the realities of field work. The shortest interview was 10 minutes, not 20, while the longest was 1 hour and 41 minutes, not 1 hour. The interview guides for clients was the same as the focus group guide. The interview guide for service providers is attached as Appendix D while that for the key informants is attached as Appendix E.

**Method of Data Analysis**

In conjunction with the Convergent Triangulation Design, my analysis followed the form of the "Concurrent Data Analysis" discussed by Creswell and Plano-Clarke (2011). This form of analysis corresponds to the Convergent Triangulation Design and has two stages. The first is the stage where the researcher analyses the data types separately. For the quantitative analysis, the only instrument to consider was the survey, and the primary method of analysis was the use of descriptive statistics. I used SPSS to do the analysis. Portions of the survey, as well as the remaining four methods, were analysed using a thematic approach, whereby the researcher looks for major themes in the qualitative data which might answer the research questions. The coding structure, therefore, took the same or similar shape or form as the research questions. I used NVivo as the software to do the analysis here.
The second step of Concurrent Data Analysis is to *merge* the two data types together. Creswell and Plano-Clarke (2011) outline two techniques for merging the data types and I used one of them, which is to merge the data sets by, in fact, discussing them in conjunction with each other in the dissertation. The "researcher needs to answer the following questions," they state:

To what extent do the quantitative and qualitative data converge? How and why? To what extent do the same types of data confirm each other? To what extent do the open-ended themes support the survey results? What similarities and differences exist across levels of analysis?

I deviated slightly here in two small but justifiable ways. First, I don't report on each question for each finding in order to make the dissertation readable and not monotonous; however, the reader will find, I hope that in most cases the answer to these questions are clearly expressed or obvious. Second, I don't discuss the merging of data in the Discussion section as Creswell and Plano-Clarke (2011) state is the custom. I did this, again, in order to facilitate an easier read, when I reported the findings. Thus, in the sections entitled "Primary Findings" and "Secondary Findings" the reader will notice I not only present the qualitative and quantitative data analyses but also discuss them to "merge" them and suggest where they either do or do not corroborate each other.

Finally, most of the comparative work that I have been able to find has made more-or-less general, unstructured comparisons. The most pertinent example is a study collaboratively done by researchers at the University of Southern California-Berkley in the US and the Tata Institute of Social Sciences-Mumbai in India (Ferguson et al., 2008). I tried to address the methodological gap here by building into my study, from research design to analysis, a structure that facilitated comparison. This meant that, as the reader will observe, I designed all instruments
to be appropriate across the two samples. In addition, the inclusion of the quantitative survey, items of which were to be identical across samples, too, were to permit me to make comparisons between numerical representations of the phenomenon of interest, thereby reducing, if only slightly, the perception of researcher bias when making comparisons. This is where the means comparisons might have been useful. Comparing means across the two samples, say on aggregate scores of items, would be telling. In fact, the same notion of comparing means on responses from clients and staff would have also been useful.

But given that the surveys were not administered to clients beyond the seven initial participants in Canada and were not administered to either clients or staff in India, I was not able to follow the path I set before me. Instead, I make comparisons, in line with Creswell and Plano-Clarke's (2011) suggestion, by discussing them. I also used their suggestion of a matrix, which the reader will observe and which presents the similarities and differences across the samples.

One final note on data analysis which doesn't, to my knowledge, come up in Creswell and Plano-Clarke's book, but which is nonetheless important, is the determination of themes, i.e., what constitutes a "theme"? For this dissertation, in some cases the determination of themes was a function of frequency, an old and hard-to-kill habit of my undergraduate education in the quantitatively-obsessed social psychology, but also an attempt at least slightly to "merge" the two data types by quantifying the qualitative (which is the second technique Creswell and Plano-Clarke, in fact, discuss, i.e., quantifying the qualitative data). The reader will, therefore, notice that in many cases I present the number of coded instances while presenting quotations.

However, quantification isn't the gold standard in qualitative research; indeed, much of the impetus behind the movement to include qualitative data in the social sciences stems from observations by researchers that important data is silenced or muffled, even misrepresented,
when quantification tyrannizes over human experience. Thus, in some cases I resisted the urge to look at the number of times a theme emerged and instead used my judgement to determine if a theme might be important to suggest a way of understanding my phenomenon of interest.

Furthermore, there's one final point regarding representation of the participants whose voices are louder than others. While I avoided the temptation or inclination to rely too heavily on some participants and ignore others, the reader will note that this nonetheless naturally occurs in an almost unavoidable fashion. Some people are just more articulate than others, or speak to the questions more directly, and some organisations were more involved and therefore such participants and organisations are better represented. I have made every attempt to be transparent here. Moreover, all of the above was done, of course, with the tacit understanding that a study of this nature - exploratory and without much direct grounding in the literature - is tentative and intended to provide direction rather than confirmation. In other words, to reference Dr. Wineburg's reminder, what I am generalising to here isn't a population, but a set of ideas about how evangelism looks in service settings (personal communication, November 10, 2017).

Ethical Concerns

Though not part of the research design I have to comment on the ethical dimension. The only ethical concern of which I was aware was the perception of the coercion to participate, particularly for clients. Often, researchers offer cash or gift certificates or food in exchange for participation, but in this case doing so was potentially a loaded offer. On the other hand, soliciting participation without a gift or food seemed a one-sided benefit for the researcher. In the end I didn't experience any ethical problems with respect to payments. But my decision to cease offering the survey as a method to Canadian clients was in part informed by my consistent observation that, in addition to what I discussed above, one reason why some clients were not
inclined to participate was that it was a bit demanding to ask for a focus group or interview \textit{and} a survey. The cognitive or affective load of such an endeavour on top of all the other worries they had was just too much, again, especially when a focus group discussion with peers was in the works.

With all of that established, I now get to the findings.
PART III: PRIMARY FINDINGS

Chapter 1: Religious Influence in Canadian Evangelical Faith-Based Organisations

In this chapter I’ll outline themes relevant to the first two research questions. To jog the reader's memory, these two questions pertain to (a) the nature and extent of religious influence and (b) the outcomes of religious influence. Below the themes are presented by research question and country, and the reader can find these summarised below in Table 11.

Table 11. Breakdown of primary findings by country and theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Great Commission is an Institutional Policy in FBOs</td>
<td>The Great Commission is an Institutional Policy in FBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted Without Coercion</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted Without Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted Through Worldview</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted Through Worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted through Faith as a Service Modality</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted through Faith as a Service Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted through Social Support</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted through Social Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted through Programme Design</td>
<td>Religious Influence Exerted through Programme Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But before we get to the findings I want to comment on data representation. Where the reader sees three periods in sequence, e.g., "....," this indicates that I've redacted one or more words. In all cases, these redactions were made to facilitate clarity or reduce the size of the quotation and not intentionally to hide a word or obscure the meaning of a given passage. Where a dash appears, e.g., "/," this refers to an abrupt end or interruption, usually by someone else speaking, and in at least one case, that was regrettably me. Where squared brackets appear, e.g., "[ ]," usually with a word or words in it, the word or words therein are annotations, sometimes in my voice, usually to clarify something in the middle of the passage or, again, to facilitate clarity. When a word in a given passage is italicised, this indicates a natural emphasis in inflection and
not my own attempt to emphasise something unless I've indicated otherwise in parentheses at the end of the quotation. Unfortunately, this was the only way I was able to transliterate inflection and this considerably flattened the often lively and enthusiastic non-verbal dimension of my participants' speech. This absence of the non-verbal dimension is particularly obscuring for the Indian data; stereotypically perhaps, my Indian participants were far more enthusiastic and "lively" in their speech than the, again stereotypically perhaps, reserved and conservative Canadians. Finally, next to each major quotation the reader will find a code. This code refers to the unique code I've given to each participant, which reflects not only their individual identity but also the organisation with which they're associated. Below is Table 12 with the breakdown of each Canadian participant code while further below in Chapter 2 where I discuss the findings from the Indian study I present Table 13 with a breakdown of the Indian participant codes. In each table, the organisation code consists of the letter "C" for Canada or "I" for India and a number next to it, while the participant code consists of the organisation code and either the letter "S" for staff or "C" for client and a number next to it. Thus, for instance, if a participant is third of four clients in a focus group from a Canadian organisation fourth on my list, then their code would be "C4C3." The staff person, if there was only one, would be "C4S1." With all that said, let's begin with the first research question.

Table 12. Anonymised organisation and participant codes for the Canadian Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Organisation Code</th>
<th>Participant Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>S1, C1, C2, C3, C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Nature and Extent of Religious Influence in Canadian Faith-Based Organisations

Below are the six major themes which answer this question for the Canadian sample, beginning with the most obvious and immediate theme.
The Great Commission is Institutional Policy in Canadian FBOs. All data types indicate that The Great Commission is adhered to and is a meaningful injunction for the vast majority of the service organisations I spoke to in Canada. This means that staff members are both conscious and intentional about sharing faith and bringing people to Christ in service settings and this is justified and inspired by The Great Commission. For instance, from the qualitative data, one participant said

Christians are called to share their faith in Jesus with other people. We are told to do that. Jesus himself instructs us to do that in the Bible. So we are being obedient to Jesus when we do that. And as a Christian organisation, nothing is more important to us than to be obedient to our leader’s calling...there’s a section in the Gospel of Mark where he puts it this plain and this clearly – “Go into all the world and preach the good news to all of creation.” There’s no fudgifying that. There’s no “Oh he didn’t really mean that.”...there’s no getting around it. And we don’t want to get around it because we want to follow what [Jesus] tells us to do.(C3S1)

Another participant paints a similarly commanding picture:

The [Great] Commission is to share the Good News, which is a life-saving issue. You know it’s not an optional issue. Like if somebody is drowning you would want to make an effort to save them, right? So The [Great] Commission is to go out with the life-saving message of the Gospel. (C8S1)

Here is a third instance, where the participant said, “We all share a love for Jesus and you know the call for The Great Commission,” to which I asked, “What does that mean?”: "Well I would say hands and feet of Christ. Sharing the word. And living out our faith and our call to invite others to know Christ and accept him as their Lord and Saviour." (C5S1)
While there were no direct questions on the survey explicitly asking about the Great Commission, responses to the some survey questions support the qualitative data here. For instance, the item, “Staff and volunteers encourages clients to develop a relationship with Christ,” yielded a rather high mean of 4.00 out of a possible 5.00 ($M=4.00$, $SD=0.95$). About 65% of respondents, moreover, indicated that they either “often” (i.e., 4) or “always” (i.e., 5) encourage clients to develop a relationship with Christ. Another item, rather clearer, was "One purpose of the programme is to bring people to Christ." This item, too, yielded a high mean ($M=4.32$, $SD=1.02$). While the standard deviation seems to indicate slightly greater variability, this is actually misleading on account of some extreme scores; about 89% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

While the vast majority of participants seemed to understand The Great Commission in roughly the same way, with some version of Matthew 28 dominating and a sense of urgency prevalent, two participants offered somewhat different approaches to understanding what Christians were called to do vis-à-vis Christ’s post-resurrection message. In other words, both participants sought to complicate the more simple interpretation of passages like Matthew 28 or Mark 16 from which The Great Commission stems. Here is an example from just one of the somewhat more complex messages:

I don't think there is a Great Commission. Jesus didn't say, "And here is the Great Commission, to go into all the world, preach the Gospel, baptise in the name of the father, son, and holy spirit"...there is a part of sharing and revealing, but it is revealing the Good News. It's not a conquering message and I think it's been misused...it is the Good News, which Jesus taught before his death and resurrection, is [sic] the fact that you are valued; you are loved; and God sees you, right now where you are, as you are, and says
"You're worthy, so be identified for what you are and not for what society or what religion might put on you." So it's different. (C15S1)

Furthermore, in addition to these explicit statements about The Great Commission, which I sometimes probed for and sometimes didn’t, there were several instances when staff indicated their intention to share their faith with clients, a fact in keeping with the spirit of The Great Commission. In other words, while these statements are not direct expressions of a desire to fulfill a formal commandment, their place in the context of organisations adhering to The Great Commission, and in view of statements mentioned already, might leave little doubt that they, too, can be seen as further support for The Great Commission as policy in Canadian FBOs. Below are three examples taken from over two dozen.

The first is a statement by the same participant who provided the qualifying interpretation of The Great Commission just mentioned, which obviously complicates his qualification. Here the staff is referring to a client leaning toward atheism and engaging in borderline-ridicule of the organisation when she visits; discussing his and other staff's response to such unabashed atheism, my participant rhetorically asks:

Will she ever change her mind about Christianity and her faith in God? I don’t know. But do I want her to experience that? Yes. Do I want her to know why it’s still messy? Yes. Do I want her to know what actual Christianity and Jesus-following is about? Yes.

(C15S1)

The second statement about the intention to share the Gospel comes from another participant, who similarly stated that the intent of certain programmes was to *introduce* clients to what they would otherwise go without hearing:
The intent [in the programme] might just be to introduce them to this God and to Jesus and something that they may never have heard about or may have heard but have no idea what the living God is. So an intent there is maybe to just whet their appetite and to have them ask questions and we know that when they start to inquire, that journey begins, that quest begins. (C5S1)

Finally, a third instance I want to share is not from a staff but a client, the only one I had the opportunity to interview one-on-one. When I asked this client what staff intend when they serve, he responded by saying:

They would want you to be a Christian like them. And to have a born again experience. And to return from your sins. And walk down the narrow path. They would want you to no longer be a slave to drugs or alcohol or lust or whatever’s your vice…in their heart of hearts they would want everybody to be Christian. (C8S5)

Again, the quantitative data support the qualitative data. A few items were, more or less, indirect such as these statements. For example, the item "Staff and volunteers share their faith with clients" yielded a relatively high mean and low variability ($M=3.95$, $SD=0.64$). About 77% of respondents indicated either a 4 or 5, meaning often or always staff shared their faith. Another item asked staff to respond to a statement, "We inspire clients' faith through staff's actions." This yielded a very high mean and low variability ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.50$). Here all respondents said they agree or strongly agree with the statement. Another item was a little more direct and asked if "Staff encourage client's religious conversion." This item yielded a slightly lower mean and higher variability, demonstrating a more tepid response to this question ($M=3.41$, $SD=0.83$).
Thus, to summarise, The Great Commission seems to be an institutional policy in the organisations I sampled, as was the less formal but still-present intention to exert some form of religious influence on clients. This brings us to the second theme.

**Religious Influence is Sought Without Coercion.** In other words, while The Great Commission is a prominent and salient aspect of the Canadian FBOs I spoke with, all staff and most clients I spoke to were adamant that sharing the Gospel also meant no coercion. This was one of the most salient or common themes in the data with just under 60 coded references. It suggests a strong push or desire on the part of Canadian FBOs to avoid the pitfalls of what one staff participant referred to as “violent evangelism,” the sing-for-your-supper, turn-or-burn evangelism which forms the stereotype of the 19th and early-20th century evangelist.

Accordingly, from the survey the following question yielded a relatively low mean: “Programmes require religious conversion” (M = 2.00, SD = 1.28). And as for singing for one's supper goes, the item "Clients can receive service that is not faith-based" received a relatively high mean and low variability, indicating widespread agreement clients can get service without having to participate in faith-based activities (M=4.09, SD=0.79).

Furthermore, from the qualitative data, here is a statement by one client at an organisation that is a clear and direct proponent of The Great Commission; the client, himself an atheist leaning toward “science,” affirmed the perspective of yet another client of a similar persuasion, when he said:

I know what you mean when I first came I thought well I’m gonna [obtain service] and the zealots are gonna try and convert me sorta thing eh. But it’s not like that at all. It’s not like that at all. The meaning is good. And even if I don’t believe I walk away feeling happier. (C7C1)
Here is a similar sentiment by a female client who had a somewhat checkered history with faith and God but who came to the same organisation but different programme as the man just mentioned above. Pleased with the level of spiritual freedom she felt she was given in the programme because she could make equivocal statements about God and religion, she said:

I'm able to say that! Say "You know, right now I don't think I trust God very much." and not feel like they not gonna come down on me like [slaps hand] "You suppose to trust God! You're just supposed to!" Like I'm not forced to put on a thing like "Well fine I trust God because you say I should." Like I'm able to be honest and say “Well today I just don't feel like I wanna talk to God today" Or, you know? I could be honest and I don't feel like I'm being judged or somebody's gonna say "You're gonna go straight to hell if you don't!" It like...I find that very comforting knowing that I could be...real about how I'm feelin'. (C7C8)

Still, despite the overwhelming support for this softer, modern evangelism, there’s yet some evidence which suggests that the old world evangelism isn’t quite eliminated and this may be somewhat of a struggle for more progressive staff members. This qualification is borne out by the fact that to the second item mentioned above ("Clients can receive service that is not faith-based"), 27% of respondents still said "Sometime," meaning in some cases clients cannot receive service without being exposed to some form of faith. To the first item mentioned above (“Programmes require religious conversion”) 23% of respondents “agreed” with the statement, meaning almost a quarter of respondents to the survey believe or observe that conversion is required in their service programmes. All of this suggests either (a) some programmatic differences within FBOs or (b) some individual differences in staff perceptions about how evangelism should be pursued via social service.
The latter explanation, i.e., that individual staff differ in their opinion on the necessity of conversion and whether service should be conditional, is perhaps the most meaningful way of summarising this qualification. That's because I got the explanation from a participant with decades of experience in the evangelical FBOs, who admitted that within the evangelical community there are enduring conflicts about how to proceed with evangelism. These conflicts, he said, get played out in FBOs. I received a similar message from the sole key informant in my Canadian sample, as well. And another staff participant openly stated that his goal within his organisation was to move it away from the old world evangelism deeply entrenched in the organisation’s DNA and strongly supported by former staff. He, too, referred to having to manage certain staff. At least one client comment (the interviewee quoted above, C8S5, p. 155) also suggested differences among staff with respect to the manner in which faith is conveyed to clients and/or paired with service. And my own observations seem to corroborate this qualification.

All of the above leads me to conclude tentatively that while many Canadian FBOs are quite admirable in their intention not to coerce their clients and tend to be largely successful in this regard, there’s still a historical inertia. The presence of this inertia suggests that, to quote a staff-participant, many evangelical FBOs still “have a hard time figuring out… the application of faith and the non-abuse of power” (C14S1).

So The Great Commission is operating policy in Canadian FBOs and the old world evangelism, that “violent evangelism,” is diminishing. But then how is faith shared? My data suggest there are at least four primary ways religious influence is exerted through service; these can be considered what that same participant, in contrast to violent evangelism, called “non-
violence evangelism” (C14S1). Not all organisations utilise all four but all four are present across my sample with enough sufficiency to warrant comment.

**Religious Influence is Exerted Through Worldview.** The first mode I’ll discuss is that religious influence is exerted through worldview, which refers to the tendency among Canadian FBOs to instil in their clients values, morals, principles, and the like from a Biblical or Christian source – i.e., the impartation of their Christian worldview, to varying degrees of systematisation.

Both major data types support this theme. From the quantitative data, the item “Staff and volunteers encourage clients to think about their problems from a faith-based perspective,” yielded a high mean ($M=4.14, SD=0.76$). Moreover, the standard deviation indicates the low variability in responses: about 77% of respondents said they “often” or “always” do this and nobody said they “never” (i.e., 1) or “seldom” (i.e., 2) do. Moreover, a set of three questions probing about whether “Staff and volunteers help clients deal with undesirable” thoughts, behaviours, or emotions “from a faith-based perspective” also yielded high means: thoughts ($M=4.18, SD=0.65$); emotions ($M=4.27, SD=0.69$); behaviour ($M=4.36, SD=0.64$). And again as the reader can tell from the standard deviations the variability is also relatively low: 86% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement on thoughts, 86% also with the statement on feelings, while 91% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement about behaviours. Thus, to the extent one’s behaviour, thoughts, and emotions are constitutive of worldview, these are being nudged in the direction of the Christian worldview by staff at the FBOs I sampled.

The qualitative data bear out this theme, too, but with slightly less nuance as seemingly only thoughts and behaviours emerge as constituent elements of one’s worldview. This included examples of “character education” or "Biblical teaching" (C17S1), teaching “Christian morals or
values (C9S1),” trying to acquire or teach “Biblical life skills (C7S2),” “renewing your mind” with the Bible (C2S1), or just the presentation of a “Christian worldview” (C7S2).

A salient example of this theme comes from a moment of intersubjectivity between myself and a staff member, when I proposed a phrase for what she was describing to me. This moment came within a larger discussion and followed this hypothetical case:

Say someone is a peasant or a slave and he’s living in a little shack. And different ways that you think, different perspectives, different things that you would do. You take that same person and you say, “You know what? You’re the lost son of the king. And you’re gonna move [laughs] into the palace. He would have to create palace thinking. He would have to create royal thinking. He would have to learn that he has authority in the kingdom. His world would get bigger. (C1S1)

I then asked “Is it fair, then, to say that you are fostering kingdom thinking in your clients?” to which she responded emphatically: “That’s a really! I’m gonna write that one down! [Laughs] Yes I am! [Proceeds to write the phrase down] ‘fost-ering-king-dom-thinking’ I like that. A lot. I am. Absolutely.” Kingdom here, of course, refers to the Kingdom of God and what many Christians see as the eventual outcome of their activities in evangelising the world.

This example is admittedly a salient one that summarises to some extent what many others seemed to describe, but the reader should resist the temptation, as I have, to project this phrase (“kingdom thinking”) onto the whole of my sample. Still, a number of other participants described “Kingdom” in some fashion and this term isn’t uncommon among evangelicals; in fact, to say otherwise would be almost impossible to defend. My participants, if they didn’t use the term, nonetheless frequently indicated their desire to foster or facilitate a Christian worldview through changing thoughts or behaviours of clients.
One more salient example of worldview shift is the re-casting of social problems in a Biblical way. “Sin” (e.g., C7S1) and “lostness (e.g., C8S1)” were terms that were used, but it seemed that the most popular construction of social problems was as a type of “brokenness” (e.g., C2S1, C5S1, C7S1). This, to me, seems to be one way to foster a Christian worldview, i.e., to nudge clients into viewing their problems as “brokenness” (or sin or lostness, etc.) and not in another, perhaps less-Biblical or less-spiritual, way (e.g., justice or injustice). Moreover, these words are not just words but semantic chains anchored deep in the Bible or evangelical oral tradition. Here is a good summary quote of what may constitute brokenness:

They have a desire for [a good life]. And as well they’re often in homes of brokenness. Not always [but] we’ve got a lot of single moms; homes where they’re on social assistance, so you know, severe poverty, living on social assistance…there are times where there’s physical abuse, sexual abuse, there’s drug abuse, and it’s not directed directly at the child, it’s from the…it’s often not the parents, but it may be the mother, but there’s either a baby-daddy or some man that just dips in and out to wreak terror on the household. So there’s a lot of brokenness like that in the families and communities that we serve…[and] criminal activity as well. (C5S1)

To conclude this theme, then, it should be noted that in all 21 instances I coded, the desire, if expressed, seemed always to help the client with spiritual means; sometimes this was not expressed but implicit, which brings us to the next theme.

**Religious Influence is Exerted Through Faith as a Service Modality.** This second theme of "non-violent evangelism" refers to the tendency among staff in Canadian FBOs to rely on faith-related activities as a modality for addressing social service problems. Admittedly there is some overlap here with the previous theme. For instance, fostering “kingdom thinking” could
be a modality in one light. But here I include primarily activities or actions, something that staff or volunteers might do, or encourage the clients to do, beyond simply viewing a problem a certain way or not. Of course, again there is some overlap here as well, because what a person does can be, and usually is at some level, influenced by worldview.

The most obvious manifestation of faith as a service is, quite simply, faith itself. In six coded instances, staff spoke about how faith itself addressed a given social problem faced by their clients. This includes the "healer" mentioned above and another participant who stated that

We as believers, we share how we get through our stuff and a lot of that. We are a faith based organisation. We are Christians. But we are Christians by choice. We have an individual relationship with Christ, if I can put it that way, and we share what happens on a personal level in our own lives...I think much of the time [clients] find [faith] very comforting in terms of what they're doing.(C8S2)

While this passage is not as specific, from other instances one observes that what faith addresses can include suicide, which one staff said they witnessed combated through faith, as well mental health, and, as we will see below, several other problems.

But by far the most common manifestation of faith as a service modality was prayer. From the survey, two questions about prayer yielded identically high means and nearly identically low variability: "Staff pray with individual clients" ($M=3.82, SD=0.72$) and "Staff pray with groups of clients" ($M=3.82, SD=0.78$). While these don't directly support prayer as service, a total of 20 coded instances from client and staff seems to clarify. This included both client- and staff-initiated prayer, as well as a few instances where prayer was done with or solely by volunteers. Here is an example of when staff and volunteers prayed in response to client distress at a food bank:
A lot of people have actually broken down here...Wednesdays is our prayer meetings...so like some of the prayer groups are here...and when they...[break down] we'll just pray for them...we're not here to sell you "Hey, come on Sunday." [R: Do you pray for them while they're there you mean]. Yeah! And obviously with their permission. I don't think we've ever had someone say no, but even when they say no, we say "OK. That's OK. But we're praying for you anyway." (C2S1)

Another organisation had a programme that similarly utilised congregants and their desire to help those in need through prayer. Here is a staff member of the programme elucidating the process.

The reader might note the way prayer is, in fact, seen as a solution to social problems:

We definitely pray. Um, we'll pray from the front [i.e., during programme]...and then we also have a team of women just from our church who are willing to pray for the needs of the moms behind the scenes. So they don't attend [the programme], but they're our prayer support group. But we tell our moms about them and they can write out prayer requests and either sign them or leave them anonymous...every week I also write like a prayer letter, sort of a what, sometimes moms don't write them but we sort of know about things and say "This woman needs new housing," "This woman needs, you know, struggling, going to court dates, so pray for this," or CAS visits, that kind of thing. So then our team is behind the scenes praying for those things. And the moms know they are.(C7S2)

When I asked this participant how this arrangement made the clients feel, she said that "Yeah, I mean, they're always puttin' stuff in! [laughs]," and went on to note that she found "even women who aren't believers are quite happy to have somebody pray for them."

A client from the same programme provided a corroborating comment, noting also that the prayer basket or "prayer team" had strengthened her faith. Note, however, that she is
unspecific about what service need was being met here, so a conservative interpretation is perhaps best:

The prayer component. They have a basket where you can put in prayer requests. And every time I put in a prayer request. It might not have been answered the way that I thought it should or I wanted it to, but it's always been clearer than clear that they were praying and God came through, in one way or another, He's come through and answered those. And so that definitely strengthened my faith. Because you know when days are dark, it's hard to be strong in your faith, it's hard to believe that He has you when you feel like you're just falling. And so seeing, being able to see those prayers being answered has solidified my faith. (C7C7)

The willingness of the clients to seek prayer was definitely a salient feature of the comments on prayer overall. "People normally, rarely, would say no to [pause] um, prayer" (C4S1). I asked if he offered to pray for them to which he said "Yeah. And sometimes people just ask for prayer. People walk in off the street and ask for prayer in this location." Interestingly while I was interviewing this staff member someone did literally just walk into the FBO seeking help. The staff person interrupted our interview to provide information to the man; no prayer was given.

Here is another comment, this one from a staff member who works for a programme focused on children and youth, underlining a common problem faced by youth and its solution in prayer:

Sometimes the leaders will prompt them to pray together or they'll even ask like "Can you pray for me?" [R: The youth ask?] The children actually [R: The children?] Yeah. [R: What is that like?] It's good. There's so much peace in that. And I'm really thankful
that that happens too. It doesn't happen all the time, like it doesn't. But when it does it's like "Yes this is good." Because we encourage them, we pray for our enemies, and pray for like the troubles, and pray for the person who has hurt us, so, we don't promote revenge. We don't promote hate, right?...like one time this girl was being bullied and I asked her if she wanted to pray. She's like "Yes I wanna pray" And then yeah, she just prayed and then maybe I'll join in, too. (C5S2)

Here is one final comment which illustrates how the use of prayer for social problems is ultimately taken up by clients, not staff, after some time at this organisation:

Obviously there's the physical needs that people have as far as food, but a lot of them have a lot of emotional burdens they carry. Tremendous burdens. Too big for anyone person. Too big for anyone group. And so, we offer a time of prayer for people. And what's neat is how it used to be just the leader would pray for the prayer request and now they're praying for one another...and they've taken over this aspect as a priestly role where you carry the burdens of others and you offer them to God to take. So that's happened over time as they've seen it modelled. And as they've seen that prayer makes a difference not only in the circumstance but in them. (06S1)

To conclude, this second mode of non-violent evangelism was the use of faith as a service modality, which included a handful of methods but predominantly prayer. Prayer addressed a number of issues, listed above. But one issue it didn't seem to address which the FBOs worked to redress themselves constitutes the third method of non-violent evangelism.

**Religious Influence is Exerted Through Social Support.** The general thrust of this third finding is that many if not most of the clients who visit these FBOs have low levels of social capital and social support, which are correlates and arguably causes of poverty. Unable to get
this readily elsewhere, FBOs attempt to fill the void and use it as an opportunity to share the Gospel and thus exert religious influence.

There are two major sub-themes here and they again overlap a bit but the distinction is important to make. The first one refers to the intentional community which FBOs generate in order to address client needs and draw people to them, recognising that “there’s loneliness and a need for friendship.” I’m using the word “community” here broadly to refer not only to the material aspects of community – a place to go, people to speak to, something to do, and so on – but also the “sense” of community discussed frequently in social sciences literature.

Accordingly, one participant, for instance, stated that their inspiration to build community was because “Christ was all about community” and thus it behoved the staff at the FBO to follow suit (C4S1). Another stated that they ran a needs assessment in the community before determining how to serve and attract clients:

When we did a survey and we asked them to prioritise what they like best, the number one thing wasn’t the food. The number one thing was the relationships. So then we decided, “Okay, so let’s make that the emphasis.” Because sometimes you’re panicking about being able to get enough food. They have access to the food banks. They can get by, but what they’re having a harder time finding is people who listen and care. And food banks don’t have time for that, right? So it objectifies people, as “the recipients.” This [programme on the other hand] humanises people.” (C6S1)

That last comment about objectification vs. humanisation of clients I will pick up on below. For now here is another quote with both religious and secular tones, the former of which the reader might notice refers clearly to religious influence; notice also the “no coercion” theme again:
I’m trying to cultivate the sense of community. We want people basically to know that they’re wanted, they’re needed, and they’re loved. Mother Theresa said ‘Loneliness was the worst disease” and she worked with people with leprosy. Loneliness was the worst disease. So community is key. And to help people appreciate that Christ is in this. Like we do a programme for women in the neighbourhood. It’s so low-key. I mean if anybody ever said ‘Boy those people pushed me around regarding faith’ No. It doesn’t happen.

(C4S1)

Yet another stated that:

The overall vision is to see a full community. So no more emptiness. No more brokenness…it's not just about food. We wanna go beyond that. Of course we want people to come to church and learn about Jesus. Yeah. Of Course. But we don't wanna make that like "Hey we just want you to know Jesus." No. We want to have a relationship with you and so with your emptiness, brokenness. Doesn't matter who you are, we want to let you know that we're gonna be here for you and so what we mean by that is kinda like "Hey, there's a place for you here. There's definitely a place." That's actually our slogan [smiles]. (C2S1)

Central to having a “place,” to these “communities,” and to their effectiveness in addressing the “disease” of loneliness, are relationships as the first participant quoted above mentioned and several others in the dataset do as well. “Relationships are central,” said one participant (C17S2); another said she comes for the “faith and the relationships (C7C7);” yet another said “relationships are everything” (C8S2). The theme of relationships emerges innumerable times in the data, but more often than not mention of a relationship either implicitly or explicitly occurs within the context of what some call “relational evangelism.” (e.g., C10S1)
Relational evangelism refers to the establishment of a personal relationship with a client so that one might have a platform to share the Gospel, i.e., so that “I can cash in my relational chips” with a client (C14S1). This is the second subtheme of religious influence through social support.

