MIAMI UNIVERSITY
The Graduate School

Certificate for Approving the Dissertation

We hereby approve the Dissertation

of

Donovan M. Weber

Candidate for the Degree:

Doctor of Philosophy

_____
Dr. Kathleen Knight-Abowitz, Director

_____
Dr. Sally Lloyd, Reader

_____
Dr. Richard Quantz, Reader

_____
Dr. Judy Rogers, Reader

_____
Dr. William Boone, Graduate School Representative

ABSTRACT

EVANGELICAL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN A CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXT:
AN EXAMINATION OF SHORT-TERM MISSIONS THROUGH THE LENS OF
CRITICAL SERVICE-LEARNING

by Donovan M. Weber

The practice short-term missions (STM) is a growing phenomenon amongst Evangelical Christians. It is conservatively estimated that over 1.6 million Christians participate in a STM experience each year with a cost of approximately 2.7 billion dollars (Wuthnow & Offutt, 2008) and yet there is very little research being produced on this trend. This research project explores the activities of a subset of this movement by asking "to what extent are the practices of those who plan and implement short-term mission trips for Evangelical university students in the United States congruent with perceptions of good practice in service-learning literature." To answer this question data were collected through an online survey (n = 101) and follow up interviews (n = 14) with campus ministers who organize and lead STMs with their students. These data are evaluated through key concepts of reciprocity and reflection identified in the service-learning literature with special attention given to imbalances of power as a concern of critical service-learning. Findings reveal that an overemphasis on evangelism and poorly directed reflection opportunities can impede truly reciprocal relationships in STM programs, but that there are positive trends developing in Evangelicalism with the potential of overcoming the lack of reciprocity in STMs.

EVANGELICAL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN A CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXT:
AN EXAMINATION OF SHORT-TERM MISSIONS THROUGH THE LENS OF
CRITICAL SERVICE-LEARNING

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of

Miami University in partial

fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Educational Leadership

by

Donovan M. Weber

Miami University

Oxford, Ohio

2011

Dissertation Director: Kathleen Knight-Abowitz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking my family for