Here is a more explicit example which mentions the term but also contextualises it in the broader goal of evangelising clients:

We’re not strong on verbal proclamation because that doesn’t work [with our clients]. It’s relational evangelism. It’s not street evangelism or “in-your-face” evangelism. [laughs]. And I’m much more comfortable with that approach as [the organisation is], because, you know, Christ was relational and he built friendships. I think that’s what we’re built for. That’s what we’re crying out for. That’s what the [clients] need. Right now they’re stuck [in their world] and it’s very tough to get them out for programmes, but they’ll come for relationships, so we have to really work hard at cultivating that. (C17S1)

Here is another explicit example but one that takes a slightly different approach by explicating why relational evangelism might be a more socially acceptable method, which the previous participant only alludes to when they mentioned that it “doesn’t work” with their clients:

I don’t believe aggression wins anything. [R: “What does win something?”]. Respect. Honour. The right to be heard. *Relationship*. I would say I subscribe to relational evangelism. And so earning the right to be heard – building the relationship. So, I don’t know you. We’ve never met before. We’ve had one conversation on the telephone previous to your arrival today. In order for me to begin to talk to you on matters of faith...I need to know [you]. We need to have coffee. We need to spend time together to

---

This participant used this phrase to refer to another outcome, not evangelism, but the quote is illustrative of the general sentiment behind relational evangelism.
get to know each other before we go into *that* depth of conversation in terms of where you are with Christ and where I am with Christ. (C10S1)

Many more examples, while they do not consist of the term “relational evangelism,” certainly refer to the essence of it, i.e., establishing personal relationships as a platform to share the Gospel. One staff member said that:

We use programmes as a means to build a relationship….so [names multiple programmes]. It allows us to be in relationship. It is sharing God’s love. Sharing God’s word in inviting them to have a relationship with God…trust is a key part in building that relationship [with clients]…Like [names one specific programme]. It’s a [kind of] club. But again, what it is, [the service] is a means by which we build that relationship and the focus is on, um, it really is about mentorship, discipleship…[which means] walking with someone as they grow spiritually. And walking with someone in their spiritual journey. Building a greater knowledge and understanding of their faith, and Jesus, and what it means to have that relationship [with Christ]. (C5S1)

Here is another example which situates relational evangelism in the context of the social isolation and lack of support that many clients might experience:

[The Bible] is *so* relevant in today’s community and culture that yearns for love and acceptance. And that is *exactly* what the Bible teaches. So the principles of Jesus is what we kinda go for. I myself always lead with the intention to show you the love of Christ, but I’m not gonna throw Jesus at you right off the bat. Maybe eventually. We’ll see. But I really am there for you. (C2S1)

Note the somewhat contradictory message about both trying to “lead” with Christ but not “throwing” Jesus at someone right away. Also note how implicit the relationship is here,
positioned as it is on either side of the evangelism; that is, at the beginning the participant notes the “yearning” for “love and acceptance” and then after an exposition on evangelism, the participant ends with a statement of assurance – “But I really am there for you.”

Three questions from the survey serve to further texture the picture of evangelism and social support. One statement was “Staff help clients join congregations,” to which a moderate mean and low variability are observed ($M=3.18, SD=0.72$). The most popular response here was 3 or “Sometimes.” Perhaps tepid responses here indicate that the “community” being created is either at the FBO or within programme, and not in a congregation, as such, i.e., community is formed in a nontraditional way and not within a traditional church structure.

This interpretation is supported by responses to a second statement, “Staff and volunteers work to bring clients they serve into a faith community,” which avoids the word "congregation" and yielded a comparatively higher mean ($M=3.91, SD=1.00$). Moreover, about 73% of respondents said they “often” or “always” sought to do so. Thus, there might be a distinction here between “congregation” and “faith community,” where the former implies a more or less formal membership while the latter is consistent with the qualitative data’s multiple references to “community” as something informal. But there’s some suggestion that the people who join the “faith community,” some of whom have been given voice above, are also only a small portion of the overall clientele, as the statement “People who visit this organisation join the faith community” yielded a lower mean than the previous two questions ($M=3.09, SD=0.85$).

Overall, whether it be through the creation of community or the formation of personal relationships, FBOs in this sample seem to generate a successful umbrella of social support under which clients fleeing isolation and loneliness can seek shelter. While under the umbrella, staff seek out the right time and place to share the Gospel. Bear in mind that however intentional
it might be, social support is nonetheless an incidental feature of social service; that is, each of the organisations generated “community” in the context of service, such that service permits the formation of social support, which in turn permits the sharing of the Gospel. Next, I will discuss the final manner in which religious influence is exerted, which highlights the very importance of that service itself.

Religious Influence is Exerted Through Programme Design. To begin with this last theme, note that what's implicit in each of the instances mentioned above are the programmes that clients come to at the FBO. Thus, this finding highlights the manner in which staff at the FBOs intentionally develop these programmes in such a way as to foster or facilitate situations where some form of religious influence is made possible, or even unavoidable.

There are two subthemes here, each of which can be thought of, more or less, as a “principle” for designing a programme. The first principle is that of holism, which refers to the necessary combination of service and evangelism. Undergirding this principle is, therefore, the belief that without a spiritual element present, service provision is incomplete or partial; in order to be complete and in line with best practice one must include a spiritual dimension to practice. The second principle is that of discipleship, which refers to the process whereby one follower of Jesus will mentor some non-followers, so that they too might become followers and eventually mentor others to become followers, and so on. My own observation, though not systematic since it’s not part of the present research, is that these two principles are not mutually exclusive, i.e., programmes can and often are designed with holism and discipleship in mind.

However, holism seems more ubiquitous. This might be because the sophistication of programme design seems to be related to the size and sophistication of the organisation, such that while smaller FBOs tend to exert religious influence through programmes, this influence is
hardly “designed” into the programme anymore than a conversation with a peer is scripted. The principle of holism, thus, lends itself to these more incipient programmes, because all one needs is a service to provide and a desire to share faith. Discipleship, on the other hand, seems to require more formalisation, which is made more likely with the size of a larger organisation. I start with holism.

The examples of holism in programmes vary in many ways, but the essence itself is preserved in each; each example is of a programme where some form of service is delivered but with evangelism as an accompanying element instead of something separate. I coded for 46 instances where some form of this holistic integration was mentioned as a constituent element of programme design. Some programmes consisted of almost two distinct sections – one for service and the other for faith, and holism was achieved by combining these two elements. Consider, for instance, how one participant described an after school programme for youth, the majority of which was secular service but with an added component of faith at the end:

We do share Bible story [sic], everyday, for 15 minutes…So our programme it’s like snack time, options time for an hour. We play games together. Mostly it’s been dodge ball. And then depending on the day, sometimes we’ll have dinner altogether, sometimes we’ll have a cooking activity. Yeah, but everyday we’ll have Bible lesson. That’s where [staff] get to share and invite the [youth] to ask questions and they ask a lot of questions and it’s been really encouraging to see and hear the questions that they ask…[this happens] at the end of the programme and throughout we try to model Christ. (C5S2)

That last sentence highlights a common manifestation of holism where the integration of evangelism and social service is not like having two separate components combined but rather like one component with both faith and service elements integrated at a higher and thus less
noticeable level. Commenting on the way faith and evangelism affected clients, one participant said:

It’s not limited necessarily to any one situation. Anything can spark it really. Sometimes for people they just watch the way we interact with one another, not even talking to anybody else. How do we get along. Right? At other times, it’s being offered the cold cup of water. It’s just different. There’s not one thing that you can sorta say “OK, come over here now for faith time. We wanna build your faith” right? No. It’s not like that. It’s everything. (C8S2)

Another commented on this type of seamless integration of faith and service by saying that "The programmes aren’t specifically faith-based. They just happen to happen here and it’s a mix of people that go to it, go to them"(011S1). I then sought confirmation by asking "So the faith is not really that integrated here?" To this the participant surprised me and said "I think it’s so fully integrated that you don’t see it as something that leaps out and hits you…I think that’s what incarnational ministry is like. I think we live it and breathe it and so it’s just part of who we are and what we do" (C11S1).

Of course, these two manifestations of holism aren’t mutually exclusive. It seemed several FBOs had programmes of either ilk and/or programmes with both components. Here’s one participant who said that: “for us everything is faith-based, but I can answer your question best by telling you that we do provide Bible studies and worship services for those who want them and who are comfortable receiving them.” (C8S2). One client provided this very interesting characterisation:

I understand what you’re trying to pull out but I think the beauty of this programme is that they understand it’s a puzzle and you need all the pieces, you know? If anything I
would say faith is like the cardboard that we’re putting the puzzle pieces on, so it’s touching everything else that they do and it is very difficult to pull apart. (C7C8)

As mentioned above, underlying these holistic programmes is a belief that service alone is incomplete or partial. Several participants expressed this point as a justification for holism. For instance, one client who served as a “leader” in a low-income neighbourhood – i.e., somebody with social influence the FBO can leverage to interact with neighbourhood residents – stated that they helped run programmes with the FBO all the time. These are holistic programmes where often “we feed them [and then] feed them spiritually” (C7C4). Another participant from another focus group echoed the sentiment that “it’s not just about the food” (C4C1). Here is a slightly different example of the way staff tend to characterise this justification of holism:

When you think about poverty, you look at poverty in the sense of there’s the materialistic [sic] of poverty and then there’s the soul. Your soul’s in poverty in a sense, right? That soul poverty. And so yes there’s the materialistic and the resources that the family needs to survive, but also there’s the soul piece for them which could be lost. I’m not saying everyone is [lost] but there could be that place where Jesus comes and gives hope in these broken situations, you know. He comes and gives life to these situations that people face, you know. (C9S1)

Contrasting “material poverty” to something spiritual, this participant also referred to “ultimate poverty” which he believed was the Biblical original sin; thus his organisation was involved in addressing both “ultimate” and “material” poverty, according to him. At least three other staff members from as many organisations used this kind of imagery to justify holism (C1S1, C8S1, C17S1), and I’m sure a re-analysis of the data would yield more.
Some comments from participants did suggest that the intent behind holism was Biblical, while others hinted, albeit perhaps unconsciously, that a holistic method was just more practical. Here is one such instance of both:

Evangelism and social service go together because if you just do one…it’s like you’re starting from the world, and you’re going up, and you’re not going to connect spiritually with a person. You’re just meeting their physical needs. On the other aspect, if you only go with evangelism. If you only try to meet their spiritual needs, you’re also not going to make a real connection. So the way to do it properly is to do both social action and evangelism and make the connection and you can’t have one without the other, in Christian ministry anyway. (C8S1)

One of the enduring tensions in the literature on FBOs is the fear and anxiety FBOs, particularly evangelical or devout ones, face about losing that “faith” while providing social service. A number of codes suggest that this fear is both present, but also that there’s an effort, at least mentally, to make evangelism a priority over service. One participant stated that they took a “balanced approach [i.e., holistic]” but that ultimately “connecting with God was the main focus” (C17S1). Another stated that their programme staff modelled good behaviour but that the youth needed to know that “being good without Jesus doesn’t get you to heaven.” (C5S2). Another yet stated that the "main purpose" of the programme was “sharing the Gospel” (C5S2). Here are two more examples of the same. The first is a more forthright expression of what has been called “holism with priority” in the literature (Stott & Wright, 2012, p. 81):

This is what I tell our ministry workers all the time. ‘We are not social workers. We are not a social agency. As soon as we drop the Gospel and our message, then we’re just like everybody else. And we’re not. We are the church.’ So, um, there are times when we’ve
been pressured in a sense to receive funding through agencies, like uh, what’s that one, the big one in [the city], but they say ‘You can’t preach Christ. You can’t proselytise.’

We’ve said no. I mean even [funder 1], we were gonna get some money from them, [funder 2], and so on. We’ve said no. The grants that we’ve gotten have been specifically that allows us to preach the Gospel, because without this, why bother?” (C7S1)

To be fair to this participant, I think they would likely have been more careful with their words than “because without this, why bother?” which amounts to saying that service is only as good as it can help fulfill The Great Commission. While this organization is a strong supporter of The Great Commission, perhaps a more realistic interpretation of this statement is that while both service and evangelism are important, the latter takes priority in the hearts and minds of staff and thus animates them to take up service; moreover, any interpretation would also note the context, i.e., that funders do often indirectly influence FBOs by forbidding evangelism and this can be disheartening to some FBOs.

Here is the second example in a rather lengthy passage which demonstrates not only “holism with priority,” but also the essence of holism by way of a seamless integration of faith and service; in essence, this one passage encapsulates and thus concludes this entire sub-theme of holism, including holism with priority:

So the faith-based component for us is that it is our foundation and our root. It’s the foundation of what we do. So we are a service, but most important is that we are a ministry. And we don’t put the service before the ministry….I think what that means to us is that you can get caught up or impressed with the million pounds of food we collect every year. You can be impressed with our efficiency because we are really efficient. You can be impressed with how many people we serve because we’ve got really high
stats. And I don’t want to be impressed by that where I forget about the people. And what I have often said is, is if we don’t watch our hearts, we can be a kind and efficient food distribution system...[Instead] you can look past the situation to see the person, and to see that person as a trinity, right? So you’re seeing the person as a trinity because they’re a body, a soul, and a spirit. So you can minister to the body, which is the food; you can minister to the soul, which is your emotions and your mind, but you have to also minister to the spirit...[which is basically] your spiritual being...to tell you the truth they’re one and separate at the same time. OK! Here’s a good example. If someone had a physical condition, right...And so if I say to them “You have an injury in your knee, I’d really like to pray for it in the name of Jesus. So if you have a fruity tooty spirituality, that’s fine, I’ll leave you with that, but I’m gonna pray for you specifically in the name of Jesus. That’s the only way I pray. So I’m not calling on the powers of the "universe," I’m actually calling on the powers of a personal and real God who loves you” Right? OK, so I’m ministering to them physically [by praying]. Now say for example, that person, the reason they’re having this problem is because they were in a car accident and somebody hit them. And you pray for them and nothing really happens and you can say OK, so one of the things I would ask is “How do you feel about the person that hit you? Are you still embroiled in bitterness because that’s gonna be a barrier [to healing]” So now we’re dealing with the spiritual aspects behind the physical injury. And so you pray for them. You talk to them about forgiveness. You release that person unto God and you just let it go. Cuz forgiveness is really just letting it go and sometimes it can just walk people through letting physically go. And so you talk through that, you talk through the emotions, pray for their leg, their leg is healed, and you say “Hey, and guess what!!
You’re food is ready” [laughs]. That would be a good example of body, soul, and spirit. (C1S1)

I should note that this staff member does claim to heal people with physical ailments with a success rate of 95% if done at the FBO, and about 65% if done elsewhere.

The second programmatic principle in use is discipleship, which as I stated above refers to a more formalized and systematic (and Biblical) way that followers of Jesus (i.e., staff) can mold and shape non-followers (i.e., clients) to become followers; those new followers would then in turn create more followers themselves, and so on, ad infinitum. While there is certainly overlap between evangelism and discipleship – i.e., discipleship can be seen as a form or consequence of evangelism – evangelism itself can, and often does seem, to be simply about sharing faith without a programmatic element facilitating an outcome. Discipleship, on the other hand, seems more about an outcome. This distinction is further borne out by the way participants seem to talk about each: numerous participants indicated to me that when they evangelized, i.e., when they shared their faith or invited others to accept Jesus, they believed the outcome was ultimately up to God or the Holy Spirit. In contrast, while not devoid of spiritual influence from God or the Holy Spirit (indeed nothing is to many of my participants), discipleship is a process with a definite outcome – a follower of Jesus.

While multiple programmes had elements of discipleship, including one working with socially integrated adults and another with mothers, my data suggests that this principle might be more common in programmes for children and youth and thus less common than holism overall. This might be a function of circumstance, because to disciple someone – to mentor them – is easier when there is an age gap. Overall, while all 17 organisations had programmes with the principle of holism as a central programmatic feature, I counted six where the principle of
discipleship was clear, notwithstanding the other 11 organisations where some form of discipleship I might have either missed or is less obvious.

I will present to the reader three systematic expressions of this principle. To start, here is a staff participant describing a programme where staff work with children from a low-income, inner-city neighbourhood from as early as age 5 and “mentor” or “disciple” them in both spiritual and non-spiritual ways until they are as old as 25:

I think the first step is introducing them to Jesus and the life of Jesus and what he came on Earth to do. And so it's speaking to our children from the age of 5. So we start working with kids from the age of 5. And you're just telling them the basics of who Jesus is - The Gospel, the good news, what did Jesus come on Earth to do. And to deal with our ultimate poverty which is, eh, um, which is sin. Um, you know we are separated from God and so, um, and so we have this thing that we're born with. And so it's telling them that Jesus has come to rescue you from this, from this, right? And so, and to give you life, um. And so we start at age 5, the sharing of who Jesus is and what he came to do and the good news of the Gospel, that says "Hey, we were once lost but now Jesus come to save us and to redeem us and to bring us to a right relationship with God. So that's the first step, you know, starting at age 5 and um, you just teach them along the way. So when they get to. I mean we're with them from age 5 to 25, so basically we journey with the family for 20 years, um with one child, and um, through that time, they're learning about Jesus, they're learning about who he is, his character, his values, his teachings. Um and you're displaying that, you're actually demonstrating that before them, you know. You know whether it's just journeying with them through the struggles they go through. And how would Jesus handle this struggle. How would Jesus handle some of the hard things
you go through in life, you know. The struggles. The social justice issues you may face in your community. And how Jesus responds to that, you know? And so it's really teaching them those things. Who Jesus is, what he came to do, and how did he live his life. And you're modelling that for them as well, as you lead them from age 5 to 25. (C9S1)

What the above long passage doesn’t tell you is that the programme isn’t as *ad hoc* as it might sound. There are clear benchmarks or phases through which the children and youth are supposed to go, and each phase has both a service element children and youth desire or require in order to live otherwise wholesome lives. Unfortunately, in order to respect the promise of anonymity and confidentiality I cannot reproduce the document and its elements to convey these next points, so I will describe it. The document sent to me by the staff participant indicates three major stages throughout a child's life, ranging from 5 to 25 years of age. Each stage is divided into domains that the FBO focuses its attention, including what the main focus is during that stage, how that focus is achieved, and what the major outcomes are for that stage. While much of the language is rather secular, there is a spiritual outcome at each phase, ranging from awareness and knowledge, to growth and maturity, and finally to a connection with a church.

Another programme similarly formalised and systematised its youth programmes in an effort to make more successful their discipleship methods. Again, I was given a document with a plan which outlines the organisation’s efforts to this end. Overall, the document outlines a plan to mentor youth so that they might develop a relationship with Jesus and integrate into their community. It contains a mission and vision statement, both of which state the aim of creating followers of Jesus. The overall plan is then elucidated with methods and objectives, centred around the aim of discipleship. Throughout the document multiple mentions are made of the importance of mentoring youth through a long-term relationship with programme staff that
could, as the example above indicated, span years or even decades. These youth, when adults, then integrate into the community, better equipped not only as individuals who must deal with modern problems, but also now as Christian leaders in an increasingly secular society, which systematically excludes the saving grace of Christ from environments youth frequent while also creating a culture of alienation.

The last example I want to share is somewhat similar to the previous ones, inasmuch as it pertains to youth and the systematised discipleship model. However, it stands out because it is by far the most systematised example, including all of the above features, such as service elements designed for each age group, phases or benchmarks, staff willing to work with youth through years or decades, but it also contains a kind of progress model with actual metrics that staff will ultimately measure. I should note that the staff member (C16S1) I spoke to does not consider this model to be one of discipleship (I asked him), so his interpretation or characterisation of this model would be different than my own. I maintain, however, that whatever the word used, the central feature of note, i.e., trying to embed within a programme a systematic process to generate followers of Christ, is clearly evident.

As with the previous examples, I cannot show or present the document on which I rely for this information so I must instead describe it. I should mention that from its inception, the model was developed in an inductive fashion by speaking to "leaders" as well as consulting the Bible on what “transforming” a life in a “holistic” fashion entailed. The subsequent model developed contains five metrics, all of which are Biblically based, but only one of which is obviously so. Each metric contains further sub-components which give the metric some texture. Based on my reading of these sub-components, the four metrics that are less obviously Biblical would, for the most part, pass any secular "test," though there may be a couple of exceptions to
be made, including a clear one where one subcomponent refers to intercessory prayer and less obvious ones, such as a mention of “healthy relationships,” which is, of course, open to interpretation, the Biblical or secular one.

The fifth metric, however, is clearly designed to measure the progress a youth is making in their relationship with Jesus and God - the psychometrics of Jesus, if you will. About a third of the sub-components of the metric here are clearly and undeniably designed to measure the progress of a person’s faith in Christ. Each sub-component is then supplemented by a measurement on Likert scales. The scales run from left to right and from (a) the absence, (b) half-presence, and (c) full-presence of a given metric’s operationalised feature. The absence of the feature the metric measures would be observed on the lower end of the scale. Counter-intuitively the full realisation of the feature in the individual, is observed at the middle of the scale. That's because the full realisation of the feature overall is observed at the higher end of the scale, and refers to the way the individual – now fully realised in a given feature at the mid-point of the scale – helps support the given feature in others around them. This model is new so I wasn’t given any information on how youth measured or performed.

To give an example of the above, the fifth metric contains one component which refers to knowledge of Jesus. The absence here is ignorance of Jesus. The middle point refers to the knowledge and acceptance of Christ by the individual in question. And having moved from a place of ignorance to a place of acceptance, the final point on the highest end of the scale refers to the sharing of the knowledge of Christ with others who are otherwise ignorant of him. The same process then presumably is taken up by these new followers, hence why this is a model of discipleship.
Conclusion on Nature and Extent of Religious Influence. I want to conclude this overall section. What I have just presented is a summary of the nature and extent of religious influence in Canadian FBOs. Starting with evidence which seems strongly to suggest that The Great Commission is an institutional policy in the FBOs I sampled, I then discussed how these FBOs sought not to coerce their clients in their quest to generate interest in and ultimately make them followers of Christ. Noting that sometimes the desire not to coerce or engage in "violent evangelism" was complicated by a kind of historical inertia from old-world, turn-or-burn evangelism, I discussed four ways religious influence was exerted in "non-violent" fashion. These are (a) through the influence of a client's worldview, (b) through using faith, mostly prayer, as a service modality, (c) through establishment of social support either through generating a community or sense thereof or of engaging in varying degrees of relational evangelism, and (d) of relying on principles of programme development, either holism or discipleship, to maximise the effectiveness with which religious influence is exerted through programmes. Next, I discuss the analysis of data pertaining to the second research question.

The Outcomes of Religious Influence in Canadian Faith-Based Organisations

This second research question yielded two major themes, each of which explains an outcome of the faith in FBOs in Canada. Naturally, there is continuity with the previous question which may be considered the “cause” of some of these outcomes (e.g., religious influence through social support leads to x outcome).

The two themes here refer to the fact that most clients experienced either some form of (a) spiritual transformation or (b) non-spiritual transformation. Similar to the themes above, one caveat here is that the separation between the two wasn’t always easy to make so the reader is encouraged to avoid thinking of these two as entirely discrete, but rather as overlapping
categories with sufficient difference nevertheless to warrant distinction. A second caveat is that the power of my measure to distinguish between more direct religious influence and the more indirect influence of other elements of the “faith” in FBOs was not strong. Accordingly, at times it might seem rather clear that an outcome is a direct function of religious influence, while other times it might seem an indirect function of it. If the reader is inclined to object to the inclusion of such indirect “causal” relationships as superfluous, then my response would simply be that in the absence of an organisational culture rooted in devout evangelical faith and driven in large measure by The Great Commission, as these FBOs are, the question of any outcome from faith would be, in most cases, a nonsequiter. This is why we would almost never ask what the impact of “faith” or “religious influence” is on clients of an organisation like the YMCA; it simply does not make sense as neither direct nor indirect outcomes of faith would be present, presumably.

Most Clients Experience Non-Spiritual Transformation. To start, then, non-spiritual transformation refers to the effect of faith specifically on service related outcomes that might otherwise be addressed through secular means. In other words, the faith helps in such cases with material, this-worldly problems with which social work scholars and practitioners concern themselves. Both major data types support this interpretation.

For instance, from the survey, a few questions assessed the “effect” of faith on social service outcomes. The item “Bringing people closer into the faith community helps them with the problems they face” yielded a very high mean ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.58$). The variability was also very low as 95% of respondents scored this item either with a 4 or 5 on the scale, indicating near consensus that faith works to help people with non-faith-related issues. This item, of course, also touches on the theme of social support above, but highlights the outcome of bringing people into the “community” of believers.
Another more general item stated, “Faith based programming helps to address the social problems we encounter (e.g., homelessness, substance abuse, etc.).” This item also yielded a relatively high mean and low variability, as 85% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement ($M=4.29$, $SD=0.70$).

Finally, when asked “To what extent do you feel the faith-based elements (e.g., prayer, Bible study, conversations about faith, attending religious services) improve or make worse the service you deliver,” 95% of respondents scored a 4 or 5, and the item overall had a very high mean ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.58$).

These quantitative data are supported with just over 50 codes from both clients and staff, strongly suggesting that FBOs, and their faith in particular, may in many cases be positively affecting clients. There are three things to note before presenting the qualitative evidence, however. First, the questions on the interview and focus group guides which correspond to this theme were worded to refer to behaviour, thoughts, and emotions and so the findings reflect these three. Second, there is a spectrum of magnitude ranging from the smallest ever change to a full life transformation, fitting of the phrase. And third and finally, while I initially coded subthemes, I ultimately chose to rid of them because they did more to obscure than clarify the raw data; yet still these subthemes are useful to bear in mind as they might easily be perceived. Thus the reader is primed to note that a large number of coded instances reflected either (a) changes to more pro-social behaviour, broadly conceived, or (b) changes to a person’s psycho-affective well-being.

With that said, here are two examples of the former, each of which reflects a similarly sizable change in the lives of two clients. For each client, faith had clearly positively shifted
lifestyle. Both had been deeply involved in organised crime in the recent past and these two passages indicate how faith drew them and kept them away from that lifestyle:

I don't wanna go [back to that lifestyle], not just because I got baptised [but] because I just discovered this new world, you know. I've been here [in Canada for] 30 years and I probably only worked this last year and a half. [The new world means] working for a living, first, because before I was involved in everything that was no good - drugs, fraud, prostitutes, you know everything, theft, you name it. And I never did any serious time here. I've been lucky, or too good, or whatever, you know. But since last year when I got baptised I promised to God and to myself and I said you know what "I do not want that life." (C8C1)

The connection between faith and this positive outcome is rather clear toward the end. Here is the second participant with a rather similar story:

I have learned how to deny my bad thoughts. So I learned self-control. For example, back home I know many people. They're doing bad stuff and I always try to be away from that, right...and for me especially when I have some problems or somebody wants to [quarrel] I say "Oh this guy doesn't know"...Like I have friends and people and I can call them and do something, you know what I mean? Support! Support! But I think "I'm not alone man. I have God. I have faith. I can try to control myself"...[There's] internal warfare...If somebody offers me do some wrong thing, I say "No" because now I have faith. That's the important thing, I can say "No," "No," "No" to bad things. That's the simple/ [R: Which you wouldn't do without faith?]. Yeah that's right. (C8C4)

These two are clear examples where faith specifically has transformed lives and there are other examples of both direct changes and “reformed gangsters” in the raw data.
However, even when faith isn’t as directly related, as I mentioned above a number of instances indicate that the FBO and its staff have helped clients develop socially, and thus change the way they behave in, feel, and think about the social world. One staff member, for instance, noted a conversation she overheard by a client, who, after coming to the programme as a shy, timid and rather young lone mother, began to set boundaries with an unknown male, a new and important feat that was influenced by her commitment to a faith-infused programme which taught her to set such boundaries in a “Biblical” fashion:

I heard her on the phone once, I guess it was somebody from her family, I think it was a boy [Hahaha]. Maybe, I don't know if it was her - I don't know who it was and she was saying "No, Wednesday mornings is for me. You do not call me. I will not deal with anything. I'm at [the programme]. This is a programme I need to make my life better."

(C7S2)

There are also several instances of youth whose behaviour changed to be more pro-social after coming to a faith-based programme – they became “better kids,” much to delight of parents, noted one participant (C5S1). Another one boasted “we’ve moved hundreds of homeless youth into viable lives” (C15S1), which consists of work, among other things. Similarly, a few adult participants at another organisation apparently said “I can hold down a job now” (C9S1) or that they learned “the value of work” (C8S3) or some form of financial literacy (C7S2).

Regarding addictions, there were several claims by both staff and clients that addictions were treated both directly and indirectly by faith and the FBO’s influence. This included extremely addictive drugs, such as crystal meth and heroin, as well as more common ones such as alcohol and, for at least one participant, food. One staff noted that they thought the people who “accepted Christ” were more likely to relapse while those who accept Christ “really take
back their life and we don’t see them anymore” (C8S3). And of course, there was one staff member who claimed to be able to heal physical wounds with prayer (C1S1).

In terms of the more psycho-affective changes, here is a powerful example of a disaffected client, leaning strongly toward atheism with clear anti-religious and anti-Christian streaks when they came to the programme, but changed in the way they viewed the social world; at least one other client, with a similar inclination for science over religion, agreed:

    C7C2: [Coming here] gave me faith, not necessarily in a religion or a deity; it gave me faith in people.
    C7C1: Yeah!
    C7C2: It gave me this return to like "Hey man, I have faith in you. I can trust you that you're gonna be this person. You're gonna be loving to me." And that was something that I didn't have.
    C7C1: Yeah, yeah, same here.
    C7C2: Like it's faith in something. Maybe not a deity, but it brought me -
    C7C1: Faith in that there are actually good people out there
    C7C2: Yeah. Yeah.
    C7C5: [inaudible] faith in people.

    Again, a number of other instances of such “psycho-affective” changes exist, including increased confidence, lowered aggression, reduced anxiety, “faith” in people, increased optimism, reduced fear, reduced anger, an increase in valuing oneself, and, as illustrated by this next instance, a powerful one of a man who’d been plagued by PTSD-like symptoms, infused with guilt over atrocities he’d committed during World War II, something akin to forgiveness. A staff told the story thus:
This is gonna sound crazy and extreme but this is what [the client] told me. [He was] given orders in a tank and a number of people had - soldiers I imagined, enemy soldiers - had huddled into a church building and he was told to demolish the church building [inaudible]. So he did. Of course he did. Anyway, he told me, the number of decades his poor wife lived with this. In his sleep he'd be strangling her, in his sleep, like he would literally be strangling her thinking she was the enemy. He was just living this horrific war and he was connecting the dots [about his life]: “The reason I’m trying to do all these good things is to try and make up for that horrible thing.” All I said to him, Ravi, was… “I just wanna let you know, you’re forgiven [there’s a pause and then I ask “How did it impact him?”]. It changed his life! It was as simple as that. I prayed with him and assured him, "You know, what you’ve done has been paid for; it's covered. Jesus loves you. It's done. The past is literally [pause] past." (C4S1)

While those are the non-spiritual changes, what about the spiritual changes?

*Most Clients Experience Some Form of Spiritual Transformation.* In other words, both data types suggest that these FBOs, unsurprisingly perhaps, are at least somewhat successful in moving people toward an evangelical faith. In total, 40 coded instances suggest that some type of faith transformation is occurring.

While a number of these 40 codes are general, my analysis suggests that there might be three sub-themes or types of changes that occur which might aid interpretation. These three represent a gradation of change starting from the first, which I term “strengthening faith.” This refers to those clients who had already been more or less practising Christians before they came to the FBO, and who found that the FBO “strengthened” their faith while there. One of the clients of a rather devout organisation, who was said to be “waving the banner of the [faith] in a
low key way” (C7C6) through helping out non-religious tenants of his building, came to the organisation with his faith and claimed one of the benefits was the continual strengthening of the faith: “It hasn’t changed me. My faith has always been strong. I’m not changed. It’s just getting stronger. And I want more people around me that are of the same faith, you know? You know, I wanna be around these people” (C7C3).

At least two participants in another focus group at a rather large organisation were moderately practising Catholics whose faith in “God” got stronger as they came to the organisation(C8C2, C8C3). Another focus group consisted of three participants who had accepted Christ prior to coming to the programme and had stated that the programme helped them “dig deeper into my faith…and grow my relationship [with Christ],” helped facilitate Bible reading and knowledge acquisition leading to a feeling that “I almost feel hungry. Like I wanna find out more…I have that thirst to gain more knowledge” (C7C7). To these three participants, I asked, “So is it fair to say that the programme has helped you grow in your faith” to which all three agreed with “Absolutely,” “Yes,” and “100%” (C7C7, C7C8, C7C9).

But the vast majority of participants, it would seem, are not people of faith, or “unchurched”(C17S1). They may be nominally Christian, walked away from the faith in some way, become atheist or agnostic, or practitioners of another faith, including Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, First Nations spirituality, and Wicca. For these clients the journey toward faith seems either to be a “warming to religion” or a more full-scale conversion, the second and third gradations of change along this spectrum.

Concerning the former, i.e., warming to religion, note that both the gentlemen mentioned above in that dialogue about learning to have faith in people warmed to evangelical faith, despite

---

* There are no consistent numbers here but some say as much as 80% of their clientele aren’t Christian
being atheists. Of particular note here is the fact that one of these participants seems to have had a rather traumatic experience with Christianity in his past and prior to his visitations to the FBO was always doggedly anti-religion:

I didn’t really like the faith part in the beginning but I do know that they’re doing it out of caring. They’re not doing it because like “We’re right; you’re wrong. We’re tryna teach you”….they wanna help you. The reason why they’re preaching to us is because they believe that it will definitely help us. And I can’t fault them for that. Like that’s a great way of thinking I think. And that’s OK with me. Even though the religion, prior to coming here, I wouldn’t be cool with it. Now, I’m like, “These are, these are good people… I was so negative before I got here. I was really, really hurt and traumatised by certain things religious people did and I thought all people were like that. All religious people were like that. When I came here I was like, you know, it’s different. These guys have their faith, they believe, they care, and I’m not just some object or nothing.” (C7C2)

Others in the same focus group noted that through the examples set by people – clients and staff – faith “rubbed off on those without faith”(C7C6):

C7C6: Believe it or not there’s a division where some believe but some don’t believe, but [the non-believers] they’ll listen to it…[They’ll] still engage in the conversation.

C7C3: Yes. They start to show an interest. And they wonder why this guy is such a happy guy and how he can, you know, preach to others and teach and still have the faith even though he’s teaching people that are ignorant.

C7C6: The seeds are always being sown right.

The metaphor of the seed is one that comes up often and seems not only to be an outcome but an objective of many: One staff said “All we can do is sow a seed, and it’s up to that person and the
Lord, what happens in that person’s life” (C8S1). While these are explicitly examples of people “warming to faith” there are several others in which the same process seems to occur but in less explicit ways, which I won't present here.

Concerning the “full conversion” to evangelical Christianity, the third gradation of spiritual transformation, there are a number of examples here, as well, but only in the form of anecdotes from staff. This includes conversions by Buddhists, atheists, agnostics, nominal Christians, and at least one indigenous man. They include both men and women and people who were from Canada and multiple other countries from which newcomers hail, including at least Mexico, India, and Mongolia.

Finally, to the extent that being part of a faith community indicates acceptance of the Gospel, the survey statement, “Staff and volunteers work to bring clients they serve into a faith community” yielded a high mean and thus supports the qualitative data that clients are experiencing spiritual transformation ($M=3.91$, $SD=1.00$). Moreover, about 73% of respondents said they “often” or “always” sought to do so.

**Conclusion on Outcomes of Religious Influence.** Thus, overall, data from the survey, interviews, and focus groups suggests two types of outcomes of religious influence. The first is that clients experience non-spiritual transformation, which helps them address the social problems for which they come to the FBOs for help. The second is that clients experience spiritual transformation, which, in addition to helping them in their spiritual journeys, often helps them with the social problems they face, as well. Next, I will discuss the findings for each of these research questions from the Indian study.
Chapter 2: Religious Influence in Indian Evangelical Faith-Based Organisations

The presentation of the findings from the Indian study will be identical to the one from Canada. Accordingly, below is a presentation of themes pertaining to the first and second research questions and Table 13 displays the organisation and participant codes. However, there are a few things to consider before we get to the findings.

First, note that the Indian sample is considerably smaller, for reasons mentioned in the methodology section and elaborated further in the chapter on the comparison. This smaller sample means that the amount of data from which to choose was also comparatively smaller. Second, again for reasons mentioned in the methodology and discussed further in the comparison chapter, the data types were also narrower, consisting primarily of interviews, focus groups, and researcher observations, with very few organisational documents to consult and no surveys. Accordingly, there is no quantitative data to present here. Third and final, while there are certainly larger-scale Christian organisations in India, sprawling, impressively large, and quite common, they are primarily Catholic and not evangelical and thus not faith-permeated. This was confirmed by my host supervisor in Mumbai as well as a key informant, herself an Indian Catholic social worker. My Indian sample, therefore, consists of comparatively smaller and less organised FBOs and the data, at times, reflects this “messiness.” I begin, again, with the nature and extent of religious influence in Indian FBOs.

Table 13. Anonymised organisation and participant codes for the Indian study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I5</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Nature and Extent of Religious Influence in Indian Faith-Based Organisations?

*The Great Commission is Institutional Policy in Indian FBOs.* The qualitative data suggests that The Great Commission is operating policy in the Indian FBOs I sampled. As with the Canadian sample, what this means is that staff members are both conscious and intentional about sharing faith and bringing people to Christ in service settings and this is justified and inspired by The Great Commission.

For instance, when I spoke with one organisation about its motivation to do service work, the staff participant from that organisation stated that it was love of God and loving thy neighbour which motivated them. I then stated in a natural manner of conversation that this was the “The Great Commandment” – to love God and to love others. He affirmed and then went on
to say, almost as if by reflex: “And The Great Commission [pause] tells us to reach out to people, the needy ones.” I then asked, “How much do The Great Commandment and The Great Commission inform your organisation’s work?” to which he said “Oh, that’s our very, you know [pause] ethos” (I1S1).

Another organisation's staff participant simply said, “Ya, we do,” when asked about practising The Great Commission. (I3S1) Another said “it’s our motto” (I6S1). Here is yet another staff person from yet another organisation who, when I asked if The Great Commission meant anything to him, said:

What we are doing is The Great Commission!…what is The Great Commission?…Go and make disciples. Go and make disciples, baptising them and teaching them all that I have commanded. So the main part of The Great Commission is to go and make disciples. Making disciples. When you go and make disciples…you go, you baptise, you teach – these are the sub-principles of the main thing, making disciples. So the Lord wanted them to go and make disciples. It’s the multiplying. They were made disciples and he wanted them to go and make the same, duplicate the same, and that’s what I am teaching. (I4S1)

But as the reader might recall from the literature review, the issue of conversion is a sensitive, hot-button topic in India, which cuts across exposed religious fault lines. Here are two participants discussing The Great Commission in a manner that pays heed to the sensitivity of sharing faith in India. They responded to a previous line of discussion which broached the topic of “forced conversion,” i.e., the idea that religious conversions in India to Christianity are more often than not a function of coercion or force, inducement, or even bribery. They objected by saying:
I7S2: If I like something, I introduce other [people] to the same thing. So that is how our faith is. We like the faith and we want others to know the faith. But we [sic] forcefully we don’t convert anybody, at all. As far as the evangelism is concerned, it’s the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we share our faith.

R: Which commandment?

I7S2: Uh…The Great Commandment

I7S1: Great Commission, we call it!

I7S2: Commission! Commission I mean to say. The Great Commission I meant to say. So go, baptise, and teach…so that [commission], we follow, but we don’t forcefully convert anybody.

One of these two participants later said that it was the “thrust” of the organisation to fulfill The Great Commission, and when I asked if there was a conflict between this fact and providing service to residents of the nearby slums in which they worked, most of whom were either Muslim or Hindus, he said: “I don’t think so…We don’t feel any kind of conflict” (I7S2).

Another staff shared a rather ambitious vision of the overall organisation: “We believe that the [sic] whole India must know Christ. We have a certain vision that by [a given year] we must reach 10,000,000 souls and 100,000 churches…socially, politically, and spiritually these people [i.e., non-Christian Indians] need to come out.” (I6S1) What he is referring to, which is not uncommon, is the belief that a conversion could change not only an individual’s social, political, and spiritual life, but that the greater the number of citizens of India who converted to Christianity, the less pronounced social, political, and spiritual problems would become. I’ll pick up on this point further below when discussing the next theme.
Here is what another participant stated, this one less clearly concerned about the potential for conflict with the Hindu majority and the larger (relative to Christians, anyway) Muslim minority. I asked what The Great Commission meant and he said:

It means everything. It means fulfilling The Great Commission. As I said we are evangelicals so we are on the streets every week, in all our churches, all across the nation. And uh, we are sharing the Gospel. We believe in the Great Commission so that’s what we do all the time…it’s a lifestyle for us. Wherever we are we’ll share…if we’re in a bus, we’ll pass out tracts in a bus. When I’m driving in an auto rickshaw, I’ll give it to the auto rickshaw driver. So wherever, yeah [Hahaha]. (I8S1)

When I brought the conversation with this participant back to the topic and asked if “wherever” included their social services, just to clarify, he affirmed and said “yes” but didn’t elaborate and I, regretfully, had a lapse of judgment and didn’t prod further.

In addition to these more obvious comments about The Great Commission, as with the Canadian sample, there are a few instances where allusions or statements are made which seem clearly in keeping with The Great Commission, even if the term isn’t explicitly used. Here is the same participant who defined The Great Commission as making disciples above, describing what discipleship means. He is a self-proclaimed expert on this matter, who travels the world, including recently to Canada, to teach how to make disciples:

The overall [vision of our organisation] is to make disciples. To make disciples. That’s the calling and commission of the Lord Jesus. See, our service is based on our conviction. Conviction is based on the principles of the scriptures, you understand? And that we bring into action, depending on the needs of people. How do we meet their needs. Help
them to know God’s love in different ways…a disciple is one who has committed his life to follow the Lord Jesus. I have written books on that. (I4S1)

The same man also showed me a booklet, which ultimately I purchased before leaving the interview. Apart from a direct indication at the top of the cover page that "The Lord Jesus Christ Commanded: 'Go and Make Disciples of All Nations...' Matthew 28:18-20," the booklet serves as a how-to guide on disciplemaking. It's used as a "training program for persons responsible for reproducing the Christian life." One could write a dissertation on the booklet itself, but to remain focused on this section, I'll just note that there are multiple direct and indirect references to The Great Commission and evangelism. Particularly common are metaphors of reproduction such as the one just quoted above; other examples of the same include a call for "spiritual reproduction" and the expressed desire that a disciple "becomes a spiritually mature, reproducing believer." Moreover, these be-fruitful-and-multiply metaphors are accompanied by mathematical calculations in table and graph formats illustrating the exponential growth of using the discipleship method to fulfill The Great Commission. All of this is summarised in the reference to the Bible as a "method book as well as a message book" (I4S1).

Another participant referenced the Lausanne-type language mentioned in the literature review: “Our vision” he said “is to reach the unreached” (I9S1). When I asked another staff what the faith-based components are intended to do, here is what the participant stated:

I mean, firstly, we want them to know and have a relationship with Christ themselves. That’s the whole idea. We know that if they do not believe in him then they will live in eternity forever without him. So that’s the main idea, that they would be saved, that they would know the Lord. And experience a personal relationship with him. (I8S1)

The overall goal of staff, he would go on to say, is salvation of clients.
Another participant mentioned the Kingdom of God:

Like I said we don’t want to force people to give their lives to Christ. But I mean at the end of the day we want people to come to Christ and know Christ and have an eternal life and enjoy the blessing of knowing Jesus and stuff like that…So, that’s why we exist, right, that’s our primary focus. (I14S1)

While there weren’t as many documents in the Indian sample, still the ones available do confirm the importance of The Great Commission within Indian FBOs, as the one instance I mentioned already demonstrates. Another one, for instance, is of one organisation’s (I6) logo, which I was given and which was explained to me; it was designed specifically to convey The Great Commission as a central animating force behind their work. Another organisation gave me a document which contained multiple references and allusions to The Great Commission, including the mention of a “blood covered” India, which itself is an allusion to the sacrificial blood of Jesus Christ, the covering of which indicates salvation. Other terms used in that same document are “sow in souls” and “soul harvest,” both allusions to the conversion of people to Christianity and reminiscent of Lausanne (I1)

**Religious Influence Sought Without Coercion.** As with the Canadian sample, the first point I want to deal with is the issue of coercion. The Indian participants also spoke to the issue of coercion, with several staff members but no clients commenting that they sought not to coerce clients when they exerted religious influence. While in the Canadian sample the issue of coercion was tied up with the history of “violent” turn-or-burn evangelism associated with street preachers, in India the matter was set against the backdrop of what one participant called the “stigma of conversion” in India (I7S2). This refers to the idea that conversions are carried out in large measure through coercive tactics, or what’s sometimes referred to as “forced conversions,”
and usually with an aim to undermine the religious integrity of Hinduism or political parties associated or dominated by Hindus. This includes most prominently the *Bharatiya Janata Party*, headed by current Prime Minister Narendra Modi, and the *Shiv Sena*, which was in power in Mumbai at the time of data collection and of this writing.

Thus, unsurprisingly the word “force” was used, i.e., in negation, several times to indicate a non-coercive approach: “Nothing is done by force,” said one participant. Another said: “We never force…still we introduce. If anybody is interesting you are free. We open the door. You come. But we don’t force. We don’t pull anybody into the religious conversion” (I1S1). Yet another said: “In reality, we don’t forcibly [sic] convert anybody, just we share our faith, as we said if I like something I introduce other person to the same thing, so that is how our faith is (I7S2).” Here is one more example of the same:

So there is no question of converting them. Even adults when they come for the meetings, we don’t convert them. Because we are only sharing the Gospel. It is up to them, to decide, if they want to follow Jesus. If they don’t want to follow, it doesn’t matter. We’re not forcing them “You must accept.” We’re giving an option to them. “You want to change you [sic] life? You want to accept and follow the Lord?”(I4S1)

Given that we are talking about coercion there is an interesting anecdote from my notes to share. When I arrived, the man in the above passage offered me something to drink. I declined politely and pointed to my bottle of water. He then asked again. I declined. He then asked a third time after which I said I try to not to drink coffee and don't drink the milk inside of *chai*, the two drinks he offered. He seemed upset and insisted that I had to have something. So I momentarily broke with my veganism and had a cup of *chai*. It was after this that the interview began and that
he seemed to relax. What's interesting is that this participant used this example of our interaction to demonstrate his view of non-coercion in service settings.

Finally, there are a couple of “sub-themes” here that warrant highlighting. The first pertains to the agency and accountability of conversion, which more often than not was placed with God, Jesus, or the Holy Spirit, and if not any of those three, then the object of the “sharing,” i.e., the client. Several participants mentioned the dynamic, a kind of formula: “I know one thing. I can to do lot of things, but it is God who adds people to the church” (I13S2). Another instance, which demonstrates the idea that the outcome of evangelism is ultimately in God's hands and sharing is thus otherwise innocuous and therefore impossibly forceful:

It’s not any compulsion. It’s not anything that we have to push them, because when they know the love of Christ, they automatically submit. It’s not…it can’t be forced in people.

It is Christ who has to work in it. It’s not we. We are just humans. We are just people.

But it’s Christ who saves them. (I14S1)

The second qualifying sub-theme is that most organisations made no qualms about evangelising children, but as one participant’s comment suggested there might be more nuance here than meets the eye of a few of my other participants. Here is an example of the former less refined version:

You know the ant story? One ant tastes sugar. A bit of sugar. And the ant will share with the other ants. So the all ants will come and they taste the sugar. That is the attraction of Jesus. When one child tastes Jesus, that child goes and then tells the other child “Hey, I found good life in Jesus. He changed my life. Why can’t you?” So children tell it to the other [children]. (I5S1)
In contrast to this perspective, another participant said they didn’t baptise children (though this did not necessarily mean not sharing the faith) because “What does a child know?” (I12S1). The issue of coercion no doubt is complicated by a person’s ability to understand what is being offered. Whether or not children have that ability is a matter I’ll touch on below in the Discussion. For now, I’ll move on to the next theme in which children figure prominently and thus begin discussion of the ways that Indian FBOs do exert religious influence, if not coercively. The first way is familiar.

**Religious Influence is Exerted Through Worldview.** A total of 18 codes from the qualitative data as well as the information I received and noted about the programmes indicate that religious influence is exerted through worldview. As with the Canadian sample, this refers to the tendency among Indian FBOs to instil in their clients values, morals, principles, and the like from a Biblical or Christian source. A term that was used a few times in the Indian sample was “character education.” Both children and adults from the slums were the objects of the character education. For instance: “We have a class for the adults. In that class we used to teach them, how to live in society. How to behave. Moral side. Secular side. And the spiritual side…Once in a week we used to teach them from the Bible.” (I15S1). Another participant who worked in another slum and was part of a focus group spoke in a way that really highlights the connection between “character education” and the Biblical mandate to make followers of Jesus:

> There are women who’ve taken part in adultery, or who abuse, or children who abuse. They don’t know what’s wrong! Because they were brought up all their life seeing people around them do that. Their fathers have abused, they’re abusing… their neighbours abuse…So when [the staff] prays for them or when [she] counsels them she tells them what is wrong according to the Bible and how you could be a changed person or a better
person for the community as well as for yourself and for your family. And then they pray for them. So she shows them what exactly is truth. By the Bible says adultery is sin. So she tells them adultery is sin. They pray for them together and then that changes them. And children you teach them good habits, such as, be it simple “don’t abuse,” or “wash your hands before eating food.” So that’s basic etiquettes [sic] that we teach them…but that’s just basic, we try to get them to the soul thing which is Jesus. (I12S3)

This conversation then flowed from this idea that character education was a compliment or precursor to the “soul thing,” to Jesus. Remarking upon the changes which ensue from this second tier of “character education,” if you will, another participant said: “There are tremendous changes there! Tremendous change means the Bible says if a person become in Christ, he is becoming a new creation. The old is going [R: Do you notice that happening?] Yeah, yeah, yeah.” (I12S1)

Apart from character education another term that frequently was used was “moral” or “moral education”: “It is basically teaching the morals and values of life. Respecting, honouring people, and you know, pro-life! Pro-life!” (I1S1). Consider this following passage, which counterposes the Biblical moral education against a word that is a direct relic of British colonial rule, i.e., in their attempt to categorise certain "castes" into the catch-all category, the British inflected their opinion with the catch-all term "Other Backward Castes":

We have Sunday school for children where we teach them different things like moral stories, songs, some puzzles, activities we have, like puzzles, memory games, then we give them some snacks….because these are all villages and slums here so they’re coming from backward, you know, lifestyle. (I4S1)
To one group of staff, when I asked why they did what they did, said the following - note the almost seamless connection and transition between a secular morality and a Christian one:

I5S1: Education helps them to understand [societal] needs. They can wide open their eyes and they can see what is happening in the society…If we educate them “what you are doing is wrong,” if someone is giving bribe to the policemen, we teach them don’t give. So education helps the child to be right citizen.

I5S2: Especially in slum area all kinds of sins

R: Sins?

I5S1: Sins. You know what you mean by sins? Anything which displeases God by seeing, hearing, doing wrong…they tell bad words, so we teach them “hold on your tongue, don’t say the bad words because that is sin.” So they stop because sin has penalty, so the moment you do sin you have to face the consequences so stop doing sin. Stealing. Telling bad words. Disobedience. Then cigar, or beer, drugs!...In the cigar they put [marijuana]…and the eraser…some of them they [sniff erasers]. They smell like that [demonstrates].

There are two things I’d like to point out here. First, it seemed to me from comments some of my participants made, on and off the recording, that the obedience and changes made in the lives of kids endeared the kids to parents and ultimately fostered a kind of acceptance, if reluctant, of the FBO. This is interesting in light of the fact that some parents might not be accepting of the Christian message being delivered in tandem with this “character education,” but take one to get the other (that is my speculating).

Second, the term "citizen" was also used a couple of times and this was, in some instances, seen as a major outcome at the individual level, but also used in a kind of utopian
desire for a wholesale movement toward Christianity – a nationwide character education.

Regarding Christianity as a potential "citizen-making" force at the individual level, the person who discussed the “sins” above said: “We want to make all these children to be good citizens” (I5S2). Another said:

> When we reach out to people they may be from any faith because basically we want to reach out [to] mankind, humanity and lift them up from a situation that is appalling and give them a better lifestyle, but also that they would be enlightened and they would be better citizens of India. (I1S1)

But he would go on to say how these individual-level efforts were part of a broader mission:

> We can have a transformation of a nation. India can become a better nation. [R: Do you see the work that you’re doing as a part of transformation of India itself] Absolutely. Absolutely…just like this little boy who walked along the beach. He saw all the starfish on the beach, on the sand, seashore and…he picked up the starfish one at a time and throwing it into the sea and someone said “Are you gone crazy? You will never be able to save all these starfish.”… But he says “One at a time, perhaps I can make that change with whatever capacity I got.” (I1S1)

I asked what India would look like if it “came to the truth” of Christ, language he used during this conversation:

> Wowww!!! Nothing like it! It would be so wonderful! You would have the streets seeing healings and blessings and prosperity. And better attitudes. You would see the transformation in all this, in the corridors of power. All corruption would stop. It would be a heaven on Earth. It would be wonderful. (I1S1)
This led into a discussion that would be certain to elicit a tip of the hat from one the founders of “character education” in modern Indian, Thomas MacCauley, who was responsible for education reform aimed at severing the Indian people's cultural and linguistic ties to their own cultures and languages and connecting them to the British culture and English language:

I1S1: So like if the Earth is a colony. Like the British ruled, had colonies, and whatever they were doing there, if [their example] was followed here, it was a blessing. For example, we have the defense forces, the railways, the whole network, we learned the English language, all from [pause] the headquarters

R: The British?
I1S1: British. And we are blessed

R: So you think the British impact on India was positive?
I1S1: *Very* positive.

R: Is that right?
I1S1: Yes, yes. Indians have twisted it. Twisted it by saying we needed freedom. I’m telling you the truth, if India was not set free in 1947 and had to be 1997, 50 years late it would have been far better. We would have been like Hong Kong, financially.

He later said he saw parallels between the establishment of the Kingdom of God on Earth, including India, and the beneficial colonisation by Britain. While this is the most salient example of a wholesale character change or worldview shifts, there were others. Here is one last instance, which emerged when I asked what an entire India “coming to Christ” would look like:

I have, I would, I don’t know, I’ve never, I mean it would be amazing I’m guessing right if God’s the entire country would turn to Christ. I would like to think that things would be much better. We’d be in a much better state...poverty would come to an end, caste
discrimination, no discrimination, less corruption, more love, I mean I’m sure things
would get much better than they are today. (I14S1)

Thus, caste, corruption and the like emerge again as macro-level changes effected by a wholesale
character education vis-à-vis the transforming power of Christ.

Finally, character education among children seemed quite popular, not only in settings
that were orphanages or like orphanages but also in slums. This is a single instance but it might
offer some insight into one reason why so many of the organisations I spoke to in India were
working with children. Here is what one staff member at an organisation said:

In the Bible there is a verse…one minute:…Book of Proverbs, Chapter 22,
Verse 6. “Train up a child in the way he should go. And when he is old he will not depart
from it”… “Train up a child in the way he should go.” There are so many ways to go in
this world, but we have to train them the particular way, you know, where he should go
[R: Which is?] Which is God's way. “And when he is old he will not depart from it” [R:
Is that why you’re working with children?]. Yeah…This is the basic thing. From this
Bible verse, we are doing this [programme].” (I11S1)

While this is one instance and thus the reader is strongly cautioned not to extrapolate too
liberally, it is nonetheless a plausible thesis for FBOs in both samples – i.e., they work with
children and youth because they can exert religious influence on otherwise impressionable,
malleable people. A similar reason was given above when explaining why discipleship
programmes in Canada seemed more focused on children and youth.

Overall, these data suggest that one way that Indian FBOs exert religious influence is
through influencing a client's worldview. This was conveyed most commonly using terms like
"character education" or "moral education" and applied to both children and adults, as well as at the individual and national levels.

*Religious Influence Exerted Through Faith as a Service Modality.* In addition to this type of moral education, religious influence is also exerted through using faith in lieu of conventional social service. As with the Canadian sample, there wasn’t a great range of ways that faith was used, but still enough to broaden this theme beyond the dominant manifestation of faith, which was also prayer in the Indiansample. Some uncommon manifestations of faith-as-service I coded here included, for instance, “pastoral” or “Christian” counselling, where “faith” or the Biblical worldview were part of understanding a problem and determining its solution. This included, for instance, addressing marital problems with some element of faith or the Bible (I15S1). There were at least three other FBOs in my sample who provided a kind of informal counselling, thus less systematised but still heavily faith-based and seemingly serving the same function. “Hope” also emerged at least three times as a potential service, i.e., staff provide hope to the client so that his or her situation might get better in lieu, or in absence, of service. Many participants also spoke of what is by now familiar to the reader and to which I will return again in the next section, and that is accepting Christ as a service modality—“salvation as service” as I coded one instance. Here is that belief expressed in rather clear terms:

We strongly believe that Jesus is the answer to *every* problem that mankind [sic] is facing right now… We believe that Jesus is the answer for everything. We try getting people connected to Jesus in every way. Be it they are emotionally disturbed…if it’s kids and their studies, we try teaching them, but then we tell them we are not just teaching you, you can ask Jesus, you can pray, he would give you wisdom. So we *do* social work, but in the end we try getting them to Jesus because he’s the answer for everything. (I12S3)
And here is yet another instance of the same:

See first of all…First I ask them “Do you know Jesus?”…people that I got at present they are all from Hindu background. They are come from another faith. So when we meet them we just talk to them about who is Jesus and what he has done for us. And we talk about that. We talk about his resurrection. And then we ask them. We challenge them that God can change your life. This, many people have seen, when they accepted Jesus Christ into their life, then God change their life.

Though I didn’t code more than five such instances of salvation as service, if I were to conjecture based on these instances as well as the overall data, I would say it’s quite possible this belief – i.e., that salvation is service – is quite prevalent, and had I asked a more pointed question about it, I would assume I’d have received a rather powerfully affirmative response. The implication of this finding is rather important and I’ll touch on it in the chapter on implications.

But as with the Canadian sample, the most prominent manifestation of "faith" as a service modality is prayer. Prayer was coded 22 times, not as something that’s done alongside service, but rather as the service itself. The problems addressed typically centered around health and to a lesser extent economic problems, problems one might see addressed, for instance, at a community centre, by Ontario Works, or a walk-in clinic using provincial insurance. Here is a list of the health related issues that faith has purportedly healed in lieu of medical care, which is not free in India: addictions (including to alcohol, cannabis, heroin, and some form of glue); amnesia; anxiety; asthma; headaches; blindness; cancer; “fits,” which I assume might be seizures; general illness; HIV/AIDS; kidney disease; rheumatic fever; schizophrenia; scoliosis; and suicide.\(^\text{37}\)

\(^{37}\) I have not provided the participant codes here for readability, as virtually all participants, staff and clients, noted some non-spiritual outcome of this kind.
In addition to these there were the more spiritual problems, unique to India, which often were seen to underpin the health problems for which prayer was used as service; these included primarily “deliverance” from demons – “there are a lot of cases of demons,” said one (I8S1). Though a few participants seem to allude to this spiritual battle being waged by “demonic” spirits on the Biblical Kingdom, few were as forthright as this staff person:

There was a lady who was possessed by demon…she was falling down automatically and [would typically be unconscious] for lot of time, maybe one hour, two hour…this was going on for many years…then she called one young lady [from the church] who is actively participating. She went [to the lady’s house] and she prayed. Immediately. She got up. It never happened…and then they find out this is the only remedy, because they did lot of medication, they did lot of black magic, and all those things, _babas, sadhus_ [i.e., Hindu priests and healers]. Nobody can heal. But now, through prayer, she got healed. (I13S2)

The lady was aided in removing pictures and statues of Hindu gods thereafter and she began attending the church connected to the FBO. Here he is again:

As I was preaching I was preaching about demons…suddenly one lady she got up and [makes impression of a kind of hysterical reaction to possession and lightly yells “Ahhhhhhhh”] in front of me…I just prayed her. She fell down…another one, two, three four [“Ahhhhhh”]. Nearly five, six people go up from there. They started to manifest [R: The demons?]. The demons. [R: Do you have names for the demons?]…some people they go to the idols, different like Kali…then some are monkey, that is Hanuman, monkey spirit, then there are, what do you call…spirit of alcohol. It is people, what [makes a person ] to drink every day? It is spirit. It is not alcohol…[R: So you think
alcoholism exists because of demonic possession?] Of course. [R: What about drug
addiction?] Of course. [R: What about HIV?] HIV is a sex [demon]...there are some
people who always liked to go to woman...[it’s the] spirit of sex. [I12S2]

To clarify, Kali is an incarnation of Shakti, the goddess of feminine strength – shakti literally
means strength. And Hanuman, a man-ape hybrid with divine powers, is believed to have been a
devotee of Rama, the incarnation of Vishu – both figure in the epic, The Ramayana, which tells
the story of Rama. Both Kali and Hanuman are worshipped as gods by many Hindus. In addition
to this quite literal demonization of Hinduism one can observe from the above passage the literal
demonization of social problems, as well – namely, addictions and HIV/AIDs, as well as
possibly adultery, though it is unclear if the sex demon is used to explain what might otherwise
be considered normal sexual behavior. In such cases, this demonization is the premise upon
which prayer functions.

These “signs and wonders,” a term used by the Richardson and Flory (2016) to refer to
these types of healings, didn’t stop there. I was told by one participant that staff at his FBO had
witnessed The Exorcist-like 360 degree turn of the head and climbing up the walls (I8S1). One
person said they had witnessed people being raised from the dead, too (I14S1).

Figuring less prominently were prayers for economic problems, though this certainly
came up. For instance:

They are in need of paying fees. So one child is saying that “I don’t have fees. I don’t
have money to pay the fees. So next week I don’t know if I’ll be able to attend the school.
But we will tell. “We will pray. The Lord will provide.” When we pray, probably that
week parents get a new job. Get some money. So the fees is [sic] paid. So next week
child will come and tell “Sir, last week we prayed, this week I could go to school.” (I5S1)
The staff member previously quoted about *Kali* and *Hanuman* had this very interesting observation about sending such a message about the power of prayer for monetary problems, however:

Actually, I cannot, this thing about, how God made them. God made rich. God made poor. [R: So giving their life to Christ does not mean that they’ll get rich]. No. I never tell them this…suppose today if I tell you “You come to Jesus and Jesus will give you everything”…but nothing happens like that [laughs]…we have seen so many people come [because they think that will change]…and they come, and afterward nothing happens, and then they go. (I1S2)

There isn’t enough data here to make a solid conclusion but I think these two instances serve to suggest a possible conflict within Indian FBOs with respect to faith as a service solution to poverty, arguably their largest social issue. In other words, while some are quite faithful in administering prayer for economic problems, others might be more reluctant. It is rather interesting, however, that more people find it possible to exorcise demons than alleviate poverty through prayer - it seems even God can’t take on the bankers.

To conclude, thus far the findings from my Indian sample have mirrored the Canadian one; both samples consist of exerting religious influence through worldview and through administering "faith" as a service, where prayer is the dominant manifestation. But the next theme is somewhat unique to India.

*Religious Influence Exerted Through Primary Services.* This theme refers to the way that primary services, which are taken for granted in Canada, constitute the “good works” that are paired with The Great Commission. In other words, the absence or minimal presence of state-run services, such as publically funded schooling (which costs money even at the elementary
level in India), basic health care (for which one has often to pay), or social services such as unemployment insurance (absent almost entirely), leaves many looking to charitable organisations for these services. This is a niche for FBOs in India to fill and constitutes the social work “platforms” through which religious influence is exerted. The three primary services through which FBOs exert religious influence or seek to fulfill The Great Commission in my sample are childhood education; healthcare; and what I refer to as material support, either in-kind or financial. I start with education and the following participant’s comment:

    Government English-medium [i.e., English-language] school starts from grade one onwards, but [the slum children] don’t have a kindergarten training. Kindergarten is private. It is run by some people. The fees is [sic] very high. For example, one year fees is [sic] coming around $1500 USD…it cannot be affordable to the slum people, because their income, the maximum their income is $100 USD in a month…so they cannot afford to send their children into the kindergarten school…so that’s the reason…slum children cannot access to the English medium school, because there is no ladder – they didn’t study any basics. (I15S1)

Accordingly, then, this organization provides basic education to children starting at the age of about four, in preparation for entrance exams to English-medium schools starting at grade one.

As the participant noted, public schools providing basic education are, by virtue of their fee-for-service model, out of reach for many residents of the slum. But I was told that this FBO's attempt to compensate for that gap was successful: “most of our students” do, in fact, gain admission into English-language schools, which is considered in India, as elsewhere in the third world, an almost indispensible tool to climb the social ladder.
However, in addition to the education at this FBO, students are fed and also exposed to low levels of religious education: “we teach them also some spiritual aspects,” said the staff member, and "they sing Gospel song [sic], then we have the Lord’s prayer, maybe they will memorise some Bible verses.” Parents who bring their children also seemingly receive social service but whether or not there is an element of faith remains unclear, though the counseling is certainly pastoral: “mothers come with the children, we give the counseling to them, and plus we teach them hygienic [sic], cleanliness, discipline, how to brush, you know all these things” (I15S1).

Another organization working in slums also had an element of this more-or-less soft religious influence by including “Sunday school” in their education curriculum:

We are giving them tuition [i.e., tutoring], secular studies, you know. Many of them are not going to school. So we are giving them tuition [for free]…then Saturday we have a Sunday school…[where they learn] songs, stories, Bible stories, morals - through that we are developing them, their character and social manners.

Yet another organization’s full mandate was to work with children, and had an explicit and almost central focus on evangelising. The two participants from the organisation were, however, more reluctant to share what they did, how they did it, and when. However, both indicated that education and religious influence were quite intimately paired, observable in this dialogue:

I5S1: We help children by teaching.

R: What do you teach them?

I5S1: We teach them morals, we teach them songs/

I5S2: Value education. Value education.

I5S1: We teach the Bible.
R: The moral education and the values that you teach, are they biblically based?

I5S1: Yes.

Finally, in addition to this model, which applies to children in slums who usually have parents and homes and thus some semblance of a social safety network, there were a couple of FBOs in my sample who operated what they called orphanages or had arrangements to work in orphanages to evangelise the children therein. While it might be odd to think of an orphanage as a “primary service,” it is nonetheless where many of the basic needs of some Indian children are met, and education is one of the main needs around which these orphanages seemed to have been modeled. I wasn't invited to attend any of these, but at least one participant from an organization spoke explicitly about the way their orphanage or “school” serves as a kind of long-term discipleship programme. "It's beautiful," he noted, when commenting on how one student ultimately became a pastor and began drawing his friends to the faith (I9S1).

The second primary service of concern is healthcare and I am using the term here broadly to encompass not only what is conventionally considered healthcare but also the “prayer healing” I discussed above. I include the prayer healing, because while it isn’t healthcare proper, and would not be considered so by the formal Canadian or Indian healthcare systems, it nevertheless functions as healthcare among the slums. As the reader has seen, moreover, such "prayer healing" is a way in which religious influence is exerted.

Furthermore, in certain cases, it is not clear whether or not the prayer healings are independently administered from allopathic medications. It is possible, and perhaps even likely, the two are paired at times. The importance of this point is that some slum residents might not know the difference between the two, or be able to distinguish their effects in real time: if I am prayed over and given antibiotics, was it the prayer or the medicine that healed me? So the reader
is encouraged to think of the multiple instances of prayer healing as constitutive of "health care" here.

Apart from these healings, then, the major source of allopathic healthcare are one-off medical clinics. The major way these clinics are delivered are through medical vans. The van in Figure B belongs to an umbrella “trust” which owns the van and then rents it out to FBOs and presumably others. At least two of the FBOs I sampled rented this particular van on particular days, but all days were rented by at least one other FBO in Mumbaibased on the schedule I saw and confirmation with one staff member. These FBOs then park the van just outside or inside a slum and offer basic health care at a nominal fee. I was told there is - and seem to have met - a licensed medical doctor inside the van, but the majority of staff are from the FBO.

The staff members start their day off with a prayer, and then await residents of the slums seeking care. One staff member of a FBO I spoke to receives anywhere from 10 to 40 such residents of the slum each day for roughly two hours. While the residents are offered care, whether it be wound-dressing or medication or diagnosis, staff members of the FBO talk to the clients about Jesus and invite them to church. I was, unfortunately, not able to be present while the van received clients, but was able to go inside and meet the doctor and FBO staff and was told what happened.

Interestingly, while I was there I was taken on a motorcycle ride through the slum the FBO operated in with the van and was able to observe the interaction between former patients and the staff member who received me. He would seemingly stop at certain houses and make conversation about faith. For instance, he asked two individual females each living in separate homes why they didn’t come to church and applied some pressure on each of them to attend. While it’s hard to impute any feelings on the part of the residents, at the very least it's important
to note they had considerably less power than the staff member; both of the former clients were female and residents of the slum, while the staff was male, relatively well off, and driving a brand new bike (with me dressed in Western garb to boot). Moreover, both residents seemed somewhere in between being Hindu and moving or considering moving toward Christianity. Here is another staff member discussing this van, as well as associated medical support they might provide for clients:

We treat them with medication, basic tablets, antibiotics. Any small injuries they would be concealed and cleansed. What we do is we cater to the slums which would have about 10,000 people in them. We would gather maybe 30-40 people…and we also provide medical help out of people we come in contact with…we would provide medical help for major operations or surgeries that need to be done…we would ask them to come prepared with their expenses and their budget. Sometime back we helped someone who had a heart disease and we had provided the money for a bypass. We would fund some amount of the money. We wouldn’t fund the whole thing. (I13S1)

Overall, this method of pairing evangelism and social service is quite successful, I was told (I13S2).

Finally, the third type of primary service I call material support, which refers to financial or in-kind support analogous to what we might expect of a means-tested social safety programme, such as those in more developed countries like Canada and the U.S. – e.g., monthly stipends or food stamps. Intriguingly, some residents of Mumbai with whom I spoke said that the number of taxpayers in India is 1% of the total population. While I haven't been able to confirm this, there were several who made such comments, and various elements of Indian society support this figure, including the level of tax avoidance and corruption noted by residents, the
widespread nature of a cash-based economy, and the high proportion of India who are poor or disenfranchised. Regarding the latter, one recent report claimed that about 60% of Mumbai’s residents lived in slums; that's about 12 million people, or more than twice the population of Toronto (Chandran, 2018). All of this means there is virtually no funding for a social floor. Some FBOs in my sample, therefore, meet these needs and do so either by in-kind gifts or some kind of financial support.

Figure B. Medical van which is rented by FBOs and visits Mumbai slums to provide healthcare.

For instance, four residents I spoke to in a slum with short interviews each had received "gifts" for their children and at least two had received other material support through the church, mainly food and cooking utensils. In addition to these gifts, the organisation coordinated with
Samaritan's Purse to have gifts delivered to residents during Christmas. When I asked the staff member if clients received money, he said no; this was paired with clients often insisting that of any economic progress: “parameshwar ne dia” or “God gave it to us” upon conversion. Whether or not the boundary between provision by God and provision by the church was made by clients is unknown and I felt uncomfortable to ask.

Regarding financial support, a former liquor- and drug-dealing devotee of the Goddess of Happiness, Santoshi Maa (literally Mother of Happiness), received a Rs. 10,000 loan from the FBO working with her, which she claims to have paid back. After having been incarcerated twice and lost her possessions, she claims to have established a construction business, building homes around the slums, which ranged from Rs 200,000 to 300,000 (i.e., $3000-4000 USD) (I13C1). Overall, I was very impressed with her success, especially after having spent so much time incarcerated over her adult life. Somehow she was able to have a home that was sufficiently large to support herself, two sons and their wives, one grandchild, and reserve the bottom for a "house church," all within a matter of years after seemingly losing it all. Moreover, she wore what was likely thousands of Canadian dollars worth of gold on her person, and the inside of her house was almost pristine, with what seemed like marble or granite floors. It was, in many ways, a diamond in the rough and shone compared to the dozens of houses I saw in multiple slums. (In fact, it was nicer than my own apartment in an upper-middle class neighbourhood in one of Mumbai's more affluent residential areas). All of this seems to have been a product of the loan on one hand but also attributed to God. There was one interesting instance where the staff member, who was present and translating for me, stopped her abruptly when I asked about the financial situation - "Nahi, nahi, nahi!" or "No, no, no!” he said, almost emphatically (I13S2).
This could have been nothing or it could have been the staff member attempting to curate what was told to me by the client.

This client also seems to have worked with the FBO to move a total of eight family members into the church and away from Hinduism, but also, not unimportantly, into stable economic positions. One son’s first job was a product of the FBO staff member’s bidding. The staff member arranged with the mother to have her son hired as a clerk at a Bible book shop, where the son claimed he first found God. Another son ran a local phone repair shop and was also doing well for himself.

That same organisation also provided a loan to a would-be, auto-rickshaw business owner, whose initial inclination toward the FBO, said one staff, was likely due to his belief the church would help him financially. After receiving the support, he converted and now, like the four residents mentioned above as well as the construction business owner, attributed his success to God.

The religious influence in these circumstances is difficult to pin-point. It is also a tricky subject as much of the controversy and violence in India between Christians and Hindus stem from the latter’s claim that financial or in-kind material support is used as an “inducement” to “lure” unsuspecting clients into the fold of Christianity. I didn't observe any clear examples of inducement, but it is also quite clear that the FBO here functions not only as a spiritual beacon but a financial one. Doubtless the slum residents who visit the "house church" at the construction business owner's house are as equally impressed as I was at the material success that's evident. It seems, therefore, plausible and reasonable that some might end up believing that the material success is a function of a benevolent Christian God and, of course, the FBO might be there as a stop gap anyway.
Conclusion on Nature and Extent of Religious Influence in Indian FBOs. I want to conclude this section on the nature and extent of religious influence. The reader will recall that the first theme, like the Canadian sample, was that The Great Commission was an institutional policy in the FBOs I sampled in India. Again, like Canada these FBOs seemed to strive not to coerce, or at least "force" clients to convert. We will see why this is more complicated than first meets the eye when I present new data in the implications chapter and expand on it further in the comparison chapter. Like Canada, Indian FBOs thus sought to exercise religious influence through other ways. This included through worldview and faith as a service modality. Unique to India, however, was the exertion of religious influence through the provision of primary services, including education, healthcare, and material support. Next, I will close out the primary findings by presenting the outcomes of religious influence in India.

What are the Outcomes of Religious Influence in Indian Faith-Based Organisations?

Concerning the outcomes in the Indian sample the same two themes seemed an accurate characterisation of the data – non-spiritual and spiritual transformation. But I want to comment on three points of distinction.

First, it seems to me the separation between non-spiritual and spiritual outcomes was even more difficult to make while coding the Indian data compared to the Canadian one. Therefore, perhaps if I had coded the Indian data first I might not have separated them in the Canadian one. Still, I think the question of whether or not to separate them is minimal and doesn’t distort the data so long as one bears in mind the two caveats mentioned above with respect to the Canadian sample: (1) there is a continuity between responses to the first and second research questions (i.e., the first is "cause" and the second is "effect"), and (2) my measures cannot distinguish well between direct and indirect outcomes of religious influence.
Second, perhaps related to this difference between samples in terms of the greater blurring of spiritual and non-spiritual outcomes in India, is the greater use of prayer as a kind of panacea in the Indian study. But logically that makes sense, as when there is such a purely spiritual intervention for commonly non-spiritual problems (e.g., addictions, HIV/AIDS, death), there is bound to be a thinner line separating spiritual from non-spiritual outcomes. In fact, while none of the codes under this theme overlap with the codes for the outcomes of prayer, those outcomes should be considered here as outcomes of faith or religious influence.

Third and final, because some of the outcomes have already been mentioned while discussing “faith healing” or “prayer healing,” or implied above in the “prayer as service modality” section, or elaborated on in the Canadian study above, I will keep this section relatively short to avoid redundancy. Still, the reader is encouraged to bear in mind that this brevity in presentation does not indicate brevity in data; there are 31 and 22 non-overlapping codes for non-spiritual and spiritual outcomes, respectively. Moreover, several of these codes refer to clients or staff discussing more than one outcome, e.g., marital harmony as a function of alcohol cessation. So there is certainly enough data, but a good portion of it wouldn't seem novel to the reader for the reason mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph. Let's begin with non-spiritual transformation.

Some Clients Experience non-Spiritual Transformation. As with the Canadian study, non-spiritual outcomes refer to the effect of faith specifically on service-related outcomes that might otherwise be addressed through secular means. These are the "this-worldly" problems for which clients seek help. Again, as with the Canadian study, the outcomes were all seen or described as positive by staff and clients. But there are two differences from the Canadian outcomes that bear mentioning. First, despite the instruments being slanted toward the
psychological triumvirate of behaviour, thought, and emotions, staff and clients seemed habitually to deviate from this categorisation and comment, in true Indian fashion, in whatever way they desired. Second, unlike the Canadian outcomes, if I were to propose a set of "sub-themes," even as a kind of heuristic tool as I did above, they would be different. For the Indian outcomes, the vast majority of the outcomes seem either to be related to (a) health or (b) economic problems. For instance, one unique point about the Indian sample is that alcohol cessation was mentioned by at least eight participants as a much welcomed non-spiritual outcome. Another participant commented on the cessation of smoking, while yet another on the cessation of drug use and abuse. In addition to these, other health-related problems included, unspecified leg problems being healed, demons causing fever being exercised, poison being treated as if by antidote, and a family member taking medication, which was also believed to be a function of spiritual intervention. To this list of outcomes, as I mentioned, we can add those mentioned in the section on prayer as a service modality, such as cancer, fits, HIV/AIDS, and depression."

The more economic changes included a family member getting a job, which was mentioned by at least three participants (I4S1, I7C2, I13C1). In addition, two client participants spoke about social mobility as a function of divine intervention (I7C3, I7C4). A staff translating for me said about a client, "Her all relatives, all family, socially they developed. Their in law [sic] they didn't have house, proper house, but now they have house. They're living a good life [now]" (I7C1). Another client at the same organisation commented through the translator who relayed to me that "they had a small hut, [but] now they build a house, because of God's blessing."

---

" For the same reason mentioned in note 36, I do not provide the individual codes for the participants here."
That is what she believes" (I7C3). This same participant attributed her daughter's recent marriage into a Christian family as a form of divinely ordained social progress, too.

In addition to these two sets of outcomes (i.e., health and financial), there's a spattering of others, including peace or absence of discord in the home (I7C4); repaired marriages (I8S1, I15S1); cessation of criminal activity such as theft (I7S1, I7S2); and a handful of outcomes similar to the character education mentioned above, including a renewal of character (I5S1, I5S2, I12S1), minor life transformation through salvation (I4S1). Here is one staff, commenting generally on what I have just discussed regarding the impact of faith on non-spiritual domains of life:

I can give you examples, people who were alcoholics, have over a period of time, have given up alcohol. People who were smokers have sort of stopped smoking. People who had issues in their marriages, their marriages have completely sort of healed. Uh, but yeah, I mean lives have changed…our objective is to repair lives. So over a period of time we’ve tangibly lives changing [sic]. (I13S1)

Some Clients Experience Spiritual Transformation. As with the Canadian study, several participants, staff and clients, commented on some form of spiritual transformation. Again, as above, I should point out at least one distinction. Unlike Canada, nobody spoke about strengthening of existing faith, because most of the clients were Hindus and the FBOs were Christian. As we might expect then, my data suggests that in India there might be, to lean on statistical language, a more "bimodal distribution," such that most of the participants speak about either (a) a shift in faith or (b) none at all. The latter point has far fewer codes supporting it, but it is implicit in some of the data and, moreover, consistent with my observations, i.e., while speaking to several participants off the record. Here is one staff participant referring to a rather
common experience, to paraphrase Thomas King referenced in the literature review, the clients from the slums come for the hardware but leave the software:

Though they understand [Christianity] is western religion. But still, whenever they are in need...they come to church. They approach us and we counsel them and pray for them. So then they get healed and go back. Some people they regularly they come to church. Only few people they come regularly to church after. But [most] people after they are getting healed from the psychological problems or physical sickness, they go back. (I7S1)

When I asked how the staff felt about this and whether or not they felt "used" he responded by saying no, that "We feel some other day, God will touch them." Another participant estimated that about 20% of visitors to the medical clinics mentioned above come to church, meaning 80% take the service and leave. Another stated that about 5% of people responded to their outreach efforts: "The response is very less. People are not so interested in the religious activities." I then asked why he thought that was, he said, "See because already they are in the religion...see for example you brought the water...I [offered] you water, you said 'I am already having [water]'...they're already satisfied with [their] religion...so they're telling 'we're satisfied'...[but] that 5% will response." This same participant stated later that over 5 years in one programme, perhaps 2 or 3 out of a total of 60 women attending a skills development programme converted, which is between 3 and 5% (I15S1). Though I didn't code each instance dozens of mentions were made both on and off the record of people asking, particularly, for prayer and then leaving without making any movement toward Christianity.

But some do convert. It is here, again, where the blurry distinction between spiritual and non-spiritual outcomes crops up, as many of these participants converted after something positive seems to have happened from a service, perhaps in response to prayer. In fact, the reader
has already observed such a phenomenon above, when I discussed a participant who ultimately
tore down her Hindu idols and converted after being healed of an illness. Another instance is
provided by the same participant organisation mentioned above, in fact, the same client
participant who went from a hut to a house; she and her husband both converted after being
exercised of nearly 20 demons by the church in their area. Another organisation working with
children stated that several of the children they work with accepted Christ (I5). Another was
suspiciously unrefined in his comments:

"When miracles happen, they do come to know the love of Christ, almost everytime,
God works and his power has manifested and they know that yes, this is the right way.
[R: Wow, so everytime they ask for prayer, pretty much they come to Christ?]. Yeah,
exactly. (I5S1)

But these more simplistic transitions to faith were also accompanied by more complicated
ones. When I spoke to one staff participant about a conversion, I asked about how many people
experienced a faith transformation in that way and he said: "It's difficult to say. But almost all
have been impacted, but to various degrees. Somemay be fully, I mean radically
transformed...they can testify themselves. Others have received the touch and they say they're
happier, or at peace. Degrees of change" (I1S1).

However, some comments indicated that the more complicated transitions were also a
function of political context. For instance, one staff member spoke about "sowing" seeds in
children with an outreach programme, but doing so carefully given that their parents were not
Christians (I13S2). And another organisation with a prison ministry spoke of the "slow and
subtle process" of converting inmates, which started with "spending time with people" and
eventually once "we make inroads" and build "trust" people are more open to speaking about God (I14S1). The reason for the slow speed, here, was the current political climate. He stated:

I mean yes, India is a democracy. There is freedom of expression. And we can practice religion...But I think because of the current political situation in the country, I think, prohibits us from sort of freely expressing our faith...I mean there is a lot of sort of stigma against Christians that we convert people and stuff like that. So we have to be a little careful is what I would say. (I14S1)

Note the conflict here between trying to convert inmates and then referring to the "stigma" of Christians as trying to convert others.

**Conclusion on the Outcomes of Religious Influence in India.** Overall, while an absence of survey data makes it a little more difficult to be confident in the data here, there does seem to be two major types of outcome in my data set - non-spiritual and spiritual. These overlap to a greater degree in the Indian sample than in the Canadian one, likely due to the greater use of purely spiritual interventions.
PART IV: SECONDARY FINDINGS

With a sufficient understanding of the primary findings just discussed, i.e., the answers to
the first two research questions, I present here answers to the third and fourth research questions,
which constitute the "secondary findings." Recall that they are "secondary findings" because they
depend to varying degrees on the data from the first or primary findings and were included
because they were more or less necessary as noted above. These secondary findings are
presented below by question but aggregated across the two studies as (a) the implications of
religious influence and social service for social work, social welfare, and social policy and (b)
the similarities and differences between my two samples.

Policy

Beginning with the implications on the three domains here indicated, I will attempt to
trace out how either the primary findings discussed above, or other data not discussed above,
might help answer this secondary research question. In the interest of space I operated according
to a general rule of thumb - include no more than two implications or no more than six pages per
sub-section (e.g., two implications or six pages for social work, two or six for social welfare,
etc.). This rule of thumb was useful in helping me select only those implications that were most
germane to study, while limiting the size of this section to something manageable for the reader and appropriate for a dissertation. The understanding here, in other words, is that I don't present an exhaustive discussion of the implications but those which best fit the data and the dissertation's scope and intent. In the end, I discussed one implication per domain.

**Implications for Social Work**

Starting with social work, recall that by “social work” I refer to the provision of social services at the individual or relational level, and this includes the professional and academic facets of provision embedded within the regulated profession of “Social Work.” Here there is one major “theme” or implication I would like to discuss and it, as the reader might guess, pertains to the question which animated this work in the first place, the one posed by Cnaan and Boddie - “Will social workers be able to comply with the *NASW Code of Ethics* while working in FBOs?”

Before commenting on how this might be answered with the data above, consider some new data, first in the form of the following graph, which outlines the percentage of respondents on the survey who stated that there were registered social workers in their organisation.

Figure C. *Responses to question, "Are there registered social workers in your organisation?" by percentage*

![Graph showing percentages of responses to the question: Yes (37%), No (47%), I don't know (16%).]
While 37% is certainly not a majority, it does constitute a significant minority. Moreover, based on an option to comment, I received five responses with numerical values ranging from 1 to 8 and averaging 4 per organisation.

Moreover, if we take this data and juxtapose it alongside the primary data, which discussed multiple ways that staff exerted religious influence, albeit in non-coercive ways, we might then duly ask what it means for the discipline of Social Work that there are as many social workers in my sample organisations. These social workers, of course, are bound by a code of ethics which forbids religious influence and warns against dual relationships and boundary crossing. But they also work in organisations which have as their operating policy The Great Commission and which routinely, almost as a matter of course, require their staff to traffic in “dual” relationships.

Another question on the survey question which might shed further light on the potential quagmire at hand is presented below. Consider Figure D, which outlines the percentages of respondents who indicated whether or not there was a “formal policy concerning discussion about faith with clients”:

Figure D. Responses to question "Do you have a formal policy concerning discussion about faith with clients? by percentage."
With 43% saying there isn’t a policy and another 33% unaware of one, it’s fair to propose, if tentatively, that a policy of conduct with respect to faith-sharing might not be a major feature of Canadian FBOs. What this might signify is that if there are conflicts experienced by staff or volunteers, Christians and registered social workers alike, there might not be a clear answer to the otherwise complicated questions they experience associated with sharing faith in a service setting. This is likely to be particularly difficult to navigate for staff if sharing is a point of friction between Social Work and Christianity as paradigms.

One is inclined here to recall some of the data discussed above. For instance, recall the statement, “We are not social workers…We are the church,” and the clear conflict it paints between social work and Christianity and thus service and evangelism (C7S1). Or recall the fact that about a quarter of respondents indicated "sometimes" when asked whether "clients can receive service that is not faith-based" or that "programmes require religious conversion."
Clearly, both of these items indicate that a noticeable minority of respondents might see some friction between social work and Christianity.

It is, of course, important to pay mind to the fact that comments such as the one above usually represent one person within one organisation at a specific moment in time, and that the data I discuss come from a small and non-random sample. But taken in the context of each - i.e., the triangulation inherent to the study - means that it is at least suggestive that absent any policy regarding faith-sharing, there might also be pressure, at least psychologically from The Great Commission, to dissociate from the profession at times when sharing faith is concerned.

However, my own participant sample consisted of only one registered social worker who was also a person of devout faith; and interesting, though perhaps not coincidentally, this person stood in stark contrast to other participants with respect to faith-sharing (C14S2). His view seems to run counter to the grain established by the other FBOs and their staff. (In fact, he differed markedly from two other staff members with whom I spoke at the same organisation, neither of whom were social workers). While again it’s improper to extrapolate from just one person (e.g., I know or know of many registered social workers who are less refined about service and evangelism), this example is also suggestive of social work’s professional education and “socialising,” dare I say secular, influence. It is, in other words, worth considering in future work what the influence of social work education might be on ideas related to faith-sharing.

Thus, of the number of elements of this interview which stood out as markedly different from others, included is the clear indication that while the faith motivated the staff member and his organisation to provide service, “[i]t’s not like a church where your goal or your mandate would let’s say be, conversions. That’s not what we’re here for right.” Another salient difference was the participant’s insistence that while they observed the principle of holism, and this was
embedded into their programmes, the holism here was less about pairing the Christian faith and social service, but rather about pairing any faith with service. In other words, if a client practiced Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Sikhism or didn’t practice anything at all, it was the responsibility of the holistic provider - in this case a Christian one - to include these “spiritual” elements into the full package of service. Here is a passage that demonstrates this version of holism and which also highlights the influence of social work education in such scenarios:

For example, [if] the client said “I used to go to church. I haven’t gone to church in a while.” I’m definitely not gonna be saying “Well hey, come up to my church.” [Because] [t]here’s some ethical boundaries there, right?...You're potentially crossing that line between your professional relationship and entering into a different relationship, a different context. If I invite someone to church who’s my client, it’s just creating a whole kind of ethical problems [sic] for the client and myself. We’re now transferring into a different relationship…potentially they could feel threatened...because obviously...[there's] a power imbalance...because I know so much about them [and]

[t]hey don’t know anything about me. (C14S2)

He went on to say that in keeping with his belief that spirituality is an integral component of the human experience, he would accompany clients, if need be, to a faith gathering. But even if he were to accompany someone to a new faith gathering, he reiterated it certainly wouldn’t be his, and he’d make it clear, moreover, that he’d be going as their worker – again highlighting the issue of relationship boundaries.

Here is another passage demonstrating his conscientiousness about boundary crossing, specifically. As the reader will be able to tell this issue is, for him, clearly not dissociated from his identification as a social worker or his association with the profession:
As a social service worker or social worker, you know, the understanding is...[that] we’re there not to do any harm. So that’s first and foremost, that we’ve been placed there, to walk alongside people. To help people. Not to do any harm. So we have to ensure that when we’re having these conversations [about faith] that (a) it’s client-directed, that they want to have these conversations, [and] (b) that, you know, if they ask me I’m gonna tell them flat out “This is where I’m coming from; this is my belief system.” (C14S2)

When we further spoke about the potential “grey area” or ambiguous circumstances he alluded to in the above passage, particularly when, according to our discussion, services are provided from within a church, where there might be more pressure to evangelise, he said: “I can definitely see that grey area, where it can become problematic if people aren’t very conscientious of you know ’What is our role?’ ’What is our mission first and foremost' and working with transparency.” I then asked more pointedly if he thought his education had any influence on his thinking about these issues:

So I would say [my education] plays an important role. If my faith gives me the foundation as to why I wanna do the work that I wanna do, I think education gives me the broader context. And it also gives me an opportunity to work alongside people, and talk to people, debate with people, engage with people, who are coming from a totally different worldview and making sure that I balance both...I understand that as a social worker, you know, I am agreeing to certain ethical practices. The more education you get, the more you move along, the greater you understand these, the greater you understand the systematic issues, so you can work better for, work smarter for your population. And at the same time my faith is what has informed me as to why I wanna do this work and to how I wanna approach this work. So, for me, it’s the best of both worlds. (C14S2)
Another participant who was not a social worker but served as a "key informant" in my study also expressed reservations about pairing evangelism and service. And while this person is not a registered social worker, she has nonetheless worked in FBOs for quite some time: "I don't understand how you do that," she said, when we discussed the pairing of evangelism and service (C18S1).

While my Indian sample did not have the survey results noted above, the qualitative data is far less nuanced and thus more clearly suggestive of an answer to what might be the clearest implication for social work with Cnaan and Boddie's question in view. It seems to me safer and easier to conclude that the data from India indicates that social work is being used intentionally as a kind of "wedge" for evangelism. As the reader will recall, while many participants noted their desire not to coerce or forcibly convert their clients, several – including some who, in theory, objected to coercive tactics – were quite forthright about the fact that social work was a kind of “means to an end” (I2S1).

For instance, upon asking one participant a variation of the standard question on the interview guide, “What is the intention of praying for them; what is the intention of sharing the Gospel?,” I received the following response:

I think for us it would be to, for them to know Christ. In the Bible it says “Go into all nations, proclaiming the Good news”… it’s called the Great Commission and that is where we would find our basis to interact with these people and let them know who Christ is. Really, the social work is just a platform to help us to interact with them on a face-to-face basis and just take it from there [R: So social work is a platform to share the Gospel?] Yes. (I13S1)
This participant later said that the evangelism was more important than the service, consistent with the "holism with priority" principle discussed above, affixing a value of 70% to the former and 30% to service. A co-worker seemed to confirm this dynamic between social work and evangelism (note the undertones of relational evangelism, too):

I13S2: That is just a key. That is just a key. Just to go into their life. Social work [pause]
R: Social work is?
I13S2: It is like a key just to go into their life [inaudible]. What I mean to say is...suppose if I help you. Then I build a relationship with you. And once I build a relationship with you it's very easy to share the Gospel.

A staff member from another organisation stated it perhaps even more bluntly by saying that, “whatever we do as social work, it may be social work, but the main reason is, they should know Jesus as their saviour. That is our main intention.” (I10S1)

Here is another participant with a more sophisticated statement that highlights the seamless transition from principles amenable to a secular social work (e.g., helping the oppressed) ultimately to sharing the Gospel:

What we read from the Bible is to accept people who are not accepted by others and to help the needy and help the oppressed. That is the major Gospel [inaudible]. As we said, the faith and the social work – social work is just another framework to get to people.

And when these two go hand in hand, it’s definitely one action together, when we try to expand faith, or teach them faith, it’s through social work.” (I12S3)

While it seems clear that this is a common and simplistic way of conceiving of the integration of faith and service, and I have suggested this might be definitive of Indian FBOs, there is, nevertheless, more nuance than the above alone conveys. For instance, all of the
participants from the organisations noted above also indicated that both service and evangelism were important, showing that while service might be a “means” it is nonetheless intrinsically important. Of course, this is also perhaps rather paradoxical, and maybe suggests the presence of a kind of doublethink, for how can any "means" have intrinsic value if its value is contingent, by definition, upon its utility in achieving an end?

Another important point to temper the primary interpretation I've provided is that one of those participants also made mention several times of how a bulk of the evangelism occurred outside of the service setting. The “platform,” therefore, which functions as a means, is in some cases more like a "bridge," which leads the clients into the church where more direct evangelism does occur. I got the impression that in the mind of my participant this was an ethically better solution, or if not ethically then certainly politically so, given the climate in India. Of course, this “bridge” metaphor doesn’t do away completely with the ethical problems which ensue from such an arrangement, either.

A third qualifying, perhaps controversial comment, is that while one could argue that it is a bit Machiavellian to use service in this way, there nevertheless are non-spiritual outcomes of the service. To put it bluntly, in other words, clients are still given medicine, education, loans, general assistance of counselling, and more; and for the residents of the slums of Mumbai, this is quite often not a matter of choice, properly speaking. This fact of desperation at once increases the ethical pressure of any given situation but credits the FBOs. Accordingly, several times my participants, myself, and members of my social network in Mumbai would wonder what the Hindu temples were doing to help the slums. After all, the majority of India and the slums consist of Hindus. Indeed, most socially conscious people from a Hindu background such as myself are likely to have had some variation of a rather woefully common experience: one visits
a temple, waits in line for hours, gives a large sum of money as a donation to a temple, then walks outside only to ignore the rampant poverty, donating neither time nor money but rather indifference and even scorn. *Bar se to hum kya milta he? Kuch nahi milta he, nah? Kuch bhi nahi milta he,* resigned one participant, which means, "What do we get from outside [the church]? We don't get anything, right? We get nothing" (I7C4).

Finally, while this is not a qualifying comment, there was one more or less outstanding exception to the rule here that Indian FBOs seem more instrumental in their use of social work for purposes of evangelism. This qualifying comment pertains to a rogue participant, who first used the term "means to an end" as a critique and admonishment of this kind of conduct on the part of Indian FBOs. Here is a passage from him, a staff member of an organisation, taking a typically more complex approach to all that I have just discussed:

You know like relation [sic] evangelism. It sounds like the end goal is to get a number in church and relationship is a means to an end. And I think that’s just being unfair to the person and just being, dishonouring God. I think the way that I would view it is discipleship is a process where you help people move away from self-centredness to Christ-centredness…[Thus in the former method] getting the number is the goal and relationship is a means to an end, whereas in [the latter] way relationship *is* the goal, you know? That’s the ultimate goal and whatever comes of the relationship is not in your hands. [R: So the outcome even if they don’t come to church/] Totally. Totally. Absolutely. (I2S1)

To conclude this point, then, what I have offered here is preliminary evidence that the question about whether or not social workers can work within FBOs is at least empirically valid. In Canada, social workers are present in the evangelical FBOs I consulted, where there seems to
be an imbalance in policies. In other words, all FBOs have The Great Commission as an operating policy for sharing faith, but many staff say their organisations don't have a policy for how and when that might be appropriate, or if they do, they’re not aware of it. Moreover, the sole social worker in my Canadian sample had markedly different views and attributed these views to his formal education. Whether or not this one instance is suggestive of a rule – i.e., whether or not social workers can work within FBOs provided they're formally trained – is a matter that requires further research. I should mention that the participant who was a social worker was also from an organisation that was rather motivated to be seen as a "legitimate" service provider, and was thus far less eager in its evangelistic activities. This might have also tempered his perspectives. (Although parenthetically, one of my participants from another organisation noted that about this FBO there is an ongoing struggle between those who wish to cultivate legitimacy in the eyes of the public, by balancing faith and service, and those who wish to cultivate legitimacy in the eyes of more evangelical supporters).

In India, of course, there is also preliminary evidence that, putting aside linguistic and/or institutional differences between the two countries, Cnaan and Boddie's question is relevant. If we cannot speak about "registered social workers" in these settings, we can certainly speak about social services. Moreover, we might also ask what the findings from India mean for International Social Work and those interested in international FBOs? Or for those who are desirous of international involvement but from a Christian evangelical purview.

**Implications for Social Welfare**

Recall here that this domain refers to the next level of social service provision where the unit of analysis is, more or less, an organisation. This refers, in other words, to the organisation, or the “system” of organisations, through which and with which social service is delivered. Thus,
the FBO – not the client or staff member – is situated here, as are other organisations that constitute a social welfare system.

The issue I want to discuss here pertains to the frequent comparison made by staff and clients between FBOs and secular organisations. Starting with Canada, a total of 33 codes indicated that secular organisations fell short in clear ways. Here, not surprisingly, there are more obvious comments pertaining to the importance of faith or Christ; that is, several participants, staff in particular, noted the value of Christ and the message of “hope” he brings as something lacking in secular organisations, i.e., the salvation-as-service idea. For instance, reiterating the premise of holism discussed above, one staff said, “The difference is Christ and what he brings” (C9S1). But what is perhaps most striking about many of these negative comparisons is that a good number of them have nothing to do with faith directly. Rather, these comments highlight the non-faith related features of the service within FBOs which distinguish and make them superior compared to their secular counterparts, at least in the eyes of my participants.

Let’s start with some of the data already presented above. Recall that one staff member who spoke about how one effect of remodelling the organisation’s programme on relationships as opposed to food was that it “humanises” clients. Another two participants, both “reformed gangsters,” mentioned their satisfaction with the FBO they visited instead of their secular competitors. And what I didn’t mention above when discussing these two is that one of them jokingly gave a nickname to the secular competitor with “Satan” it. This was a play on its actual name and was meant to highlight the environment of drugs and alcohol, propped up, one staff at the organisation implied, by a harm reduction model (C8S2). Recall also the client who said the FBO he visited taught him he could have “faith in people” (C7C2); he too had negative experiences with secular agencies which were ultimately overshadowed by the positive
experiences from the FBO he now visited. Moreover, this was a man leaning toward atheism and not faith. There is also the “healer,” who said that she sought to avoid getting overly distracted by her service-related performance so her organisation didn’t become merely a “kind and efficient food distribution system.” (C1S1)

What these examples suggest is that the preference of FBOs over secular counterparts, according to my participants, stems from the "personal touch" FBOs seem to be able or willing to give. For instance, the “healer” also said this: “I think the faith-infused part gives us a better perspective that we’re not focused on ‘the task at hand’. We do food well so we can do people well”(C1S1). Another instance of the same, here is a conversation among clients which demonstrates the “humanising” element noted above:

C7C2: A soup kitchen or a food bank. You kinda go in their get your food and leave.
C7C1: Yeah, you’re anonymous there.
C7C2: Here it’s kinda like, they bring caring to the table. You know, like? It’s not like “Go pick your food.” You sit at a table. You talk with people, and there’s like this personal, social element to it.
C7C1: Yeah people ask your name.
C7C2: Exactly!
C7C3: You know I’ve gained a lot of friends here from the way they’re set up.
C7C2: Ya. [laughs]
C7C3: You know, we’re [sic] all become family. We pray for everybody. We take care of each other. And become friends and become a family you know. And that’s what I really love about this place you know, is the fellowship.
C7C6: The component of family is what it is. I mean, some people can walk in broken and leave fully loved when they leave…some people come from backgrounds with no family, no, just whatever the case may be from behind it, maybe having the only meal be [inaudible] today, it just shows them that somebody out there cares.

In fact, the congruence between clients and staff here couldn’t have been greater. Here is what the lead staff person at the same organisation had to say a few days earlier, referencing a Ph.D. student’s work with them and a needs assessment. Please note that this is a different organisation and a different needs assessment from the one already discussed above, which served to establish community as the foremost component of another food bank:

After doing community assessment [the PhD student] said “This community needs a food bank.” So that’s one of the things that we did. After praying, we’re gonna do a food bank. But when we did research on food banks, a lot of the food banks that we saw, were like, you are a number, you come, you give your I.D., they would give you your box of food, which you had no real choice in what that was, and then you went…there’s physical brokenness of people that need resources, but that’s the one thing that people jump to right away. But if you don’t tackle the four [types of brokenness] you’re not really tackling poverty. So there’s spiritual brokenness, which is what the church is all about, but there’s emotional brokenness and social brokenness. (C7S1)

So part of the reason these FBOs are doing better, at least by their own estimation and the clients they serve, is that they may be filling a personal or social niche which, according to some of the allusions made by my participants, secular organisations cannot or will not meet. “I don’t know if they’re short staffed [pause],” noted one participant, seemingly perplexed at the chaotic and cold environment of a neighbouring secular competitor (C8S2).
Part of this personal or social touch is, of course, the staff themselves, which, by their own assessment and those of the clients, tend to be more committed than secular competitors. Here is what one new staff member had to say, demonstrating some of the sacrifices staff at this FBO made to ensure optimal service for clients:

We do this because we really do love Jesus and we want to love other people also, because it’s not like we get the highest salary. [laughs] We don’t. Like that’s always like the big thing that we stress right, like, we could be other places. I know so many of the staff who are so educated and who are such good workers that they could be making double, or triple, the amount that they’re making right now. I really respect and look up to the leaders I work with. Some of them have chosen to move into the community so their commitment is really big for these [clients] and for God. And this is only because God is calling us into this community. (C5S2)

Here is another perspective from a group of three staff, which highlights this same “personal” touch at the staff level.

C17S1: I would say our commitment to these kids is probably stronger than any community centre.

R: Do the youth tell you that, too?

C17S2: We’ve had the kids on the Friday night, “You’re not like this other place”…”You guys work here but you’re not crabby”…”You actually care about us.” I’ve also had a teenager come for the first time and others have come here for a while and be like “I bet this girl, like, says ‘all these bad kids’” and it’s just like people doing it for a job as opposed to people doing it on a mission.

C17S1/C17S3: Mmm hmm.
GOOD WORKS AND THE GREAT COMMISSION

C17S1: That’s right.

C17S2: That genuine authentic relationship that goes beyond the walls of this facility, like going to their concerts, and going to their, like just being that actual mentor in their lives. It’s not just a relationship that we foster within these walls.

C17S1: That’s right.

C17S2: It’s like genuine authentic relationships that wants to be a part of their life and watch them grow…it’s not something that’s ‘contained’

C17S1: Yeah, we care for them outside of work hours. You know, whereas most people are being paid to care about youth. We are being paid as well but we raise our own support for this position.

While the same trend of comparing FBOs and their secular counterparts did not emerge in India, mention of the differential commitment of faith-motivated and secular staff was made a handful of times. For instance, one participant said that the faith and the beliefs were a pillar of his work:

Otherwise it's like a job...but this is a vocation. And a commitment. That is it. That makes the difference. So it's not something shallow. It's right from the core of one's being that one is involved with. Otherwise it's not going to last because it can be a quite a challenging job [sic]. (I1S1)

That same participant referred to faith as a kind of "sap" inside of the FBO, which sustains its staff’s commitment and enthusiasm even in the face of the "challenging" nature of the work.

Another participant noted the detrimental effect of a definitive feature of professionalised social work, especially under a neoliberal policy - limited contracts and timelines:
See when we do something to the society...We definitely don't stop...we don't stop that work. Even though there are oppositions and there are the kind of violence against [us].

But still we try to help the people. Because people, see, if in 10 people if someone gets, 1 person gets healing or life [inaudible] we definitely don't want to stop that work (I7S1).

We then went on to discuss the NGO and governmental responses, which he saw as differing from each another, largely because of these contracts:

Yeah, see secular organisations what they see. All NGO or even governmental groups, they have the project system, for two years and three years, or kind of like five years, four years [R: So just to clarify then once secular organisations' contacts are done, they leave?]. Yeah, definitely. Definitely. [R: And you stay?]. Yeah, we stay there. (I7S1)

He then very correctly and astutely pointed out that my own commitment was also limited and "secular" in this regard:

See you have come for your research, how long would you stay? [R: For the research?] See how long would you stay in India...since you have [come] for this work, when this work is over, you'll go. See, the church, all the work that we do. See even [if] we leave, the church exists, the people exist, and the work continues. It's not a time based [thing]. It's not a time limited [thing]. (I7S1)

To conclude this point, then, it’s important to take all of what I've written as tentative, given that no comparative study on the matter has been done in either Canada or India between similar faith and secular organisations. Having said that, discussions with both clients and staff indicate that FBOs are attracting not only clients warm to religion, but also those who’s relational or emotional needs are left unmet by secular organisations, operating as they do – at least in terms of the stereotype – under the sometimes “colder” and more distancing dictates of
professionalism. Secular organisations are “transactional,” to use the word of one Canadian staff participant, whereas FBOs try to be “relational” (C14S1).

Furthermore, connecting this finding with the previous one, it might be that while social work education offers clear rules around boundary crossing that precludes “harm,” it might also, at least in practice, in its effort to prevent harming clients, provide a paradigm that might fail to fully serve them. This is an extremely speculative point and the reader is cautioned against taking it in any other way; but it isn't altogether implausible nor inconceivable and it wouldbe a wild irony for social work as a helping profession, salient among others for its reliance on emotional labour. This point, of course, invites discussion about when and what types of boundary crossing is appropriate and when and how a more relational approach is consistent with existing knowledge on ethical social work practice.

Of course, what this "implication" means for the main topic can take many forms, which like the first implication for social work generates more research questions. We might ask whether the affective dimension in FBOs draws clients closer toward faith. We might ask whether or not personal relationships inherent to FBOs creates a particularly difficult circumstance for the client when considering whether or not to adopt the faith; one is no longer making simply a professional choice, but a personal one to either accept or decline. A client could very well feel like they're "letting" someone down by not adopting faith or feel a sense of social approval for adopting it.

**Implications for Social Policy**

The final dimension to consider is social policy. Recall that social policy here refers to the legal and non-legal regulations which texture and structure the social welfare system and social work; in a nod to Bronfenbrenner’s Macro-System, this definition also includes the
“ideas" undergirding the policies. The one point I want to discuss here has to do with funding. In
Canada, many organisations received public funding despite their very clear and stated aim to
evangelise.

From the survey, for instance, a total of 62% of respondents indicated that they received "funding from municipal, provincial, federal, or other secular public bodies." A subsequent
section which asked participants to comment on the funding indicates that federal funding was
the most ubiquitous. The funding ranged from $50,000-100,000 per year and the most frequently
cited programme was the Canada Summer Jobs programme. Notably, from the Canadian
government's website I noticed that among those who did receive Federal funding from the
Canada Summer Jobs programme was the organisation whose staff person said pointedly that
they wouldn't accept public funding unless such a grant permitted them to proselytise; they
received in 2016 just above $25,000 for the summer (C7S1).

But in interviews it seemed some organisations received even more than would fit within
this range. For instance, in one interview, an organisation's staff boasted that about a full fifth of
its multimillion-dollar budget came from federal, provincial, and municipal grants (C14S1). It's
financial statement also includes a sizable amount from a secular private body. Another
organisation, comparatively smaller but still no house church, indicated in its financial statement
that about a tenth of its funding came from grants in 2016-2017 (C8). For yet another smaller
organisation with a rather clear commitment to The Great Commission, there's about a quarter
from grants in 2016-2017 (C9). And one organisation which works both in and outside of
Canada received in 2016 a whopping seven-figure grant to work abroad in a country in the
Global South (C3).
Contrasted to these FBOs are those on the other end of the spectrum, which did not receive or even apply for funding. But among these FBOs are at least four which receive in-kind donations from a central food bank for their own much smaller food banks, which serve as local outlets. Additionally, if one is to count one other organisation which received both monies from government as well as in-kind donations from a central food bank, then the number of FBOs receiving in-kind support jumps to five. The in-kind donations come, of course, in the form of food and are distributed by the central food bank, which functions as a kind of secular (one is tempted to say "kind and efficient") distribution centre in the province of Ontario. There are more than one such kind and efficient distribution centres, but I obtained the 2017 financial statement of one, which seemed most common and was helping at least four out of the five FBOs in my sample. It received just over $50,000 in government grants, which pales in comparison to the whopping multiple millions it received from donations, presumably from some citizens who might not want to support FBOs. From staff interviews I was told they audited their local outlets and one of the conditions of in-kind donations was a separation of food and religion.

Taking all of this together, the social policy issue becomes clearer: Should the federal, provincial, municipal governments, or any secular body, be providing funds or in-kind donations to organisations which evangelise or which pair evangelism and service? And if so, what conditions must the FBO meet? I am not suggesting an answer here but there are a few things to consider.

First, it's important to recognise that the Government's own official policy doesn't forbid but in fact reinforces evangelism. Not only is evangelism protected under The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but the "advancement of religion" is one of the four categories within which one can register a charity in Canada. Here is what a summary of a policy statement on the Federal
Government's website says in elaboration of this category: "To advance religion in the charitable sense means to promote the spiritual teachings of a religious body and to maintain doctrines and spiritual observances on which those teachings are based." The statement goes on to clarify that "there must be an element of theistic worship, which means the worship of a deity or deities in the spiritual sense." I think a more nuanced understanding of this issue requires deeper study and perhaps consultation with a legal scholar, but it seems clear that the "advancement of religion" and thus evangelism isn't a problem from the policies regulating charities in Canada, a fact which bears on this policy issue.

But one might ask what about the way that the "advancement of religion" grinds against Social Work? This is the second point to consider here. Apart from the obvious fact that the Codes forbid religious influence, there is yet another consideration which, in fact, is not just localised only to Social Work. As pointed out by the Canadian Secular Alliance (CSA) in a recently submitted letter to the Senate Committee on the Charitable Sector, "[w]hile it is commonly argued that religious ethical systems further the public interest, the CSA will observe that many religious doctrines oppose rights that are guaranteed in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms." The four rights that "religious ethical systems" typically oppose, according to the CSA, are (a) "equal rights for men and women"; (b) "equal rights for heterosexuals and homosexuals"; (c) "freedom of speech (through support of laws punishing blasphemy)"; and (d) freedom of conscience (through support of laws punishing apostasy)" (Canadian Secular Alliance, 2018).

Of course, the preamble to the CASW Code of Ethics states rather clearly that "[s]ocial workers are committed to human rights as enshrined in Canadian law, as well as in international conventions on human rights created or supported by the United Nations" (Canadian Association
of Social Workers, 2005a). Moreover, the anti-oppressive tradition in Social Work is so strong that one need not provide much evidence to support the contention that at least the first two rights are strongly supported by social work, putting it at odds with any FBO that might oppose them.

In fact, this point about a broad secular humanism is apropos in yet another way. The Canada Summer Jobs program, referenced above and which granted monies to several of my participant organisations, became a matter of controversy while writing this dissertation. The controversy erupted (still erupting in some sense) when the Trudeau Liberals said they would include a criterion on future applications which would require applicants to affirm that their organisation respected those very *Charter* rights mentioned in the CSA letter. In confirmation of the CSA's position, however, some religious groups vehemently opposed this criterion and Federal CPC leader Andrew Scheer became a frequent conduit for such opposition.

After a highly politicised and publicised row, some clarification to the changes was made by Liberal Minister Patty Hajdu. She outlined that organisations who professed *beliefs* contrary to the rights of women (e.g., abortion) and members of the LGBTQ community (e.g., equal rights to marriage) would not be disqualified by virtue of the fact alone. This position was likely taken because doing otherwise would risk infringing another *Charter* right, but this time on the part of the FBOs staff (i.e., freedom of conscience and religion). Thus, the clarification seemed to indicate that the criterion was included to ensure that public funding didn't go toward charities whose "core mandate" infringed upon or undermined the rights of others. In other words, a demarcation was being made between "core mandate" and "beliefs" (Arthur, 2018). This leaves room, of course, for many of the staff from organisations in my sample, who indicated to me, often indirectly, that they endorsed a traditional view of marriage and gender and sexual
diversity. How this view is experienced by clients, including women and members of the LGBTQ community would be an interesting matter for future research. But either way, this tension between competing rights also bears on this policy issue.

A third consideration is latent in this controversy as well. Arguably, there is a distinction among (a) receiving funding from public bodies, (b) receiving funding from public bodies for the advancement of religion, and (c) receiving funding from public bodies for services in the public interest. I did not ask any pointed questions about the way that public funding was used in my sample. However, I was told by at least two of the participants who received in-kind donations from the secular food bank, that they made efforts to separate the food from the religion. And others made it clear, including clients, that service was never contingent on faith. In other words, the Canadian FBOs seemed quite respectful in this regard.

But at times I also got the impression that the separation was perhaps a fiscal formality and not experiential. In other words, even if an FBO was very diligent in use of public monies, it may not always be easy for clients to perceive that separation, or for FBOS to realise it. In fact, much of the data referenced above (e.g., the principle of holism, the principle of discipleship, prayer as a service) militates against an actual separation of faith and service. Thus, if one is funded, is not the other?

What I am suggesting with this rhetorical question is a variation on the "fungibility" argument I alluded to in the literature review, which states that funding for a religious organisation in any way is funding for the religion itself (see Saperstein, 2003). While the argument is rather weak when considering organisations in which faith is a historical or ambient phenomenon, who are almost always indistinguishable from secular organisations, the argument is rather strong when considering evangelical or faith-permeated FBOs, by virtue of the fact that
in the former faith is not present while in the latter faith is *ever*-present. Thus, the use of public monies for FBOs might risk lending a kind of second-order validation to a given religious belief system.

Responses to the following question, a moderately high mean with little variability, are also telling: "Faith-based elements of the programming (such as prayers, Bibles, pamphlets, conversations about faith, invitations to join faith gatherings) are present when clients receive service?" ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.76$).

**Conclusion on Implications for Social Work, Social Welfare, and Social Policy.** To conclude, what I have presented in this chapter is a brief discussion of the implications of my findings for social work, social welfare, and social policy. I combined the primary findings with new data to suggest three major implications, one for each domain. The first implication was for Social Work, and this implication pertained to the question by Cnaan and Boddie. I noted that there was evidence for a large minority of registered social workers and confusion around policies governing faith sharing in my sample organisation in Canada. In India, the absence of a survey and a robust Social Work discipline made it difficult to pose Cnaan and Boddie's question directly. But the instrumental use of social work as a wedge for evangelism was clearly on display. Overall, the question of whether or not social workers could work in FBOs and remain true to social work was validated for Canadian and Indian FBOs and these preliminary data suggest a complicated answer in need of further investigation. The second domain concerned here was social welfare, where I discussed the way staff and clients in both countries saw a differential level of commitment, favouring FBOs over secular organisations, and greater "personal service," overall. Though this finding wasn't as obviously connected to religious influence, the fact that FBOs may be more willing to transgress *some* personal boundaries in
order to "put people first," or generate a less-professional and more communal environment nonetheless bears on religious influence. I wondered, are gaps in the way professionalised, secular organisations, generally speaking, fostering a movement toward FBOs for certain clients? Finally, the third domain pertained to the question of public funding. Here we observed that a good number of the organisations in Canada received public monies or in-kind support and asked questions based on some of the literature about what this implies, given that these organisations exert religious influence on clients.

Chapter 2: Notes on an Emerging Comparison

Arguably, the essential value of any comparative work is that it allows one to see and understand each party, as well as the attribute in question, in a manner that wouldn’t be possible without the comparison. This next section thus outlines preliminary notes on an emerging comparison between Canadian and Indian FBOs, and ultimately FBOs across multiple national contexts. Originally, the comparison was supposed to be supported by all methods, including the closed-ended questions on the survey, which would have provided statistical evidence for those comforted by the blanket of numbers. But because of the threat to validity of the survey measure and my decision not to administer it in India, this section consists of comparisons based largely on the qualitative data and my notes. Interestingly, the methodological issue of whether or not to administer the survey became an integral part of the comparison and this, along with other methodological issues, constitute a significant portion of this chapter.

Before I get to the comparisons, I should point out what the reader might have noticed already. In many cases I have already commented on the similarities and differences throughout
the findings section, where it seemed natural and relevant. Therefore, I will here briefly summarise what I have mentioned and elaborate only on those points which have hitherto been left out or underexplored. Toward the end of the section, the reader will find a complete summary of the comparison between Canada and India (Table 14). Also, I will first comment on similarities and differences with respect to the primary data. From there I discuss data which falls under the banner of "Comparative Notes on the Research Process," discussing three major points, including (a) my experiences as a researcher in both contexts and (b) my relationships with organisations; and (c) the decision not to include a survey in the Indian study. I did not include comparative information on the implications question because there was insufficient data to do so. Overall, I hope that this section usefully combs through the preceding 80-plus pages to summarise and situate the dissertation's findings before getting to the discussion and conclusion.

**Comparative Notes on the Primary Data**

**The Great Commission as Institutional Policy.** Starting with the first theme, as the reader is well aware, both Canadian and Indian FBOs rely on The Great Commission as an institutional policy which exists alongside the mandate to provide service. There seem to be negligible differences here. For instance, in both cases the same passages from the Bible were presented verbatim as justification for the policy and in both samples The Great Commission came up organically. However, one difference worthy of note here is the differential weight or emphasis on evangelism in India. This was borne out in the interviews and focus groups, where there seemed a greater emphasis, one might say zeal, for bringing people to Jesus in India than there was in Canada, as well as openly instrumental use of social work as a "means" to the end of evangelism, which was observable and discussed in the sub-section on the implication for social work.
Religious Influence Sought Without Coercion. In both countries, staff sought not to coerce clients into adopting the faith, either in tandem with or independently of service. In the Canadian sample, moreover, there was virtual consensus among clients that staff were successful at non-coercion. A mild exception came from an interview with a client wherein the client hinted that some volunteers (not staff) were more aggressive with evangelism (C8C5). In the Indian sample, the coercion theme emerged as well, but clients did not comment on coercion at all and for a number of reasons, including that it wasn't on the interview schedule, I didn't ask.

A telling difference here, which would be useful for future research, is the backdrop against which assertions of non-coercion occurred. In Canada, it seemed both staff and clients were reacting, almost viscerally, to the old-school "violent evangelism" when discussing coercion. In India, of course only staff reacted to past evangelism, but they reacted not to the colonial evangelism of the British, which one might imagine was similar to the "violent evangelism" in Canada. Rather, staff from Indian FBOs situated coercion in the context of the real and imagined threat of the Hindu majority, propped up by latter's accusations of "forced conversion." Interestingly, while I was in India, several incidents occurred across the country related to forced conversions. And while writing the dissertation the USCIRF report for 2018 was released in April. As reported by The Economic Times, the report unsurprisingly pointed out, among other things, that a significant minority of Indian states passed "anti-conversion" laws which presumably target "Christians for proselytizing" (The Economic Times, 2018). The laws constitute a broader "downward trend" in religious freedom at the hands of an increasingly powerful Hindu political machine which sought, so the report alleges, to "saffronise" India (i.e., to make all things Hindu).
My own data complicates this simplistic latter point a bit. While some staff in India did indicate that the threat of violence or some sort of intimidation was a reality, others pointedly said they did not feel threatened. At least two participants even noted the traditionally open-ended nature of Hinduism as a reason why they didn't feel threatened. Furthermore, I presented data above suggesting rather clearly that some FBOs have a desire to "see a blood-washed India" (I12S3). Thus, one might rebut the findings from USCIRF and rightly ask what is the difference between saffronising or blood-washing? Whatever the answer, the context against which issues of coercive and non-coercive evangelism occur differs markedly across these two countries.

A second difference here is the level of confidence one can have in this finding across the two samples. In Canada, there were clients and staff, as well surveys, interviews, focus groups, and observations which supported the finding that non-coercion was both sought and achieved. Moreover, only one staff participant from Canada gave me the impression that they were stonewalling me (a case on which I don't have room to elaborate, but which I comment on below). Additionally, whether justified or not, the willingness of some of my Canadian participants to talk openly about the complexities of coercion and non-coercion also lends confidence that there is a level of consciousness and conscientiousness about the matter, necessary though maybe not sufficient conditions of concern about coercion.

In stark contrast, only staff (not clients) from the Indian sample commented on coercion, and at times in a seemingly reactionary or defensive manner vis-a-vis the spectre of an indifferent Hindu majority; and these comments occurred in interviews and focus groups as no surveys were administered. Thus, fewer sources and methods support the idea that non-coercion is sought and achieved in Indian FBOs. My own observations and the contextual information, moreover, doesn't inspire complete confidence, either. Unlike the rather open nature of the Canadian FBOs
and their staff, many of the Indian FBOs were rather closed off, controlling my experience in a manner that was at times difficult to navigate as a researcher (on which I elaborate below). The level of desperation of clients was also greater as they faced more extreme levels of poverty and illiteracy in India. And, moreover, at times I got the distinct impression that clients didn't have the capacity to understand the finer details of their experience. One staff member who translated for me kept deferring to variations of statements such as "That's what they believe" and "For them, they think that," suggesting he didn't believe as they did; in other words, while he was comfortable facilitating or fostering the movement of his Hindu clients into his church under the pretense that, for instance there were demonic sources causing their poverty, he nonetheless might not have believed the same and might not have suggested otherwise to the clients (I7S2). Another staff member from another organisation, as the reader will recall, seemed to exert some influence over former patients of the medical van in a manner that would certainly not pass in a Canadian setting. Overall, the above caveats mean there's weak evidence of non-coercion in India (I13S2).

**Religious Influence Sought Through Worldview.** While FBOs seek to avoid coercion, religious influence is nevertheless exerted in "non-violent" fashion in multiple ways. First, common to both countries, FBOs exert religious influence through worldview. The Canadian data consisted of survey questions which suggested that staff at FBOs sought to influence behaviour, thought, and emotions through faith. This was then confirmed by qualitative data in Canada, with 21 coded instances, and in India, with 18 coded instances.

The one notable difference here is the question of who's worldview is being forwarded. Among members of the Canadian clientele, the vast majority seemed either nominal Christians or with Christianity in their family's history. In India, this was completely different. The FBOs
were evangelical and many of them were either founded by or connected to their Western counterparts. And, of course, if they were not directly connected in this regard, they were at the very least likely to derive portions of their worldview from the Western evangelical tradition, dominant as it is globally. Moreover, the staff were all Christian, but the vast majority of their clientele were Hindus or Muslims in the slums. Therefore, interfaith interaction was significantly greater in India, a point that bears consideration when reading the data.

Therefore, to the extent that evangelical Christianity is a vehicle for a uniquely Western worldview, the direction of influence is likely to be noteworthy to anyone comparing FBOs across these two countries. Of course, at least two of my participants noted that, apart from the stereotype that Christian groups engage in forced conversion, the other great misconception that hinders Christianity's progress in India is the assumption that Christianity is a foreign religion. Setting aside the debate on that question, the conclusion here is that likely the worldview shift that was sought in Canada was more likely to occur on a spectrum from secular Western humanism to a distinctly evangelical Western worldview, and this shift, as discussed above, was successful to varying degrees. On the other hand, the worldview shift sought in India was from either an Indian Hindu or Indian Muslim one to an evangelical worldview heavily influenced by the Western evangelical tradition.

**Religious Influence Sought through Faith as Service Modality.** The second mode of influence exerted by FBOs, this one also common to both countries as well, is the role of some element of faith to stand in lieu of, or in addition to, service. There was a spattering of different modes which included counseling, either pastoral or a generic and thus less-established variety of therapy; the provision of hope; and the notion that "salvation" is a service, i.e., that Jesus is the
answer to social problems. But by far the most common manifestation of faith as a service modality was prayer, which was coded for 32 times in Canada and 22 times in India.

A salient difference between Canada and India as the reader might have gleaned is the presence of what has been called “spiritual gifts” or "signs and wonders," i.e., every single FBO I spoke to in India had witnessed something that might be placed fairly within this domain. And several had themselves "delivered" those living in the slums from putative demonic forces, including for alcohol addiction, queerness, and the unspecified but devilish effects of the worship of Hindu deities. This was consistent across both smaller and larger organisations in India. But in Canada, there was only one organisation which made such clear assertions about the power of prayer in healing and delivering victims from demonic forces.

**Religious Influence Sought through Social Support.** The fourth mode of influence was through social support and these were of two types. The first type was to establish some sort of community, both physically and psychologically, while the second was for staff members to establish a personal relationship with clients. These two types of "social support" then served as platforms to share the Gospel.

However, this theme emerged only in Canada. But I want to qualify that a bit here. While it didn’t emerge from the Indian data, as such, it was nonetheless present in the background. In other words, while it didn't emerge in discussion with clients or staff, I nonetheless observed that the FBOs provided *de facto* communities for many clients if they were so inclined. Staff, moreover, were often engaging with clients in a way consistent with personal relationships, i.e., absent the cold professionalism that forms the stereotype of secular organisations. One participant even noted the strategic value of forming personal relationships intentionally (I13S2).
And this comment foretold another perhaps prescient one by a different participant, who noted that it seemed relationship evangelism was making its way to India (I2S1).

Thus there is strong evidence to suggest that religious influence is pursued through social support in Canada, as both clients and staff indicated so through surveys, interviews, and focus groups, and all of this confirmed by researcher observation. On the other hand, at least research observation suggested that some form of social support was present in Indian FBOs, usually through church-based fellowship, suggesting weak evidence for this finding in India.

**Religious Influence Sought through Primary Services.** Perhaps one of the reasons why social support didn't emerge within the Indian data was because of a Maslow-like hierarchy: Indian clients seemed more in need of primary services and the FBOs accordingly focused on them. It is through those primary services that religious influence was at times exerted. I indicated three major primary services that were delivered in India: education, healthcare, and material support.

This is obviously rather different from Canada. Consisting as it does of a comparatively stronger welfare system, Canada equips the majority of its citizens with subsidized basic education up to the level of post-secondary; maintains a largely subsidized healthcare system; and has a deteriorating but as-yet-still-functioning set of means-tested programmes to provide some material support for those in need.

This fact points to two key differences between the two countries germane to any comparative work in this domain: (a) Canadian clients of FBOs are experiencing poverty while Indian clients are experiencing *extreme* poverty and (b) Canadian clients are more likely to be literate and with a basic level of education while Indian clients are less likely to be literate and be without basic education. Figures E, F, and G present photographs of areas I visited which
demonstrate the level of extreme poverty and the condition of slums, doubtless familiar to many who've travelled through India or the Global South. The photos, I think, speak for themselves.

**Religious Influence Sought through Programme Design.** The last of the modes of non-violent religious influence is programme design, which emerged as a theme in the Canadian data, and I discussed two principles. The first is the principle of holism, according to which service *must* be paired with the Gospel in order for the former to be "complete." This principle was present to varying degrees across programmes and FBOs. A sub-theme was what I called "holism with priority," which is a term from Stott and Wright (2012). This refers to the idea that while it might be important to pair the two, it is important to bear in mind the implicit hierarchy - salvation is always more important than service, being as it is an offer with infinite, rather than finite, implication. This sub-theme, too, was present to varying degrees across programmes and Figure E. *House 1 from a slum in Mumbai.*
FBOs. The second principle was discipleship, a term that comes up quite a bit in the evangelical literature. In this study, discipleship referred to a principle of programmes that facilitated and even made unavoidable a process with a definite outcome: a follower of Jesus. I indicated here that this principle seemed to be characteristic of larger programmes with a focus on youth.

While a few of my participants from India used the term discipleship and certainly seemed to mean the same thing, there wasn't a lot of evidence that this was designed into the programmes. Regarding holism the same can be said, i.e., it was less designed into the programme but nonetheless present. This particular point of comparison is complicated by the fact that in Canada there appeared to be more "programmes" as such while in India service was
Figure F. A "side street" from a slum in Mumbai
Many Clients Experienced Non-Spiritual Transformation. The second research question about the outcomes of this religious influence was answered with two major themes. The first concerned non-spiritual transformation which many clients across both samples experienced. Here the difference seemed to minimal, but I did suggest that the Canadian sample indicated a slant toward outcomes related to an increase in pro-social behaviour or those related to an improvement in psycho-affective well being. In India, on the other hand, the outcomes seemed related either to health or economic standing.
Many Clients Experienced Spiritual Transformation. The second theme or type of outcome was the spiritual transformation about which clients and staff spoke. Here there is a mild distinction to be made. In the Canadian sample I noted a graded movement from one end to the other on a metaphorical spectrum of spiritual transformation. Clients were either (a) having their existing faith strengthened, (b) warming to faith, or (c) converting. By contrast, the data from India seemed to indicate that clients were either reluctant about spiritual transformation, sometimes "using" the services of the organisation (both spiritual and secular), or engaging in full conversion.

Comparative Notes on Process of Research

In addition to the comparison across the primary research questions, which, as I have mentioned, is summarised in Table 14, there were three other relevant points of comparison that were methodological in nature and should help the reader better imagine what it was like to conduct this research in India compared to Canada, and thus, understand the data better. These three points are (a) the invitation I received to join the faith, (b) my relationship with the organisations across the samples, and (c) my decision not to include the survey in India. The first issue is a commonality while the second and third are differences.

Invitation to the Researcher. While I didn’t include it in the main findings above, because it didn't fit well, it nonetheless is thematic of my data; I coded it as “Invitation to the Researcher.” This refers to a set of codes which encompass the myriad ways in which I was invited (and still am) to engage with the evangelical faith by some of my participants. This was a common though not unavoidable experience in both samples and the type of invitation ranged anywhere from gentle nudges and allusions all the way to borderline finger-wagging, fear-mongering disapproval of my spiritual state: “You too should accept Jesus as your Lord!,” I was
told by a large, intimidating man with an intense demeanour and colleague in tow in a back-alley café my second week in Mumbai. This "invitation" occurred shortly after he highlighted a message of damnation, grilled me about my beliefs, and told me that I wasn’t going to get the full picture of his FBO on account of my non-Christian status. Though he was also seemingly paranoid and indicated that he’s on several “hit lists” and once was almost thrown out of a moving train by a mob of Hindus for his work (I10S1).

Of course, that is an exception. Most invitations were more or less gentle and from staff who said things like “Jesus loves Ravi” (I4S1), or said that if the interview was going to go well “maybe I’ll share Jesus with you” (C2S1). And at least one client engaged in evangelising me. He was part of a focus group in Canada in which all participants had been through considerable and protracted trauma; the emotional weight of the moment was, therefore, heavy and I was considerably shocked when the client broke the fourth wall constructed naturally by long periods of quiet listening: “I hope that many people they don’t wait to live what I have lived, to know the word of God,” he said. Then, with the full effect of breaking a fourth wall, looked at me and said with air-tight certitude and conviction, "You should do the same. [R: Me?!]. Yes.” (C8C2).

I was also prayed for multiple times and the distinction between prayer and evangelism was not always clear to me, perhaps a telling observation in itself: “In the name of the Lord, father, son and Holy Spirit, and I pray that, Lord you be with him, guide him, you be his master, because you are master of everything” (I5S1). Another participant asked politely as we finished: “Are we pretty much done here then? [R: Yes we are]. Okay, before I let you go would it be okay if I prayed for you right now?.” Here is an excerpt:

Father, it’s just been great chatting with Ravi like this, Lord. I’m thankful, Lord, that you love him as much as you love me or anyone else, Father, and you offer him that same gift
of Jesus Christ that you offered me, Lord. Father, I ask that you would touch his heart in the hours, days, weeks, years, decades, whatever Father. Your timing is always perfect, Lord. So I ask that you would touch his heart, Father, and that he would seek to know more about who you are, who Christ is, and who he is, in the middle of everything you offer him now and in all eternity. And I pray this in Jesus’s name. Amen (C3S1).

Many participants read spiritual or cosmic significance into my doctoral work and this came out during prayer, too. Here is one such example that registers in the note of a doubting Thomas or C.S. Lewis, i.e., the sceptic or atheist who gets more than bargained for once a step toward faith is made. This instance occurred at the end of the interview when I asked if the participant had any further questions:

Part of this is also for you. Many of those who read the Bible to analyse it, to find out errors, they have become believers of God. Now you have been researching, hearing from so many people, from me, perhaps, the Gospel. You are exposed. And you should think seriously about your life, because we cannot remain neutral. The Lord Jesus said there are only two ways – narrow way and broad; there are two gates, narrow gate and, you know, broad gate. And you have to decide where you want to enter, where you want to go. There is no neutrality. Either you [choose] the narrow way or the broad way…[the broad way] leads to eternal death. The narrow way…very few enter into it, but it leads to eternal life. And that is what Jesus placed before us, the options, and what you want to choose…the broad way is leading to destruction (I4S1).

Note that the first sentence is pregnant with interpretive possibility (“Part of this is also for you”): Did he mean that he was doing me a spiritual favour by sitting in for the interview? Did
others see the interview not as an equal exchange nor as a scholarly favour but as a spiritual one, an opportunity even?

Though not a prayer, here is a “prophetic word,” again related to the research, which I received from a participant about 17 minutes into our interview:

What you are doing right now, this whole process of studying humanity, and studying humanity with faith and integration, studying the communities of the world and connecting with people is a foundation, not the ceiling. This is a foundation in your entire life and the Lord has really large things for you in mind that he wants to place you in positions where you are going to shift culture, and you are going to shift cultural thinking. And you have to remember that culture means point of view…so when you’re shifting cultural thinking you’re shifting points of view, you’re shifting the points of view of the people. And He wants to place you in positions, in a position that’s really much higher than you have ever imagined…He has bigger dreams for you than you have for yourself even though he’s very, very proud of the big dreams you have for yourself (C1S1).

My dissertation committee was enjoined to consider their place in the process noted above, but I shared this in earnest because such words are likely to be quite difficult not to believe and to be felt rather powerfully, particularly when one is on the wrong side of a power imbalance, not only in the relationship but in society at large, and needs hope. The comment is, all but literally, what dreams are made of, and yet carries an added jolt of divine significance under the sacrosanct banner of “prophecy.” Indeed, I myself have been exposed to this kind of “prophesising” by Hindu pundits when I was younger and found it excruciatingly difficult to avoid thinking and feeling the way their prophecies suggested. I will come back to this point in the Discussion.
For now, let me conclude by briefly noting two reasons to mention this finding apart from its intrinsic value, which is that it is an instance of The Great Commission being heeded. First, note that while I am a graduate student and thus junior colleague in academia, I had considerably more power than clients do, especially in India, and yet I was still an object of evangelism often well before an hour had elapsed. Second, this finding highlights one of the nuances of researching evangelical FBOs as a non-evangelical. Though I personally didn’t mind the vast majority of the evangelism I was an object of – save for the more aggressive type – nor did I mind being prayed for – it’s a kind gesture – I do think I would have been approached differently had I been an evangelical or even practising Christian. Perhaps not in a better or worse way but that distinction doubtless bears on my data to some extent; how, I cannot know, save for the fact that it is likely to render telling differences in many ways. Next I will discuss those difference which I *am* able to discuss.

**Relationships with Participant Organisations.** The second methodological comparison between samples pertains to my entry into the organisations, which I alluded to above but will expand on here. In Canada, only once did an organisation decline to participate and this seemed, in part, to be a function of scheduling. Some were more welcoming and open than others, of course, but by and large, staff (as well as clients) in Canadian FBOs were quite open and willing to, at the very least, sit down with me for a conversation. This posture toward a researcher facilitated easy entry into the organisations. Some of the relationships were so easily established that I would go back to these FBOs without any professional purpose, just to visit.

One exception here for Canada was an organisation which I alluded to above. The staff member behaved very oddly, in my opinion. First, while he was reluctant to participant, he nevertheless did. Then as the interview began he spoke at an embarrassingly noticeable lower
register than he did before we began, making it difficult for my two recorders to pick up his voice during the interview. Then he seemed to stonewall me thoroughly, ending the interview in just about 30 minutes, after having answered all questions in the simplest manner possible, and indicating complete confusion over the pairing of faith and service in any fashion. But what I found most curious about this experience was not the response I got; this would be fine if it seemed so simple. Rather, what struck me was the fact that the responses *deviated* not only from sample organisations that seemed *less* evangelical and more mainstream than this one, but also from information about the organisation on its own website and in the premises. In fact, the staff member is part of an umbrella organisation, a kind of meta-organisation, which is devoted to evangelising. This was the only time in Canada when I experienced something of this nature.

In India, this kind of experience would have been considered better than normal. I didn't count, but dozens of organisations declined to participate. I was asked several times to provide a letter of reference from a church so that they could vouch for me. Related to this point, I was asked almost always, by those who participated and those who declined, what my spiritual beliefs were. My honest response, in many though not all cases, was either dismissed or treated differently. In fact, my host supervisor, Dr. Dabir, told me outright my first week in Mumbai, before I had met with any organisation: "They will not talk to you." Luckily they did, but this wasn't easily achieved. Numerous times, for instance, I was also asked for my qualifications as a researcher, some suspecting that I was anywhere from a disgruntled lone-wolf Hindu to an agent of the state trying to infiltrate an FBO. (Of course, if nothing wrong is being done, then what is there to fear? On the other hand, Hindu mobs are mobs proper and often it seems nothing wrong has to be done to incur their wrath. So it is complicated). Ultimately, on at least six occasions I had to ask Dr. Caragata to "vouch" for me via email. This led to several participant organisations
agreeing to participate and ultimately this method snowballed into multiple participants. Some form of stone-walling was also the norm, though not total, among Indian FBOs. A handful told me I wasn't going to get the full picture, or that they couldn't risk sharing it. Others seemed bothered by some of the words and questions. In the end, I did establish some relationships with organisations, but they were hard fought, and it was the preservation of the relationships that informed, in part, my decision not to include a survey in the Indian sample, to which I turn next.

**Decision Not To Include Survey.** The decision not to include the survey in the Indian study was a very difficult one, because it meant that I wouldn't be able to compare quantitative data. But after consideration of my conversations with Dr. Dabir and consultation with Dr. Caragata and one of my Indian participants, I think the decision was the correct one to make, not only for this study but also in the long run. There are three major reasons why I opted not to include the survey.

The first reason is that I feared it would be an invalid measure and introduce some degree of methodological noise into the study. Despite my best efforts, this particular threat to validity stems from language and the use of terms in the survey which seemed from the interviews and focus groups to be inappropriate for the Indian context. Though there are a handful of terms which could have translated poorly or at least dubiously enough to warrant more attention than was permitted while I was doing the field work – e.g., faith, faith-based, faith-based components, etc – I will use one example to demonstrate what I mean by a threat to validity as a function of language.

That salient example is observed in the following dialogue in which a participant of mine constructs religious “conversion” in a manner that is maybe the anti-thesis of what it means to those in the West, where conversion can mean not only a wholesale baptismal shift, but also a
gradual and slow process of change. In other words, what is telling here is that he contrasts
“conversion” against the multitude of things which could either fall under conversion or be all
but synonymous with it in the West:

Faith we believe is not for religious conversion. We believe in [doing] something for the
people, rather than taking [something from them]. We believe, our organisation, [in]
giving to the people…that means changing a Hindu mind to Christian. And we believe
the love of God that we received, we share it with them. That’s what we believe …[acting
out faith means doing something] good for the people as well as…[modelling] an ideal
people to show them. “You learn from us; rather than words.” We stand [as] an example
to them. (I15S1)

“Changing a Hindu mind to Christian,” sharing faith with residents, acting out faith to
intentionally influence them, deliberately “standing” as an example of an “ideal people”: these
are all references or allusions to conversion if not the process thereof. And yet the person
speaking to me didn’t see it that way ("Faith we believe is not for religious
conversion"), suggesting even a kind of Orwellian doublethink, repeated in still other ways. That
same participant, for instance, also adhered to The Great Commission and saw his life as a
“living testimony” to the children, women, and families with which he worked; “it’s a silent
preaching,” he said, "That’s what I call it." Of course, one might rightly ask about the
discrepancy here: how is conversion not related to The Great Commission, to being a
consciously “living testimony” or to “silent preaching?” To that same effect, he also insisted
multiple times that what his organisation was doing was “pure social work,” despite claiming
that about “20%” of the work was faith-related. Later our conversation tellingly dug deeper into
the vicissitudes of faith:
But I believe in [keeping faith and service separate]...if a person doesn’t want to change religion, [would] you want him [sic] to...suffer? So [why would] you only help the person who change the religion? Say the person doesn’t want to change, but should that person suffer? So I believe...[in] helping a person irrespective of religion. Social work is not religion-based; it’s human-based. That’s why I give open social benefits irrespective of religion. (I15S1)

This passage suggests that his notion of “conversion” might be synonymous, to him, with “forced conversion,” of the variety which forms the stereotype of Christian FBOs in India. In other words, conversion is not a changing of faiths or any manner of religious influence, but rather religious influence exerted in exchange for service – service on condition of conversion or violent evangelism.

This perhaps frustrating example is what Timothy Garton Ash (2016) would see as a function of the “foundational” differences embedded in language; in other words, at the “foundation” deep below the surface of the words themselves, there are a set of meanings which are heavily influenced by cultural context and thus not readily perceivable or translatable. There were, I have suggested, other such examples, though none more germane than the tussle over the word conversion. At times the examples seem to stem from Hindi-English translation, too, as opposed to just English conversation. It is fortunate that I understand about 90% of Hindi spoken among common people and, moreover, grew up with Hindi, Gujarati, and English as first languages. It was this knowledge that allowed me to sit on a linguistic fence and observe the translations as they occurred. On one occasion of translation I was shocked and noted in my notes how my translator struggled to translate the foundational elements of my English-language questions into Hindi, despite being fluent in both. To put it differently, while he understood the
question, when he conveyed it in Hindi he seemed to struggle to match the conceptsto existing signifiers in Hindi. For instance, _seva_ is the Hindi word often used for “service” in English; but does _service_ mean _seva_ completely? Is one referring to the individual and the other to community?; and what is “service” exactly in the Indian context? Does it have the same connotation or is it at all gauche to call community _seva_ service? The foundational problem of language, thus, was ever present, and while the interviews and focus groups allowed me to calibrate or observe in real-time any problems of this nature, the survey would not have afforded the same flexibility and risked introducing a source of noise in the measurement.

Moreover, if the foundational problem were the only one related to language it might have been still better; but the problem is compounded by other linguistic issues inherent to the topic of study itself. For instance, the use of terms with multiple and fluid meanings is quite common in the literature and in conversation with my participants (e.g., “witness,” “evangelise,” “proselytise,” and “share” can all mean the same or a different thing). Another example is the popular reliance on idiomatic “expressions” in faith communities, again not unique to India, which serve less to signify a concept or thought than an emotional or social posture: “Praise the lord!,” some of my Indian participants used to say, some with jarring enthusiasm, when they picked up the phone, not to ask you to praise the lord nor because they were doing so but because, it would seem, the expression served a social function – it conveyed vehemently the person’s faith in Christ and was a kind of “dog whistle” to other person of the same.

This is an issue I will have to wrestle with in the future. My preliminary ideas on how to do that is by (a) stripping all instruments of all jargon, conservatively defined, and referring to specific things I’m measuring with the plainest possible language; (b) employ a professional
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translation service, which was prohibitively expensive for a dissertation; (c) pilot the instrument; and (d) use a blended survey with open- and closed-ended questions delivered one-on-one and not over the internet. This last remedy would allow me to capture qualitative data in the style of an interview and to ask closed ended question in the style of a quantitative survey. But “in person” or real-time method would allow me to calibrate any misunderstanding. This method was suggested by Dr. Chaves (personal communication, February 14, 2018) and I think avoids some of the difficulties mentioned.

The second reason I decided not to include the survey in the Indian sample was initially more influential in my decision as it was the first source of delay. As mentioned above, entry into the organisations was quite difficult in India. Moreover, the political environment has made evangelical and charismatic Christians especially sensitive to non-Christian inquiries into the work they do in communities. During focus groups and interviews I was able to build rapport and to word and ask questions in a manner and during a time that was appropriate. I was able, for instance, to avoid the word "conversion," for instance, when quickly I realised it was tantamount to profanity or taboo to some. Also, my interpersonal interactions with some of my participants seemed to allay fears that I was, in fact, malicious in my intent. By contrast, with respect to an impersonal and somewhat clumsy survey, I wasn’t sure how the survey would be received and feared alienating some of the participant organisations by introducing a clumsy measure into the mix. The long term goals I have set for my work would benefit greatly from some of these relationships and I wanted to be careful to preserve them.

The third reason I didn't include the survey in India pertains to clients. I wasn’t entirely convinced that the clients of FBOs had the presence of mind to respond to some of the questions posed to them. Indeed, as the reader might recall, one of the staff participants who stood-in as a
translator kept using phrases like “That’s what she believes” or “To them that’s why it happens” to seemingly distance himself from the beliefs of participants, for instance in faith healing. This indicated to me that the staff himself believed that the participants were too easily duped by the signs and wonders they experienced, or by the shadow of superstition cast over evangelical faith.

This brings me to the Canadian sample and two reasons why I stopped collecting surveys from participants after reaching only seven. The first reason is the same as the above - the absence of a presence of mind and/or literacy. The second is that the demands on clients seemed to be great. Their participation in an interview or focus group seemed a sufficient tax on their time and energy that asking them to fill out surveys would have gone overboard. Because of the way that the Research Ethics Board regulates data collection, I could not give the surveys to staff to administer to clients.
Table 14. *Summary of commonalities and differences across Canadian and Indian samples.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative Item</th>
<th>Common Feature</th>
<th>Relative Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Great Commission is an institutional policy in service settings in evangelical FBOs.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher observations and qualitative data suggest The Great Commission may be more emphatically pursued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak evidence that non-coercion is sought and achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of non-coercion occurs against backdrop of &quot;violent evangelism,&quot; both historical and present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Religious influence sought without coercion.</td>
<td>Moderate to strong evidence that non-coercion is sought and achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of non-coercion occurs against backdrop of &quot;violent evangelism,&quot; both historical and present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Religious influence sought through worldview.</td>
<td>The worldview shift sought was from secular Western to Western evangelical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The worldview shift sought was from Indian Hindu or Indian Muslim to Western evangelical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Religious influence sought through faith as a service modality, with prayer as the main modality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater incidence of, and emphasis on, prayer as direct intervention in service settings, including &quot;miracles.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Religious influence sought through social support.</td>
<td>Strong evidence that community-building and relational evangelism are platforms for sharing faith, and these occur primarily within the FBO or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak evidence that community building and relational evangelism are platforms for sharing faith, most likely through church-based fellowship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Religious influence exerted through programme design, through holism and/or discipleship as principles. N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clients experience non-spiritual outcomes.</td>
<td>Most of the outcomes related to an increase in pro-social behaviour or psycho-affective well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clients experience spiritual outcomes.</td>
<td>Three types of spiritual transformation: (a) existing faith strengthened; (b) warming to faith; and (c) accepting the faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Evangelical FBOs work among the urban poor.</td>
<td>Poverty defines circumstances of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low levels of illiteracy among clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low levels of interfaith interactions between staff and clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low interfaith tension in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High levels of secular and governmental support for primary and other social services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government funding for many FBOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART V: DISCUSSION

To conclude the dissertation, I will use this section to situate selected findings portions of the literature discussed above, namely the interpretive framework. I have excluded, for the most part, the portion of the literature review focused on evangelical Christianity because that information was largely context (i.e., this isn't a dissertation on evangelicalism). While the interpretive framework was also largely contextual, it is nonetheless more useful to understanding FBOs and it will help tie together some of the more salient findings. I situate the findings in the empirical literature in the conclusion. Please note that in my attempt to be concise, this Discussion is a selective or focused Discussion. Given the nature and breadth of the literature review as well as my findings an exhaustive Discussion would run another 100 pages, at least. Moreover, I've applied a familiar criterion, limiting myself to about four to five pages per subsection. In each section and subsection I attempted to select, therefore, a point or points of discussion that were most germane to the dissertation from the first page to the findings. Its purpose, therefore, is to be a more-or-less bird's eye commentary on the findings from the vantage of usually one or two major points in the literature or something that came up in the findings that wasn't covered properly in the literature. Departing from my attempt to "present" the findings in the Preliminary and Secondary Findings sections, here I also take greater liberty and engage in more speculative thinking.

Situating the Findings in the Interpretive Framework

Starting with the interpretive framework, the reader will recall that I had discussed five fragments: (a) the state and civil society; (b) ethics of service; (c) secularism and religious freedom; (d) proselytism and conversion; and (e) postcolonialism. Accordingly, below I discuss
my overall findings vis-à-vis each of these five fragments, limiting myself, as I said, to no more than five pages for each. I begin with the state and civil society.

_What Do My Findings Suggest About the State and Civil Society?_ While there doesn't seem to be to an obvious or salient connection between the existing literature on the state and civil society and my findings, there are nonetheless a few points that bear mentioning. These points are less about what my findings "suggest" about the state and civil society, certainly most of my questions had nothing to do with it, than they are about bringing together the dissertation's two major sections - the literature review and the findings - hopefully to greater appreciation of each.

The first observation I want to make is that, contrary to some of the literature (e.g., Hackworth, 2012), my findings didn't paint a clear picture of economic conservatism (i.e., neoliberalism) on the part of the FBOs. Now, it's important to bear in mind that the absence of any economic discussion is likely a function of my research design - I did not ask questions about economics - but it's still worthwhile to note. Of course, there were some very slight exceptions in both countries, such as comments about learning financial responsibility or being able to hold a job as a function of religious influence. And while such comments might evoke stereotypical images of people who lack the moral rectitude or the Protestant work ethic to pull themselves up by the bootstraps, they are nonetheless comments difficult to consider uniquely conservative or neoliberal.

The second observation is related to the subtext of much of the literature in the USA surrounding the welfare reforms and PRWORA mentioned above. Specifically, I'm referring to the notion that neoliberalism fosters the movement of clients to evangelical FBOs by, of course, limiting the reach of the state. Again, my study was far more limited in scope than to be able to
answer properly the question implied here. But it did seem to me that many of my client participants were more or less in a state of great economic need and this was in part a function of a weak or weakened states, which, to use Esping-Anderson's terminology, further "commodified" them and, moreover, their spiritual lives, in both countries.

To add insult to injury, many of my Indian participants, both clients and staff, were from out of province in India; they came to Mumbai to find work, fleeing worse conditions in their native states, in many cases having left a family behind to make money and remit, or to chase a dream of greater prosperity in the city - all of which are symptoms which figure in the discourse on neoliberalism in India. In fact, the very phenomenon of the slum is, in many ways, a decidedly neoliberal externality, an outgrowth of globalisation, caused by the "brutal tectonics of neoliberal globalisation" (Davis, 2011, p. 174). It's "driven by the reproduction of poverty, not by the supply of jobs," remarks historian, Mike Davis: "This is one of the unexpected tracks down which a neoliberal world order is shunting the future" (Davis, 2011, p. 16). He goes on further to comment on India's neoliberalism as "stupendously lopsided" since its inception in 1991, with "one million new millionaires," but "56 million more paupers" (p. 171). Davis (2011) quotes Jeremy Seabrook, who called the advent of neoliberalism in India "the worst time for the poor since Independence" (Davis, 2011, pp. 170-171). Moreover, these policies have "wreaked havoc in the neglected Indian countryside," where many of my participants seemed to have come, and "where three quarters of households lack access to sanitation and unpolluted drinking water, and the poor shout futilely for "electricity, roads, and water" (p. 171). I could go on, but I think the point is made. While there is certainly a huge difference between Canada and India, it seems doubtless that in both cases, a weakened state is at play in the background of the lives of my participants.
Therefore, despite how little people commented on economics, I couldn't help but wonder how this played a role in my findings and the lives of my participants. For instance, in both countries, were the criticisms of secular FBOs and state-run services really about a kind of decadent and bitter professionalism, or, was there lurking in the background a decaying state, and what was seen as the fault of professionalism or neglect was really a fault of fatigue and capacity? The FBOs, after all, were independently funded and while there's no way for me to measure here the way their funding models have been affected by neoliberal policies, to some extent, I think we can assume that a steady stream of private donations might have cushioned the blow: "Look, this just came in," said one staff participate in Canada, pointing to a cheque for $5000 CAD, a not-uncommon occurrence apparently. And of course, the same is true of India, where the welfare system didn't seem sufficiently strong in the areas I visited, which were not obscure locations but rather some of the most notable slums in one of the most known international cities in the world. The FBOs in India seemed even less contingent upon any public funding, as many of my participants noted the importance of private donations. And the figures of international donations to evangelical organisations in India mentioned by Bauman (2015a) further set FBOs apart from the state under threat from neoliberalism.

It bears considering, therefore, how this potential movement of clients into FBOs would be affected if, for instance, India, or perhaps more accurately, the state of Maharashtra, were to improve or strengthen its state. Certainly the provision of and access to healthcare and education would have addressed perhaps the single greatest set of needs among Indian clients for which they visited FBOs. How would this have affected the FBOs? I couldn't help but notice that the Indian social service terrain resembles Daly's (2010) characterisation of the early 20th century American welfare system - with minimal or inadequate state funding and a set of associational
arrangements, mostly faith-related, serving as kind of shadow state. Accordingly, Wood and Gough (2006) proposed a different typology from Esping-Anderson wherein India, it seems to me, would be considered not a welfare regime, but rather an "informal security" regime, where the arrangements permit access not to welfare *per se* but its poor cousin in informal security. According to this regime, there is an "embrace of extensive non-state as well as state institutions" and "people rely heavily upon community and family relationships to meet their security needs." (p. 1699). "Informal" and "short-term" security here are gained at the cost of "longer-term vulnerability and dependence" (p. 1699).

In Canada, there is an interesting experiment which might further strengthen its state and could have implications for the market of clients available to FBOs. After a "forgotten" 70s experiment with the Milton Friedman-esque "mincome" in Manitoba, in 2017 the province of Ontario announced a $50 million, three-year-pilot programme for basic income offered in the cities of Hamilton, Lindsay, and Thunder Bay. As of this writing, the province had successfully enrolled 4000 participants, all of whom receive regular payments (CBC News, 2018). These can vary as a "single person could receive up to about $17,000 a year, minus half of any income he or she earns. A couple could receive up to $24,000 per year. People with disabilities could receive up to $6,000 more per year." (Bennett, 2017). Apart from the money, tellingly, the messaging behind the project registers in a Keynesian note: while the amount isn't "extravagant," then-Premier Wynne said, the programme says to those suffering from poverty, "Government is with you; the people of Ontario are with you." We might then ask if the more Government is with poorer citizens, the less those citizens will access FBOs? But then again, as my data have shown, one of the main reason my participants seemingly accessed FBOs in

---

* Quite literally days before the defense of this dissertation the new Ontario Premier, Doug Ford, scrapped the entire project, breaking an election promise.
Canada, at least, was for social support, a sense of community, and this was also a major pathway to religious influence (recall the comments about poverty emotional, social, and spiritual and not just material).

What Do My Findings Say About the Ethics of Service? Perhaps one of the most intriguing undercurrents of my findings is the way the notion of agency comes up in various ways and how this bears on the ethics of service, overall; or rather, how the ethics of service might bear on it. The reader might recall several instances where either clients or staff saw God as the agent in their lives. Yet a major premise of the literature on the ethics of service provision is the notion of human agency. Thus, we can take note of something uniquely interesting here. Ordinarily, ethical breaches occur when either a client or social worker acts in a manner inconsistent with ethical dictates. But so many of my participants had a third agent, one more influential than they, whether that be Jesus, God, or the Holy Spirit. To such believers, success or failure, inspiration, motivation, all come from a divine agent. To such believers, the ultimate agent is the one to whom they are ultimately accountable. What does this mean for the ethics of service?

To give one example from my findings of when such an issue might come up, consider that many participants in both studies used a kind of formulaic representation of agency when it came to religious influence: "I share but God converts." In other words, the notion that it is God who converts or that it is God who ultimately is responsible for religious conversion subverts the warnings and admonishments of undue religious influence in the Codes and Guidelines. How can a social worker or service provider be responsible if it was a divine power, and moreover, if it can only be a divine power who moves people to convert? Related to this is the fact that at least some of my staff participants mentioned to me - on and off the record - that the Holy Spirit
ultimately guides them in their decision making. Again, how can a social worker or service provider be accountable to the public if the agent behind their actions is the Holy Spirit, a being in which likely most Canadians and the vast majority of Indians don't believe. Now, of course, sharing is perfectly consistent with the Charter but it grinds against the Codes, Guidelines, and perhaps where public funding is present, it's a faint threat to freedom from religion. This formula of agency, that it is God and not the staff or client, makes everything even more complicated.

Another instance of this matter of agency is where clients themselves might lack the proper agency to interact with people with greater power. This is in part what influenced me to avoid the survey, of course, but it also seemed a characteristic lurking in the background of client-staff relations in both countries. Here it's useful again to recall one of Tangenberg's (2005) rhetorical questions in her consideration of ethics: "Does the client have agency and physical and mental capacity to resist religious program elements if she or he objects to them?" While it is virtually impossible to give any kind of serious answer to this question here, it is worth speculating. Perhaps annoyingly with a question, we might respond and ask, "Does poverty or extreme poverty breed a form of desperation which ultimately reduces agency or physical or mental capacity?" Some would respond emphatically with "How could it not?!" They might point to the numerous participants in India, who were themselves desperate because of their illiteracy. Or who were made desperate by their need for basic healthcare. Or who might have acted with an acutely parental instinct when they sought to provide their child with basic education, desperate to avoid for their child the social denigration they themselves experience. They might point out the gradual but very real devolution of state services in Canada, which doubtless reduces agency, perhaps through commodification à la Esping-Anderson. On the other hand, others might point out the numerous instances where clients themselves sought out prayer
in both countries. (Is seeking out prayer a sign of desperation or of agency?) Or the way that staff in both countries sought earnestly to avoid coercion, however differently they might have defined it. Or argue that it is government corruption or inadequacy, public indifference, and the shortfalls of secular agencies which foster the conditions in which agency is compromised in the first place - FBOs, evangelicals in particular, to quote Goldstein (2010), might just be the ones to "clean up the mess."

Of course, a glaringly special case here is children and youth. To quote a participant, "What does a child know?" (I12S1). The comment was, of course, meant to highlight the fact that agency in young people is likely not as sound as it is in adults, all things considered. Accordingly, this participant modified his approach to sharing faith, though many, including those in Canada, did not. And yet the evidence about child agency is rather conclusive, it would seem. The pre-frontal cortex, that portion of the brain responsible for executive function and decision making, and several other higher order cognitive tasks requisite of adulthood, don't fully develop until the age of 25 (e.g., Blakemore & Choudhury, 2006). If we return to the sub-theme of discipleship as a principle of programme design with this scholarship in mind, then the response to Tangenberg's rhetorical question seems all the more obvious in this special case: Children likely do not have the agency nor mental capacity "to resist religious program elements if she or he objects to them." Or put differently, their ability to make decisions is seriously compromised. It is quite difficult not to think of the quoted passage from Proverbs 22:6 also: "Train up a child in the way he should go. And when he is old he will not depart from it." Thus, when it comes to the matter of religious influence, children do seem an alone and easy target.

Extrapolating from this one special case, we might conceive of others that were less obvious. For instance, gender. Is it not the case that an interaction between male staff and a
female client might be fraught, at least to some extent, with a power imbalance related to gender? While in Canada, this matter is of concern, I would say in India, this matter is of *utmost* concern. In Canada it seemed often that men worked with men and women with women. In India this didn't always seem to be the case. In fact the vast majority of my staff participants were male, while it seemed the vast majority of the clientele were either women or children. We wade into quite murky ethical waters here, where mostly male Christians are providing religiously-infused service to mostly Hindu females, who themselves are in destitute, in part, because of a still-thriving patriarchy in contemporary Indian society which denies them full access that a man would have. As a researcher and person of Indian heritage, this was one of the most salient features of my experiences in Mumbai. While I would caution against extrapolating too liberally, as so many do with India, it's a relevant concern here. I have mentioned off-hand that in the future I could, on my own or with a colleague conversant in feminist analysis, re-analyse my data to bear interesting analytical fruit related to religious influence and gender. Even better would be to design a study intended to investigate this matter and its relationship to gender. Overall, it seems to me the discussion on agency of clients might be a better representation of reality if it were to consider, of course age and gender, but also other facts about the person, such as class, education, literacy, and so on.

The final example I want to discuss is a little less obvious. Consider this: a staff influences clients into viewing their social problems through the agency of God (e.g., "It is God who gives wealth"). Yet these social problems are demonstrably a function of structural inequality (e.g., income inequality). Is shifting thinking this way consistent with the ethical principles of Social Work? Are some FBOs, in other words, diminishing client self-determination vis-à-vis the very this-worldly cause of many of their poverty-related issues, by
shifting their thinking to divine causes? This to me seems suggestive of a Marxian ideology or false consciousness and the anti-thesis of a kind Freirean *praxis*, according to which clients *ought* to think about and act on the sources of their inequality. In the latter example client agency is perhaps diminished - "God made rich. God made poor," said one participant. While in the latter Freiriean instance, the client's agency is increased - "It is necessary that the weakness of the powerless is transformed into a force capable of announcing justice" (Freire, 2016, p. 62). It is important to note that this difference, of course, occurs irrespective of any faith orientation. In other words, increasing client agency in the face of injustice isn't inconsistent with faith and certainly not with Christianity, as the plethora of examples we have suggest, not the least pertinent of which are those related (albeit indirectly through Marx) to Freire, i.e., liberation theology; this also includes efforts made by my staff participants to empower clients irrespective of their faith orientation. Nevertheless, it does bear considering whether some of my participants are fostering in clients a kind of divinely-sanctioned complacency in the face of an unjust world, by way of modifying their sense of agency, or to lean on social psychological terminology, by compromising their sense of self-efficacy. One can't help but think of Lenin's permutation of Marx's oft-quoted comment on religion, here, that it is, indeed, the "opium for the people" (Lenin, 1905, emphasis mine). 

Overall, from the vantage of the scholarship on the ethics of service, the issue of agency is rather important to consider here, because what I have discussed above might permit the abdication of responsibility on the part of the social worker in a manner that is not in the best interest of the client. Nobody can know if and when a given social worker's mind was moved by

---

40 Consider instead, "Washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral."

41 The distinction between Marx’s "opiate of the masses" and Lenin’s "opium for the people" was pointed out to me by Dr. Paul Freston.
Jesus, God, or the Holy Spirit. Implicit in this discussion about the boundary between divine and human agency is the boundary between church and state, which I discuss next.

What Do My Findings Suggest About Secularism and Religious Freedom? The reader will recall that in the literature review I commented on secularism, understood as the separation of church and state, and provided summaries of it, as well as religious freedom, touching on both the legal and some extra-legal pieces of information. The FBO, as I have mentioned, is a kind of paradigm of the difficult and careful separation of church and state, because it is in many ways both a place of worship or exercise of religious freedom, sometimes actually a church, but also a public space when it provides service in the public interest. The line here between church and state is, therefore, exceedingly difficult to determine.

This is the first point I want to make, namely that my data suggest or reaffirm exactly the way that inside FBOs in Canada and India, the American Jeffersonian wall is absent, and in its stead stands a fence of separation. In Canada, this was demonstrated by the level of funding FBOs received, as well as the way that public funding opened space for public discourses. One of those discourses as we have seen is that related to the ethics of service, both broadly conceived but also more specifically with reference to the Codes and Guidelines. Closely related to this is the broader discourse of Social Work, which threatens to trespass on the sacred whenever a registered Social Worker, such as the one participant mentioned in the Implications for Social Work section above, enters an FBO as an employee. It is important to note that this imagery, of trespass from one side of a fence onto another does not imply a negative effect; evaluation of whether or not such trespass is positive, negative, or neutral is likely to be determined case-by-case, and would depend on the person, as well as the extent to which their understanding of their lifeworld was influenced by religious or secular discourses. Clearly, the one Social Worker
discussed above didn't see a conflict, but felt that he could hold onto his deeply felt faith, keep it alive, and yet still remain true to the values of Social Work. The point, then, is that these facts of the FBO (i.e., public funding, public discourses, Social Workers), demonstrate a secularism that is responsive and not insurmountable as a wall might convey.

In addition to the funding, however, there is also the widespread cooperation between state and civil society actors and evangelical FBOs which also demonstrates this responsiveness and thus the fence-like nature of Canadian secularism when considered from this vantage. I did not include this in the findings above, due largely to space, but I coded 13 instances where participants spoke about some form of cooperation, either at the institutional or individual level, with public institutions. I have already mentioned above the way that a central, secular, food bank, distributed food to FBOs who served as outlets. Another said, "because we've connected with a lot of government organisations, we've become known to them, so we will go and we will meet with municipal officials and provincial government officials and say 'This is what we can offer. This is our experience. Would you like us to?'" (C3S1). The same organisation received an invite from a municipality to a kind of service-oriented trade show where multiple organisations advertised their services in a local community in need. Another organisation noted the one-year partnership with Ontario Employment Services: "we had them come every six weeks and do a workshop. So they did workshops on personality types, and what kind of work would you be good for" (C7S2). At that same organisation another staff member took me down the street to a house devoted to service people recovering from addictions, run by a local secular non-profit. The nature of the partnership here was evident when we walked right into the house, just after the staff member greeted a person sitting on the porch. A glaring instance of a missing plank in the fence of secularism, the staff member, a pastor, walked through the house as if it were his
own, greeting members and then settled downstairs where he spoke to and encouraged one of the residents, who was clearly and obviously under the influence of something, to come to church.

This last instance sheds light on an important facet of this cooperation between secular organisations and FBOs: not always was the cooperation devoid of inclusions, of ethical complication. Some organisations who worked with and in schools noted how they had to conceal the religious component of their service, or else the public school wouldn't let them in. One organisation said, "We don't go into the school saying we want to preach the Gospel." He added that "we don't go into the schools with that motivation. We go into the schools more about how can we help serve our community...how do we help these teachers." But there is a slight conflict of interest here. I asked where the conversations with faith start. "The conversations with faith will start more in our programmes, and so we'll volunteer in the schools but then our kids will come to our after school programmes." In this way, the same organisations sought to "build relationships in the community" and such relationships were platforms to invite children to the after school programme, where the 20-year discipleship programme would commence (C9S1).

Another organisation's participants noted that one staff member "cultivated" a relationship with a particular school with which "he keeps up" (C17S3). He visits the schools twice a week, supported by a relationship with the principal and some teachers with whom he has a "deep relationship" and who "cheer for him" (C17S3). Another staff does something similar, "acting as a tutor and an assistant to the teacher" in a local school. This is, I was told, "the perfect place...to go and really meet broken kids. Really, they've got so much brokenness" (C17S3). I asked whether these staff were able to speak about faith, noting that some organisations were more clandestine, to which one staff said "Yeah, yeah" and laughed (C17S1). Another noted the importance of building relationships and being able to share the staff's personal journey to faith.
with the class. Sometimes, "if there's a question and answer time...it just opens the door. How do you not share, right?" (C17S2). There are, of course, other such instances, including informal partnerships, referrals from secular agencies and public institutions to FBOs, and so on.

In India, I coded 8 instances, which included more than one organisation that would have an arrangement with a local hospital to "minister" to patients. "I've got permission from a government hospital" where they "minister" to them by providing "home care, personal hygiene, and reason to live." "They know we pray," but they don't evangelise in the hospital. They "go to their house or out, either to garden or park somewhere, and then we minister around there." They "have got two churches" from this method (I10S1). Another example from the same organisation sounded less principled: They go into hospitals where there are HIV/AIDS patients, and "we are ministering to them. We are talking to them about their sickness...and we want them to accept Christ" (I10S1). Interestingly, the staff mentioned that these cases occur under a banner of confidentiality from family members, given the taboo nature of HIV/AIDS in India. Thus all of this occurs from the vantage of a patient, in isolation from their community and during a time when mortality is salient. And if a patient dies, all is not lost, as this is a path to building a relationship with a family: "And then do you minister to the families," I asked. "Yes, yes, yes," he said (I10S1). Another organisation was less indirect. The staff commented on how they service tuberculosis patients: "We meet up with patients, pray with them. Share the Gospel with them. Let them know who they are and you know God loves them. They are precious in the eyes of God" (I4S1). In this case, the hospital was aware that the organisation was a "Christian organisation sharing the Gospel." As with Canada, there are other instances, including partnerships with police (I1) and secular organisations (e.g., I2, I7).
These two examples I've just discussed - the public funding and the cooperation between public institutions and FBOs - demonstrates the "live and salient" lines between "law and community," to lean on Berger (2015) again. They lay bare the fissures in the practise of secularism, which were also arguably visible in the debate on the Canada Summer Jobs programme. But what I find most intriguing about this situation is that it seems to suggest that secularism in these two countries is not characterised by a "secular fiction," which is the term Paras uses slightly differently than I use here, but rather secular improvisation: There is a general idea or prompt of secularism in the minds of participants but how this plays out in real-time is really an art of improv. What this means for religious influence is a matter worthy of consideration in future work.

I want to mention two more points before getting to the next section and they pertain to the counterpart to secularism, the exercise of religious freedom. The reader will recall that in Canada religious freedom includes not only the "freedom to practise religion without state interference" but also "the freedom from state compulsion to participate in a religious practice" (Moon, 2014, p. 25). I am not a legal scholar and so the answer to the next question might seem pointless or irrelevant or simplistic, but I think it's worth it to ask here rhetorically: Is religious influence in service settings a fair exercise of religious freedom, or should it be limited because the level of funding given to FBOs as well as the second-order public validity given by public cooperation, renders it in some way state compulsion for clients, denying them of the right of freedom from religion. Setting aside any legal nuance I might miss, i.e., if we were just to take the question theoretically, then from the vantage of my data, certainly, the answer to this question isn't simple. There are some examples where clearly the FBOs in my sample managed the separation of church and state handily (e.g., the Social Worker), but there are other instances
where such separation seems impossible. The most salient example of such is the provision of salvation as service. What does it mean for secularism when a partially publicly funded FBO acting in the public interest provides salvation in lieu of service. It's hard not to re-quote Kruse (2015) who spoke of Billy Graham, who "insisted that the poor in other nations, like those in his own, needed no government assistance. 'Their greatest need is not more money, food, or even medicine; it is Christ,' he said. 'Give them the Gospel of love and grace first and they will clean themselves up, educate themselves, and better their economic conditions" (p. 53).

In India, there is a similarly two-part definition of religious freedom. The first part is obvious in Article 25 of the Indian Constitution, which states that "all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion." But again the first subsection states a limiting clause, that this free exercise is "[s]ubject to public order, morality and health." Again, I have to admit my lack of qualification in Indian law to be able to answer the question implicit here, but again speculation does illuminate my findings. The question is similar: Is religious influence in service settings a threat to public order, morality, or health? Again, setting aside the legal nuance and focusing on this question in a more loosely theoretical or speculative fashion is telling. For instance, my findings and especially the research process were overshadowed by the inter-religious strife between Hindus and Christians, particularly because of the stereotype that Christian organisations engage in conversions of Hindus. But as the data suggested, even a conservative interpretation suggests that the FBOs in my sample were engaged in converting through service settings, and sometimes this was done in clandestine, ethically dubious ways. Is such an exercise of religious freedom subject to limitation based on public order? Is the exercise of religious freedom by healing the sick with prayer evangelism subject to a limitation based on health? What happens when, in lieu of medical
treatment, a prayer healing has failed and someone dies? Do they report it? Questions such as these and the one asked with reference to Canada rest beneath the neat surfaces of the sanitised legal definitions of religious freedom. At times of public notoriety, they bustle beneath but so far, to my knowledge, they haven't been answered. This brings me to the main issue at hand, proselytism and conversion and what my findings suggest about them.

**What Do My Findings Suggest about Proselytism and Conversion?** Because there's a great deal of overlap between these two topics, i.e., religious freedom includes proselytism and conversion, I want to start with a small point continuing the latter discussion, but with slightly more nuance. In the literature review I mentioned with reference to the limits on proselytism that a judgement in Canada by Supreme Court Justice Dickson, noted that "[W]hatever else freedom of conscience and religion may mean, it must at the least mean this: government may not coerce individuals to affirm a specific religious belief or to manifest a specific religious practice" (Justice Dickson cited in Berger, 2015, p. 81). Again, I hasten to point out my lack of legal training to consider this point with expertise. But I also can't help but point out that at least theoretically this judgment implies a question related to the one above that asked about freedom from religion as a limitation to freedom of religion. If "government may not coerce," then what about government by proxy? In other words, in dark neoliberal waters where so many actors in civil society serve to plug holes in a sinking Keynesian ship, does the FBO not count as government by proxy and if so, what are the implications for proselytism? Bear in mind that this speculation has no bearing on evangelism in churches, or elsewhere in public spaces, but rather is a function of the hybrid nature of the FBO in a secular democracy. Another question emerges when my findings are pressed against the porous nature of Dickson's statement: What does coercion mean? Is it, as the dictionary says, "to compel to an act or choice?" If so, is salvation-
as-service coercion? Are people in destitute free enough to avoid feeling compelled? Is working with children a situation fraught with compulsion? Can choices be made honestly? And what about the subtle influence exerted by practitioners of relational evangelism? Does that create a chimera of personal obligation and compulsion resistible to few? I could go on, but the point, I think, is clear; with the boundary between state and church increasingly blurred in a hybridised entity such as the FBO, at what point do we determine that the government's responsibility ends and the church's begins?

Related to this particular nicety is another, this one attributable to Dickson's judgment as well but referred to by Moon (2014) instead of Berger (2015). In the literature review I stated that Moon pointed out that it is perhaps the end or effect which determines whether or not the right of freedom from religion is violated, that such violation occurs not only when someone is actively required to do something by the state, but also when they are passively prevented from doing something by the state. The constitutional catalyst here was the forced observation of the Sunday Sabbath, but again we might ask a theoretical and speculative question. With the same caveats noted above in mind and with an understanding that definitions of important words (e.g., coerce) render different meanings, we might ask: Does the absence of state-based welfare or secular service provision passively deny citizens the right to freedom from religion? Bear in mind that 36% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement, "There are no other organisations close by that clients can go to for the service they receive here." This means the FBOs they visited were the only places of which they were aware from which they could derive welfare. Moreover, where there might be secular organisations available, they might be heavily compromised in their capacity in a neoliberal era. One can't help but note, here, that at the level
of politics the economic conservatism common among evangelicals helps foster this very climate.

The final point I want to make here is perhaps the most obviously related to on-the-ground proselytism and conversion. It pertains to the criticism levied by some such as Arvind Sharma (2011) who note that the conceptual foundation of proselytism and conversion suggests a slant toward the West and Christianity. Not in itself a problematic thing, of course, but certainly something to consider given that, as several have pointed out, the preponderance of allusions, references, debates, laws, and constitutions with this slant belies the diversity of conceptions of religious change in the world of practised religion (e.g., Sharma, 2011; Woods, 2012; King, 2012). This includes, also, conceptions of religion, too. I mentioned one conceptual bias as the individualisation of religion and religious change in the West. Consistent with the criticism, I noticed firsthand how the notion of individual choice was differently conceived in India, the fact of which I was at least partially aware given my Indian heritage. Religious change didn't seem to occur in a manner that didn't affect the group or community. When I had told my mother that I didn't consider myself a religious or practising Hindu, nothing much changed. But in the cases of some participants this was not the same. In one case, a participant made a rather intellectual, C.S. Lewis-like conversion to Christianity, reading books in his room as he struggled with sex addiction, until stumbling upon the Bible and feeling a love come over him. "The addiction instantly left me." Now a pastor, he noted how difficult it was for his parents to come to terms with his choice; leaving Hinduism was a source of conflict. "I think like any parent of any teenager, they were genuinely concerned for me," he said. "Although they didn't like what [he] was doing," they thought his consideration of multiple faiths was fair and thoughtful, so they "couldn't really do much," he quipped with a hint of defiance. "But obviously that didn't stop
them from feeling bad about it, feeling hurt, or feeling overwhelmed." And they had difficulty answering "to their community" because "my parents were the most liberal." Another instance of the similar dynamic comes from a young client, who came to the faith on a less cerebral path. A migrant from a poorer state in search of a "good life," he was devastated by the harsher reality of life in Mumbai, particularly for those not well-prepared to feed off the global economy, which generally requires high-level education and English. Part of that harsh reality was an introduction to alcohol. Thereafter, it wasn't long until he was addicted to alcohol, keeping different company, depressed about his lack of success, and ultimately in a position in his room, contemplating that "I will finish my life." Through a series of twists and turns, he ended up on the street with an evangelist and found God. It was then that the conflict with his family began. "Why are you going to another faith?" they asked at first. This led to a series of debates and fights over the conversion which ultimately led to the parents resigning over their son's choice but stalwart in their opposition to one thing: "If you are a Christian, we have no problem," said the family, "but why are you preaching?" It turns out his new faith required him to preach to his parents and others in his extended family. He obeyed. I asked how he preached and he indicated quite clearly that he told them they had to accept Christ "otherwise you will die and go to hell." Again, the family would say "Don't preach [to] other person. If you believe it, you believe it. Don't preach [to] others. Don't [preach to] relatives." But this didn't stop him. I'm not sure where the conflict remains but it was clear that this conversion to Christianity, though made by one individual, led to conflict within an entire extended family.

These are two distinct examples but they offer a glimpse at the way the individual slant of proselytism and conversion may, in fact, violently scrape against the otherwise communal and collective ground of Indian society and culture, rooted as it is in likely centuries, even millennia
of tradition. It's important to note the presence of a second bias in the anecdotes above, namely that conversion was sought exclusively. In other words, in neither case did the participants themselves simply adopt elements of the faith and maintain elements of their previous faith, as is consistent with the syncretism which Sharma (2011) notes is common outside the West. Even the cerebral path taken by the first participant didn't include syncretism. Perhaps this was an individual choice, but it bears considering that the Western and Christian discourse on religious change itself influenced his decision not to include the wisdom of the Bible and the teachings of Christ alongside those of the Upanisads and Krishna. Put differently, for all his efforts to make a genuine religious change, he might have failed to make one based on genuine terms. The second participant, too, interpreted religious change in this way, and sought to reproduce it in his parents and relatives. He didn't once indicate to me that he might simply suggest to his parents the wisdom in the Bible. He said "I found peace" and he wanted to share this with them. But it was peace from one religious tradition in exchange, one might presume, for peace from another religious tradition. Critics such as Sharma might point out that absent the Western slants toward wholesale change which saturates the air of religious conversion scholarship, my participant might simply have offered Christ as one source of peace among many. But this, of course, did not happen, likely because it is not permitted by the evangelical traditions of my participants. This discussion of Western and Christian bias in a predominantly Hindu India brings us to the final fragment for consideration.

**What Do My Findings Suggest about Postcolonialism?** The value of a postcolonial lens is greatest when viewing something which, without it, doesn't refract postcolonial rays. Thus, here I will attempt to use that lens to reveal how some of my findings suggest a kind of colonial bias.
Some readers might have already sensed the first and most obvious focus, which stems from the very pairing of evangelism and social service. The reader might recall it was this pairing which earned the ire of the cosmopolitan Gandhi, causing him to oppose "proselytising."

Again, it's hard to make a strong case either this way or that regarding my findings, but it is worthwhile to wonder. For instance, was what we observed in the sections on religious influence through primary services "proselytizing under the cloak of humanitarian work," as Gandhi said? Or was it harmless, devoid of the kind of dishonest concealment implicit in Gandhi's metaphor? Certainly, one of my findings resonates so closely to one of Gandhi's comments that despite a full century between them, the comment might have been made by someone during my fieldwork: "Why should I change my religion because a doctor who professes Christianity as his religion has cured me of some disease or why should a doctor expect or suggest such a change whilst I am under his [sic] influence? Is not medical relief its own reward and satisfaction?" As the reader might recall, that is, in many ways, precisely what occurred in the medical van, but as well quite similar to what occurred when staff of FBOs in India entered medical facilities to evangelise often terminally ill patients.

The second point of focus is also perhaps obvious, but one of the most fruitful for a postcolonial lens, and that's the section above on religious influence through worldview. While for my Canadian sample this point about worldview change is almost completely absent of any postcolonial implication, save for one mention of an indigenous man who converted, the Indian sample is the opposite. It is rife with instances which might make even a hardened postcolonial scholar flinch. In other words, the worldview shift from one that is Indian Hindu (or Indian Muslim) to one that is Western Evangelical certainly strikes a postcolonial chord, because that is, after all, what a huge portion of colonialism in India was about. Of course, some of the changes
that stem from the "character education" or "moral education" mentioned in this section are
generic; they are accessible to public reason (e.g., hygiene) and neither decidedly Western nor
evangelical. But other changes related to one's worldview are harder to imagine absent any
colonial undertones. This includes not only religious change itself, but also the terms of religious
change, which as I have just mentioned excludes the possibility of a kind syncretisation. 
It also
includes the way the evangelical worldview casts social problems, as we have seen (e.g.,
brokenness), or understands the human condition, i.e., as characterised by sin and salvation and
not karma and moksha. It can also include, apparently, political views, albeit inflected with
faith. Interestingly, one of my participant's had a flag of Israel on his desk. I queried and instead
of a uniquely Indian narrative, even an Indian evangelical one, he conveyed to me the
conventional American evangelical narrative, which included the notion that Israel is God's
chosen nation, so that it "be a shining light to the gentile nations." However, he
said "[u]nfortunately they missed it, off and on, and therefore, God raised the church." "But He is
not finished with Israel yet," he cautioned, alluding to the importance of Israel in the prophecy of
end times for evangelicals, a point which The Washington Post recently underscored as the USA
moved its embassy to Jerusalem (Bump, 2018). Ending with a pithy explanation for how he
reconciled the fact that Jews didn't worship Jesus, after noting the Torah as a common book, he
said "Hebraic roots, Christian fruits!" Perhaps a testament to just how canned/Americanised this
explanation was is that he mentioned neither the anti-Semitism faced by Jews at the hands of the
Christian America or Britain, including in colonial Britain, nor the fact that a predominantly
Hindu India has been home to Jews for centuries, where they have lived in one of the few,
perhaps only, countries, where a program against them hasn't been established.

---

"Yasmin Khan provides some interesting insight into how during the first censuses taken by Britain, many religious
identities were hyphenated in a fashion perhaps unimaginable today, e.g., "Mohomedan Hindus" or "Hindu
Mohamedans," which now would usually just be either Muslims or Hindus."
This section on worldview in India also highlighted the scope of change. As the reader might recall, this scope of change pertains to the desire for the wholesale shift of India to Christianity, which again smacks of a kind colonial ambition. But it was here in particular that the third point I want to highlight emerged most clearly, this one less obvious than the first two. This point is about the imputation of cause for the social problems FBOs witnessed and the source of its solution. In other words, the narratives offered by my participants were curiously slanted toward much colonial and even post-colonial invective against India - regarding the iniquity in Indian society, the cause was either India, Indians, or Hindus, and the solution lie outside India, Indians, or Hinduism, with the West or Christianity. While this was seldom obviously stated, it was perhaps most clear in the comment made by the participant who lamented a premature independence, wishing instead for the extended tenure of the beneficent Brits. It was present anytime a participant spoke about Hinduism being a source of evil or demonic possession, which sounded a familiar colonial note that Hinduism is a "stupendous system of error." But it was also implicit when participants spoke about the myriad of problems present - adultery, abuse, drugs, alcohol, stealing, bribery, the caste system, to name a few - and then proceeded to offer evangelical Christianity as a solution, because the subtext often seemed to be an indigenous immorality.

Needless to say, this simple formula of indigenous cause, colonial solution, belies a complexity. For instance, regarding the success of the solution, as one of my participants admitted, many of the clients visiting FBOs simply went back "to their old ways" and to "even their old faith" (I13S1). Others noted this same dynamic, as I mentioned a few times above in the findings. Regarding the cause, what about all of the data which suggests a colonial inertia, the momentum of which lends force to social problems in India? For instance, Mike Davis's book
Late Victorian Holocausts powerfully demonstrates how British colonial policy exacerbated famines in the late Victorian era up to the time of Independence. In 1943 alone, in the state of Bengal, while Indian soldiers were fighting for the British in World War II, 7 million Bengalis died of starvation under British economic and social policy. Even the caste system is worthy of consideration, a caricature of which is so powerfully associated with Hinduism in the minds of non-Indians, that when considering Hinduism, even in Canada and the US, it's almost a reflex to mention the caste system. For instance, in 2010, the BBC reported that many Christians who accepted Christianity to flee caste discrimination "find no refuge from caste in Christianity" (Natarajan, 2010). While the report refers to Catholicism the point, I think, is that caste discrimination is likely at times more unruly than even Christianity can handle. Another example: Nicholas Dirks, a Professor of History and Anthropology at Columbia University in New York, wrote in 2001 a book devoted to investigating just where the origins of caste are and how much of it was influenced by colonial rule. Dirks states clearly that "caste, as we know it today, is not in fact some unchanged survival of ancient India, not some single system that reflects a core civilizational value, not a basic expression of Indian tradition" (p. 5). Instead, he goes on to point out, caste is "the product of an historical encounter between India and Western colonial rule" (p. 5). Dirks cautions against a simplistically anti-colonial view, but that cautionary note is in the same vein of the point I am making here, namely, that the certitude and simplicity conveyed about cause and solution in my findings likely betrays a colonial bent. The Manicheanism doesn't hold up, I would argue, under closer scrutiny, and like Professor Dirks's observations about caste, one might not be surprised if many of India's social problems were neither uniquely Indian nor uniquely Western, but a "product of an historical encounter between
India" and its conquerors, which included not only the West but also prior to that the pre-modern Muslim world.

That this is a bias and not simply a symptom of an historical amnesia is supported by the fact that there was also curiously almost nothing whatsoever said about current economic and political conditions which bear on India. Nobody spoke about where the slum residents came from, why they were there, and how economic globalisation under neoliberalism has exacerbated social problems in India. Apart from betraying the biases of certain staff participants in India, what such narratives threaten to do is commit a kind oral erasure of colonialism and neoliberal excesses as causes of these social problems and turn the blame again on the victim, not on the corrupt politicians per se, or the greedy multinationals, but rather people in the slums, who are atomised and thus bear the weight of centuries of civilisational conflict when they encounter devotion's visage. It's hard to know, of course, how they feel, but imagine being told and convinced in your heart of hearts that everything you've ever believed was wrong, erroneous, that your identity is rooted in rotten soil, not only that of Hinduism but also of original sin, and that the cause of virtually all of your problems was so deeply a part of you that really nothing you'd ever done would have made a difference.
PART VI: CONCLUDING REMARKS

To conclude, allow me first to indicate to the reader how this work began. Of course, I am not reaching as far back as my Sunday-morning, televangelism-watching days, but rather about four years ago when I first stumbled upon this scholarship in Social Work. It began initially as an attempt to respond, in my mind, to the question posed by Cnaan and Boddie (2002) about whether and how social workers could work within particularly conservative FBOs and remain true to the values and codes of ethics of the field of social work. The project, of course, became bigger than that, as I attempted a more direct and intentional look into the pairing of faith and service, the latter sometimes referred to as evangelism or religious influence within evangelical FBOs in two national contexts previously unexamined. I ended up become consumed with the topic, reading as much as I could, watching documentaries, talking to friends who were evangelicals, even attending a bible college for a course on missions. All of this gave shape to my work, and ultimately with assistance from my committee, I settled on a project. I asked what the nature and extent of religious influence was, the outcomes thereof, how the nature, extent and outcomes of religious influence differed across national contexts, and overall what the implications are of the all of above for social work, welfare, and policy. The findings are inconclusive given the exploratory nature of the work but are promising inasmuch as they give a glimpse of Canadian and Indian FBOs and suggest multiple areas of contribution and future directions for research. But first I want to discuss the limitations of the present work.

Limitations

The first and most obvious limitation of this study stems from the methodology. The absence of a survey in India leaves a "data gap" which made comparison across samples a little more difficult than I had first intended. With samples of surveys on either side, and with clients
and staff, I had hoped to run statistical tests to compare means across groups. For instance, how did the mean scores of Indian staff differ from those of Canadian staff on survey questions assessing the exertion of religious influence? Or another example: how do mean scores on a question about coercion differ between staff and clients in Canada? These more nuanced analytical points would have strengthened the study. But, as I have discussed above, adding more surveys in the manner they exist now would have led me to write qualifying caveats about the possible problems with the measure's validity. That is assuming I could have even got responses from clients or staff without trampling on some relationships. Related to this methodological limitation is the small N for the survey. It's ironic that I had initially planned to have the survey as the primary method of data collection, thinking it would be the easiest to use, but that in the end the secondary data methods ended up being the most ubiquitous. Thus, the qualitative participation rates are actually higher than the quantitative. In the future, as I have noted, remedying this "foundational" problem with the surveys would yield both a more robust set of data but also a more robust comparison between any two countries.

Another limitation pertains to selection bias of clients. In Canada and India, my access to clients was carefully curated by staff. Had I received more unfettered access to clients, would my findings have been the same? In fact, my access to staff was also usually curated by a higher level administrator. So we might also ask whether or not my findings would have been the same had I received unfettered access to staff. Future research might include some kind of an effort to randomly select participants or staff so as to circumvent any potential bias. In fact, with a more robust survey this issue could also be addressed, as clients do have access to smart phones and computers and so would be able easily to participate in a confidential survey without any staff person's notice.
The third limitation is one that I think was also unavoidable. I did the best I could to represent a wide variety of the scholarship, but given the breadth of the scholarship I naturally left quite a few sources out. One category of scholarship that I will explore further is religious scholarship. In addition to those I have myself, I was given some very interesting sources, including books, names of authors, and so on, from my participants. But the timeline of the dissertation made it impossible for me to include most of them. Still, I managed to include some (e.g., Stott & Wright, 2012). One dilemma here is, of course, what counts as academic scholarship, which is one reason I didn't make my way confidently and carelessly into the religious literature. There is a plethora of sources in the domain of religious literature, no doubt, but working out which of these sources one can and should include in the academy, i.e., those which at least should be characterised by an attempt at unbiased inquiry, is not always easy. Which of these sources are apologetic and which are scholarly? The answer to this question, I think, is it depends on the source. Another category of scholarship I have left out is the social psychological, which I had intended to include but didn't have the space. There is a great deal one can learn about what goes on in the FBO simply by referring to this scholarship and its observations about discipline, obedience, beliefs, the process of thinking, the effect of a situation on a person's cognition or affect, and so on. It seems any comprehensive inquiry of FBOs, particularly one that focuses on clients and conversion, should include the vast scientific knowledge we have from this and cognate fields. Moving forward, I continue to read, and will start to make my way into the religious sources I have been given, and continue to explore the possibility of integrating social psychological research into the mix.

A fourth limitation is perhaps obvious: This study's findings are limited in terms of generalisability, inasmuch as the FBOs are selected from a fairly narrow geographical region in
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both Canada and India. My findings, therefore, are a starting point and suggest what religious influence in evangelical FBOs in the Greater Toronto Area and nearby cities is like, or what religious influence in evangelical FBOs in Mumbai is like. But they can't tell us much about what religious influence would look like in, for instance, Northern Canada or Québec, each with its own set of unique circumstances. Moreover, my findings can tell us little about what religious influence might look like in rural settings in India, or in cities with relatively different economic and social circumstances, such as the comparatively poorer Odisha or the more Christianised south, such as Kerala or Tamil Nadu. But despite this limitation, and the other three, the study has promise to contribute to the existing literature.

Contributions

To begin with the broadest contribution, to my knowledge this is the first study in Canada directly to explore the nature of religious influence in evangelical service settings. In North America the study joins a handful of others that have attempted a similar kind of exploration (e.g., Sager, 2011). A corollary of this first contribution is that, it seems to me, to be the first study to examine a faith-related issue within FBOs from a non-faith vantage in Canada. Put differently, the studies done in Canada were either funded or conducted by organisations or people who were themselves associated with evangelicalism or Protestant Christianity generally, and seemed often to support the views commensurate with their traditions. While this not to say their contributions are inherently flawed, and maybe not even inherently biased, it is nonetheless incomplete, given the way the matter of religious influence in service settings crosses decidedly secular lines. Of course, this first point also includes the fact that this is the first study, to my knowledge, to investigate systematically religious influence in service settings in India. Unlike

“Though here is an excerpt from Janzen's (2010) dissertation: "My research beliefs arise out of my general belief-system (i.e., my Christian faith). In fact, my Christian faith is the primary lens through which I view the world and to which my research identity is subservient" (p. 40).
Canada, this topic had virtually no scholarly work of which I was aware, despite how the issue in the country is like an exposed nerve in pluralistic, post-colonial India. Thus, the literature to which this work might contribute or be associated would be constituted by studies focused on other parts of the world where neoliberal policies have made way for evangelical service provision; but here again there are only a handful of such studies (e.g., Pelkmans, 2009). Finally, the comparison between the two countries is also novel. Again, there was very little literature here, in fact none on religious influence. The closest study is, of course, that cited above by Ferguson et al. (2006) which compared FBOs across Mumbai, Nairobi, and Los Angeles. Any comparison between Canada and India, despite the two nations' strong ties, maybe among the first in the social sciences literature.

Regarding the first point of connection between my findings and the literature more specially, a somewhat obvious point, there is a convergence between my findings and the literature which suggests the presence of an inherent oscillation or balancing between religious and secular mandates in FBOs. Here I have clearly indicated that oscillation in the title, but have referred to it at times as the "dual mandate." One of my participants referred to the "application of faith" and the "non-abuse of power," which highlights this tension, too (C14S1). Also, the reader observed the tension when reading about the participant who opposed public funding which prohibited proselytism. And again in one of the more salient accounts, a devout follower of Jesus commented on how he was able to manage the boundary between his faith and his service. Moreover, the principle of holism, and it's attendant corollary in holism with priority suggests the same delicate balancing act between service and evangelism. Of course, all of these map onto what many others have suggested, too, including the by-now familiar question by Cnaan and Boddie (2002) about how social workers might be able to work in FBOs. Or by
Janzen et al. (2016), who referred to the "dual motivation" of churches. In his dissertation Janzen (2010) also mentioned that some interview participants referred to the push and pull between the outcome of outreach (i.e., a relationship with Jesus) and the process of outreach (i.e., service, love, in short, a non-violent evangelism). Of course, the presence of this tension is suggested in the titles of Unruh and Sider's (2005) book, as well as, in a more critical vein, Sager's (2011) paper. In sum, all of these instances suggest that the balancing of service and evangelism is a live issue in contemporary FBOs and, as I have hopefully conveyed, is of utmost importance to social work scholarship and practice.

The second point of connection I want to make here, which emerges forcefully not only as a function of frequency in the literature but also as the elephant in the room of my findings, is that my findings suggest the predominance of a kind of "peripheral evangelism." In other words, religious influence seems more often to occur not in direct, obvious ways, but in round-about ways; and in the same way a person's peripheral vision catches a glimpse of something that happens not directly in front of a person, this kind of evangelism occurs not directly in front of a client, but at the client's periphery. In Canada, for instance, Janzen (2010) referred to a participant who noted that they sought to "make disciples" but that it was through "serving rather than proclaiming, spending time with people, rather than just going out there" and preaching (p. 96). This, of course, sounds awfully similar to the themes of social support, relational evangelism, and the discipleship programme principle in Canadian FBOs that emerged from this study. In fact, in general, the desire to "serve" rather than proclaim seems a foundational value of FBOs across both my studies. Another example from Janzen (2010): he noted that The Great Commission is to "be governed by an imperative of love" (p. 7). Consider that statement in relation to responses to a question on the survey which I did not share above, "We try to
demonstrate God's love to clients": scores were virtually unanimous, with a mean of 4.95 and only one respondent giving anything lower than 5, or "strongly agree," by indicating a 4 or "agree." What does "God's love" mean here? In the US, the same kind of peripheral evangelism emerges, too. These were referred to by Unruh and Sider (2005), for instance, who noted that one of their participants preferred "low-key approaches." These included two of the ways mentioned in my findings, "forming friendships" (i.e., relational evangelism) and "talking about one's religious experiences" (p. 47). Or recall that Monsma and Mounts (2002) found that evangelism was an "indirect or secondary goal" for some of the FBOs they studied (p. 17). Accordingly, a participant in their study said "Our call is for life transformation; we do not proselytize."

Lockhart's (2003) paper states that one leader of an organisation said, "We don't tell a person, 'You've got to become a Christian.' What we do is, we show them our curriculum; they have to make a choice...We show them our text book [pointing to the Bible], but as far as saying, 'Hey, you've got to convert to Christianity,' no we do not do that." In sum, these instances all map onto my findings, as religious influence through social support, programme design and the myriad other ways peppered across the other themes from both studies suggests the dominance of a kind of circuitous approach to religious influence, which I have called peripheral evangelism.

The third point of connection isn't supported by the frequency of instances characteristic of either the first or second points, but it is nonetheless interesting to note that faith as a service modality seems part and parcel of evangelical FBOs. In my study, this emerged as a theme, under which were several ways faith manifested to stand-in for service. The most deeply integrated in terms of faith and service was, of course, when salvation was the service. In Canada, the literature seems somewhat vague. For instance, the best we get from Hiemstra (2000) is that about a quarter of respondents in his study "engage[d] in efforts to encourage
clients to make personal religious commitments." With a little more specificity, Janzen et al (2012), taking a cue from Unruh and Sider (2005), refer to evangelism as a part of the 'range' of programmes for immigrants. Elsewhere Janzen also noted that the majority of congregations didn't offer evangelism to clients, while about 22% did occasionally and 8% did always (Janzen, 2010, p. 93). But in the U.S., the literature does admit more clarity. Hodge (2000), for instance, found that 20% of respondents to a question indicated that "salvation from the power of sin and addiction through a relationship with Jesus" was the purpose of the programme. Lockhart (2003) and Sager (2011) noted similarly integrated components of programmes where faith was, more or less, a service.

In India, my data suggested an even tighter integration than in Canada. While there isn't scholarly literature on the issue, this finding does pique one's interest in view of some of the theoretical literature and news reports which highlight some of the problems which might emerge from a close integration of the two. Moreover, the close integration certainly touches on Paras's finding that the distinction between mission and development was complicated for international FBOs to perceive, much less make. Interestingly, in my sample there was one FBO which shared quite a close relationship with another. The FBO was a service oriented organisation but the partner organisation was strictly evangelistic. Thus, when the FBO provided services, with federal money and/or public permission, they did so, but made way for the evangelistic organisation to follow. My participant served the same position and role in both organisations, further complicating the separation of service and evangelism.

The fourth and final point of connection is about coercion, which is an important ethical issue not only for social workers, but also for FBOs, staff of which, as the reader will recall, saw this as an important issue in both countries. My data pointed to a strong drive to avoid coercion
in Canada and India. This is divergent from Sager's (2011) finding that service was, in some cases, contingent upon service, or from Trotter Davis's (2014) findings, which suggested that nearly 80% of FBOs had a mandatory faith-based component. But the theme of no coercion tellingly diverges only slightly from the international literature, because while non-coercive religious influence emerged in the Indian data, so did data which suggest Indian FBOs used service as a "wedge" for evangelism - a mighty contradiction. Recall that CIDA officials who observed, for instance, that some FBOS were "actively using development as a wedge to proselytise." Or the "suspicious activities like development work attached to church planting and evangelism," which certainly seemed to me what many of the Indian FBOs were actively doing. Pelkman's (2009) work indicates how medical care can be a kind wedge for evangelism, too, which is quite similar to the finding of primary services mentioned above. All of this in addition to the weak evidence for non-coercion in the Indian sample, suggest that while staff were adamant not to coerce clients, to quote the same participant I've quote twice before, some FBOs may have a tough time figuring out the "application of faith" and the "non-abuse of power" (C14S1) - especially internationally.

**Future Directions**

Someone once said that academia is like a cocktail party; once you get a PhD you're invited to converse on important issues, by publishing work in the form of papers and books and presenting at conferences or giving talks. I have to admit that while I like this analogy, sometimes academia *does* seem more like a dysfunctional family dinner, with half the people not showing up, and the other half either talking past each other or missing the other's point. Whatever party I enter with this work, once I am able to publish some of the findings, I'll be part
of that conversation and this brings me to the final message before the close of this work: future research.

While there's no telling how others will take this work, my own inclination would be to conduct comparable studies in three to five locations in Canada and three to five locations in India over the next five years. The goal here would be to dig deeper into the pairing of religious influence and social service provision, hopefully with more funding, some graduate student assistance, and more time. These subsequent studies would not only add to this dissertation but benefit from it. In a kind of methodological praxis, I would use the lessons learned here to strengthen the research questions, research instruments, the processes I used, the data analysis, and address the limitations, all to better study the phenomenon of interest. Related to this "methodological praxis" is, of course, the firsthand experience I gained while living and researching in India for three months by myself, indispensable "know-how" that would benefit any future work. After the five years I feel I would have a confident grasp of the issue in two major secular democracies, with similarities that would confirm or corroborate what is implicit in this work, namely that conservative evangelicalism is an international, borderless movement with an ambitious vision with implications for social work, welfare, and policy. The differences are important, too: India is only one of two nations with a majority Hindu population, a romanticised target of evangelicals, and has a tattered social safety net as it attempts to pull its citizens out of a colonial swamp. Of course, there are many other directions to go with this research as well, but for now this dissertation and this plan are the next steps for me to take. And while I no longer watch much T.V.; the only cartoon I seem to watch is the Trump presidency and I don't channel surf enough to come upon something like the *Hour of Power*, I remain just as interested, just as fascinated with my topic today, as I was from the start.
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Appendix A: Client Survey

Instructions:

Welcome! Thanks for agreeing to fill out this survey. It should take you no more than 20 minutes and it will probably take you a lot less time. If you have any questions about the survey please ask the researcher.

The first set of questions are designed to assess the integration of faith or religion and the service you receive.

1. Religious things (such as prayers, pamphlets, priests) are around when I receive service.

   Always present  Sometimes  Never present

2. I can get service that is not faith-based or religious.

   Anytime  Sometimes  Never

3. Staff & volunteers encourage me to develop a relationship with Christ.
Always                        Sometimes                       Never

4. Staff & volunteers work to bring me and others they serve into their faith community.

Always                        Sometimes                       Never

5. Staff & volunteers encourage me to think about life’s problems in a faith-based or religious way.

Always                        Sometimes                       Never

6. To what extent is this helpful (please refer to the previous question #6).

Helps a lot                        Neither                       Doesn't help at all

7. Staff & volunteers help me deal with my thoughts in a faith-informed or religious way.

Always                        Sometimes                       Never

What kind of thoughts do they help you with? How?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. Staff & volunteers help me deal with my emotions or feelings in a faith-informed or religious way.

Always                        Sometimes                       Never

What kind of emotions or feelings do they help you deal with? How?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. Staff & volunteers help me deal with my actions in a faith-informed or religious way.

Always                        Sometimes                       Never
What kind of actions do they help you with? How?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. Staff & volunteers talk about their faith or religion with me.

Always  Sometimes  Never

11. Staff distribute religious materials to clients*

Always  Sometimes  Never

12. Staff help us join congregations*

Always  Sometimes  Never

13. Staff pray with individual clients*

Always  Sometimes  Never

14. Staff pray with groups of clients*

Always  Sometimes  Never

15. Staff use religious beliefs to instruct clients*

Always  Sometimes  Never

16. Staff encourage client's religious conversion*

Always  Sometimes  Never

17. Staff use religion to encourage clients*

Always  Sometimes  Never
18. Staff provide information about local congregations*

Always  Sometimes  Never

19. Programmes require religious conversion*

Always  Sometimes  Never

20. I can get service without participating in faith services (e.g., prayers, church, Bible readings)?

Always  Sometimes  Never

21. There is pressure to join the faith community (e.g., go to church).

A lot of pressure  Some pressure  No pressure

22. The religious things about the programme help me.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

23. Bringing clients of the programme closer into a faith community helps them with the problem(s) they face.

Helps a lot  Helps a little  Neither  Doesn't really help  Doesn't help at all

Please explain.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

24. A great number of people who visit this organisation join the faith community
25. Staff & volunteers have helped me change the way I think about life.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

What did they change and how?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

26. Staff & volunteers have helped me change the way I think about myself.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

What did they change and how?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

27. Staff and volunteers have helped me change the way I feel about myself.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

What did they change and how?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

28. Staff and volunteers have helped me change the way I feel about other things and people.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

What did they change and how?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

29. Staff and volunteers have helped me change the way I do things in my life.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
What did they change and how?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

30. I am satisfied with the service I receive.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

31. I often get what I need.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

32. There are no other organisations close to me that I can go to for the service I receive here.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

33. The religious things about the programme improve the service.

Implements it a lot    Improve it a little    Neither    Makes it a little worse    Makes it a lot worse

Please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

34. One purpose of the programme is to bring people to Christ.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

35. What is your least favorite part about the organisation's service?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

36. What is your favorite part about the organisation's service?
Appendix B: Staff Survey

Instructions:
Welcome! Thanks for agreeing to fill out this survey. It should take you no more than 30 minutes and it will probably take you a lot less time. Pilot tests of the survey took no more than 15 minutes.

Great! Let's get started. The first set of questions are designed to assess the integration of faith or religion and the service you deliver. Some of these questions were previously used in a study in the United States at the University of Texas by researchers of faith-based organisations.

1. Faith-based elements of the programming (such as prayers, pamphlets) are present when clients receive service.
   
   Always  
   Sometimes  
   Never

2. Clients can receive service that is not faith-based.
   
   Always  
   Sometimes  
   Never
3. Staff and volunteers encourage clients to develop a relationship with Christ

Always  Sometimes  Never

4. Staff and volunteers work to bring clients they serve into the faith community

Always  Sometimes  Never

5. Staff and volunteers encourage clients to think about their problems from a faith-based perspective.

Always  Sometimes  Never

6. To what extent is this helpful for the clients (please refer to question #6)

Helps a lot  Neither  Doesn't help at all

7. Staff & volunteers help clients deal with undesirable thoughts from a faith-based perspective.

Always  Sometimes  Never

What are some examples?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

8. Staff & volunteers help clients deal with undesirable feelings from a faith-based perspective.

Always  Sometimes  Never

What are some examples?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
9. Staff & volunteers help clients deal with undesirable behaviours from a faith-based perspective.

Always	Sometimes	Never

What are some examples?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

10. Staff & volunteers share their faith with clients.

Always	Sometimes	Never

11. Staff distribute religious materials to clients *

Always	Sometimes	Never

12. Staff help clients join congregations *

Always	Sometimes	Never

13. Staff pray with individual clients *

Always	Sometimes	Never

14. Staff pray with groups of clients *

Always	Sometimes	Never

15. Staff use religious beliefs to instruct clients *

Always	Sometimes	Never
16. Staff encourage client's religious conversion*

Always

17. Staff use religion to encourage clients*

Always

18. Staff provide information about local congregations*

Always

19. Programmes require religious conversion*

Always

20. We try to put religious principles into action*

Always

What are some examples?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

21. We try to demonstrate God's love to clients*

Always

What are some examples?
22. We seek to inspire clients' faith through staff’s actions*

Always  Sometimes  Never

What are some examples?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

23. Faith-based components of the programme help clients.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Please explain

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

24. Bringing clients closer into a faith community helps them with the problem(s) they face?

Helps a lot  Helps a little  Neither  Doesn't really help  Doesn't help at all

Please explain

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

25. A great number of people who visit this organisation join the faith community?

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

26. The staff at this organisation have helped clients change the way they think about the problems they face.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
What did they change and how?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

27. The staff at this organisation have helped clients change the way they feel about problems they face.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

What did they change and how?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

28. The staff at this organisation have helped clients change the way they do things in life.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

What did they change and how?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

29. How effective is your organisation at bringing people it serves into a faith community?

Very effective    Effective    Neither    Ineffective    Very ineffective

Do you want this to change? Why?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

30. Faith-based programming helps to address the social problems we encounter (e.g., homelessness, substance abuse).

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree
Please explain:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

31. Clients are satisfied with the service they receive.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

32. Clients often get what they need.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

33. There are no other organisations close by that they can go to for the service they receive here (Here please refer to the specific service component).

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

34. To what extent do you feel the faith-based elements improve or make worse the service you deliver?

Improves it a lot    Improve it a little    Neither    Makes it a little worse    Makes it a lot worse

Please explain:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

35. To what extent do you feel the faith-based elements of your programming improve or diminish your capacity to provide service?

Improves it a lot    Improve it a little    Neither    Makes it a little worse    Makes it a lot worse

Please explain:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

36. One purpose of the programme is to bring people to Christ

Strongly Agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly Disagree
37. Name of your organisation: ____________________________________________

38. Faith orientation or your organisation: _________________________________

39. Age of organisation ________________________________________________

40. Sector (e.g., homelessness, hunger): _________________________________

41. City: __________________________________________________________________

42. What are the faith-based elements to your programming?

43. Are there registered Social Workers or registered Social Service Workers in your organisation?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

44. If so, how many, approximately?: ____________________________________

45. Do you receiving funding from municipal, provincial, or federal sources?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

46. If so, how much, approximately?: ____________________________________

47. We have a policy concerning religious discussion with clients

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please explain
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

48. What are the biggest obstacles to fulfilling your organisation's religious mandate?
________________________________________________________________________

49. What are the biggest obstacles to fulfilling your organisation's service mandate?
________________________________________________________________________

50. What's your position title: ____________________________________________

51. What's your role: _______________________________________________________
52. Highest level of education: ________________________________

53. Are you a registered Social Worker or Social Service Worker?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

54. Length of Service: ________________________________

55. Faith Orientation: ________________________________

56. Age: ________________________________

57. Gender: ________________________________

58. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

Appendix C: Client Focus Group/Interview Guide

1. Tell me about [organisation name].
   a. Tell me about the faith-based components?
   b. What do you think are they intended to do for you?
   c. Does it improve the service you receive?
   d. How does the religious component affect you, otherwise? Positively or negatively.

2. Tell me about your interactions with the staff?
   a. When do staff talk about religion with you?
   b. When do staff invite you to participate in religious services?
   c. When do staff give you faith-based advice? What do they say?
   d. Why do you think they do this?

3. How have the faith-based components changed you?
a. Has it changed the way you think about things?
b. Has it changed the way you do things?
c. Has it changed the way you feel about things?
d. Have you changed faiths/joined congregations?

4. Let's speak about the contribution of [organisation name]
   a. Why do you come here?
   b. Would you be able to get service elsewhere?
   c. Is there another solution to [social problem] you think would work better?

Appendix D: Staff Interview Guide

1. Tell me about your organisation.
   a. Tell me about the faith-based components.
   b. What are they intended to do?
   c. Does it improve the service?
   d. How does the religious component affect clients? Positively or negatively.

2. Tell me about staff interactions with the clients?
   a. What's the overall goal staff have?
   b. When do staff talk about religion with them?
   c. When do staff invite clients to participate in religious services?
   d. When do you give faith-based advice? What do they say?

3. How have the faith-based components changed clients?
   a. Has it changed the way they think about things?
b. Has it changed the way they do things?
c. Has it changed the way they feel about things?
d. Have they changed faiths/joined congregations?

4. How does providing service impact your faith community?

Appendix E: Key Informant Interview Guide

1. Tell me about [organisation name].

2. Tell me about your interactions with the staff and clients there?
   a. Do you think there is pressure to participate in religious services?
   b. Do staff talk about religion with clients?

3. What do you think the religious elements of the programming are intended to do?
   a. Does it improve the service?
   b. How does it affect clients?
   c. Are they influenced religiously?
   d. Do they convert?

4. Let's speak about the contribution of [organisation name]
a. In what ways do they improve social welfare delivery?

b. In what ways do they interfere with social welfare delivery?

c. Do you think they're necessary? Does the government rely on them?

5. In what ways do you think government policy should be changed to better serve?

   a. How would or should the organisation be changed?
   b. Should it be regulated in some way?
   c. What about [enter prod about religious influence]?
   d. What's one idea you think is dangerous

---

Appendix G: Staff Email Invite

Dear Service Provider,

Faith-based social service provision is a key piece of Canada's mosaic of service provision. As an important stakeholder group within this mosaic - staff and volunteers of faith-based organisations - you are invited to participate in a study that seeks to investigate the interaction of faith and social service in faith-based organisations. If interested, you can participate by completing a relatively short online survey linked here. The survey is confidential and anonymous and will ask you a series of questions related to the topic.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University research Ethics Board (REB#5468).

Sincerely,
Appendix H: Staff Post-Survey Invite

Thank you for filling out the survey! Surveys are useful and can provide a lot of information but sometimes a real one-on-one conversation works better. If you are interested in having such a conversation then please email Ravi Gokani at rgokani@wlu.ca with an email - blank if you wish - indicating at least in the subject line that you are interested. Ravi will be in touch with you shortly thereafter to go over the details and determine if we can proceed further.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB#5468).

Thanks, again!

Sincerely,
Appendix I: Oral Script for Staff Survey Invite (Telephone)

Opening line

Ravi: Hi. I'm Ravi Gokani. I study social policy at Wilfrid Laurier University's Faculty of Social Work. How are you?

The reason I'm contacting you today is to ask if you're interested in participating in a research project on faith and service in faith-based organisations. I've identified your organisation by reviewing [insert reason]. If you provide service and consider faith to be an indispensible part of that service then you qualify.

The purpose of the study is to examine the way these two elements - faith and service - interact by asking staff and clients what they think, feel, and experience. If you agree to
participate, you could fill out a survey or sit with me over the phone or in person for an interview and I could ask you question - or you could do both!

**If participant declines:**

Ravi: OK. Thank you.

**If participant accepts:**

Ravi. OK. Thank you. I will send the link to the survey which will include a page indicating your consent to participate. What's your email address?

Also, please note that this project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB#5468).

---

**Appendix J: Oral Script for Client Survey Invite**

Opening line

Ravi: Hi. How are you? [conversation to build rapport]

If and once rapport built:

Ravi: I'm wondering if you might want to answer a few questions on your experiences here. It'll take about 20 minutes and you will get a $5 Tim Horton's gift certificate. Just so you know this project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB#5468).

If client declines:
Ravi: OK. Thank you.

If client accepts:

Ravi. OK. Thank you. Here is a brief form that indicates you've agreed to participate.

[Researcher will review form with client].

Once client signs form:

Ravi: Great. Let's get started.

---

Appendix K: Oral Script Client Focus Group/Interview Invite

Opening line

Ravi: Hi. How are you? [conversation to build rapport]

If and once rapport built:

Ravi: I'm wondering if you might want to join a group discussion on your experiences here. It'll take about 20 to 60 minutes and you will get a $5 Tim Horton's gift certificate and I'll provide food. Just so you know this project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB#5468).

If client declines:
Ravi: OK. Thank you. Would you prefer to have a conversation alone?
If client accepts. Researcher will direct client to venue:

Ravi. OK. Thank you. Here is a brief form that indicates you've agreed to participate.

[Researcher will review form with client].

Once client signs form:

Ravi: Great. Let's get started.

---

Appendix L: Key Informant Interview Invite

Dear Service Provider,

Faith-based social service provision is a key piece of Canada's mosaic of service provision. Credible research has demonstrated that faith-based organisations depend on their relationships with other faith-based organisations and secular providers. You have been identified as a "key informant" - someone who possess unique and valuable knowledge about a subject matter. Therefore, you are invited to participate in this study by engaging in a conversation with the researcher (also called an interview in research jargon). The conversation can take place over telephone or in-person and would last between 20 and 60 minutes. The questions will pertain to the central focus of the study, which is to investigate the interaction of faith and social service in faith-based organisations. If interested, you can respond to this email and someone will get back to you shortly.
Appendix M: Consent for Client Interview

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between faith and social service provision across national contexts. We are looking to interview no more than three to four clients. Ravi Gokani is a PhD Candidate at Wilfrid Laurier University’s Faculty of Social Work.

INFORMATION

Should you agree to participate, you will participate in a conversation with the researcher (also called an interview). This discussion should take no longer than 60 minutes and we could finish in less time.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks to participating.

**BENEFITS**

The benefit to you should you choose to participate is the opportunity to discuss your perspectives and experiences and perhaps in some general way help to improve your service experience.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Your confidentiality is ensured as the interview does not require you to indicate your name or any other personal information. When we record the interview and then transcribe or convert the audio recording into text, we also eliminate personal information you might have said. The only people who will have access to the recording or the transcript (the written version of the recording) are myself and my supervisor, Dr. Lea Caragata. When results of our study are published in peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and other academic fora, we will likewise eliminate all personal information. We would like to include quotations from the interview in the presentation of the study, but any identifying information written here will be deleted when presented.

**COMPENSATION**

For participating in this study you will receive a $5 Tim Horton's gift certificate. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will not receive the gift certificate.

**CONTACT**

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,*) you may contact me, Ravi Gokani, at rgokani@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (which receives funding from the Research Support Fund). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710 x4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca

**PARTICIPATION**

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. You have the right to omit any question(s)/procedure(s) you choose.
FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

Results of the research will be published in a dissertation and as well may in the future constitute portions of a book, article, or presentation on the investor’s research. Should participants require feedback on the findings of the study, they are welcome to contact Ravi Gokani at rgokani@wlu.ca after August 31, 2018 at which point Ravi Gokani will provide a summary of the findings.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature_________________________________ Date _________________

Investigator's signature_________________________________ Date _________________

I agree to allow the researcher to use an audio recorder to accurately capture what I say.

Participant's signature_________________________________ Date _________________

Investigator's signature_________________________________ Date _________________

Appendix N: Consent for Client Focus Group

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between faith and social service provision across national contexts. We are looking to have about two to four focus groups with between three and ten participants each. Ravi Gokani is a PhD Candidate at Wilfrid Laurier University’s Faculty of Social Work.

INFORMATION

Should you agree to participate, you will participate in a group discussion (also called a focus group). This discussion should take no longer than 60 minutes and we could finish in less time.

RISKS

The only risk to participating in the focus group is that you will be in a social setting with peers
and what you say will be heard by them. However, each person who participates, including yourself, will sign a confidentiality agreement, which means they agree to keep what is said private.

**BENEFITS**

The benefit to you should you choose to participate is the opportunity to discuss your perspectives and experiences and perhaps in some general way help to improve your service experience.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

In addition to the confidentiality agreement mentioned above, your confidentiality is ensured by us, the researchers, as the focus groups do not require you to indicate your name or any other personal information. The only people who will have access to the aggregate data are myself and my supervisor, Dr. Lea Caragata. Once we get enough participants these survey scores will be compiled together and the results of our study will be published in peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and other academic fora. However, again, even in these fora, nothing will identify you. We would like to include quotations from the survey in the findings, but any identifying information written here will be deleted when presented.

**COMPENSATION**

For participating in this study you will receive a $5 Tim Horton's gift certificate. Some light snacks and refreshments will also be provided toward the end of the focus group. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will not received the gift certificate.

**CONTACT**

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,* ) you may contact me, Ravi Gokani, at rgokani@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (which receives funding from the Research Support Fund). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710 x4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca

**PARTICIPATION**
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. You have the right to omit any question(s)/procedure(s) you choose.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

Results of the research will be published in a dissertation and as well may in the future constitute portions of a book, article, or presentation on the investor’s research. Should participants require feedback on the findings of the study, they are welcome to contact Ravi Gokani at rgokani@wlu.ca after August 31, 2018 at which point Ravi Gokani will provide a summary of the findings.

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I agree not to identify other participants and not to share what we say outside of this focus group.

Participant's signature_________________________________ Date ________________

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature_________________________________ Date ________________

Investigator's signature_________________________________ Date ________________

Appendix O: Consent for Staff Interview

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between faith and social service provision across national contexts. Due to time limitations, we are looking to have only about three to four interviews with staff at faith-based organisations. Ravi Gokani is a PhD Candidate at Wilfrid Laurier University’s Faculty of Social Work.

INFORMATION

Should you agree to participate, you will participate in a conversation with the researcher (also called an interview). This discussion should take no longer than 60 minutes and we could finish in less time.
RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks to participating.

BENEFITS

The benefit to you should you choose to participate is the opportunity to discuss your perspectives and experiences and perhaps in some general way help to improve your service experience.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your confidentiality is ensured as the interview does not require you to indicate your name or any other personal information. When we record the interview and then transcribe or convert the audio recording into text, we also eliminate personal information you might have said. The only people who will have access to the recording or the transcript (the written version of the recording) are myself and my supervisor, Dr. Lea Caragata. When results of our study are published in peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and other academic fora, we will likewise eliminate all personal information. We would like to include quotations from the interview in the presentation of the study, but any identifying information written here will be deleted when presented.

COMPENSATION

For participating in this study you will receive a $5 Tim Hortons gift certificate. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will not receive the gift certificate.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study) you may contact me, Ravi Gokani, at rgokani@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (which receives funding from the Research Support Fund). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710 x4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. You have
FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

Results of the research will be published in a dissertation and as well may in the future constitute portions of a book, article, or presentation on the investor’s research. Should participants require feedback on the findings of the study, they are welcome to contact Ravi Gokani at rgokani@wlu.ca after August 31, 2018 at which point Ravi Gokani will provide a summary of the findings.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature_________________________ Date _________________

Investigator's signature_________________________ Date _________________

Appendix P: Consent for Key Informant Interview

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between faith and social service provision across national contexts. Due to time limitations, we are looking to interview only about three to four key informants. Ravi Gokani is a PhD Candidate at Wilfrid Laurier University’s Faculty of Social Work.

INFORMATION

Should you agree to participate, you will participate in a conversation with the researcher (also called an interview). This discussion should take no longer than 60 minutes and we could finish in less time.
RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks to participating.

BENEFITS

The benefit to you should you choose to participate is the opportunity to discuss your perspectives and experiences and perhaps in some general way help to improve your service experience.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your confidentiality is ensured as the interview does not require you to indicate your name or any other personal information. When we record the interview and then transcribe or convert the audio recording into text, we also eliminate personal information you might have said. The only people who will have access to the recording or the transcript (the written version of the recording) are myself and my supervisor, Dr. Lea Caragata. When results of our study are published in peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and other academic fora, we will likewise eliminate all personal information. We would like to include quotations from the interview in the presentation of the study, but any identifying information written here will be deleted when presented.

COMPENSATION

For participating in this study you will receive a $5 Tim Horton's gift certificate. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will not receive the gift certificate.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,* ) you may contact me, Ravi Gokani, at rgokani@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (which receives funding from the Research Support Fund). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710 x4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. You have
the right to omit any question(s)/procedure(s) you choose.

**FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION**

Results of the research will be published in a dissertation and as well may in the future constitute portions of a book, article, or presentation on the investor’s research. Should participants require feedback on the findings of the study, they are welcome to contact Ravi Gokani at rgokani@wlu.ca after August 31, 2018 at which point Ravi Gokani will provide a summary of the findings.

**CONSENT**

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature______________________________ Date ______________

Investigator's signature________________________________ Date ______________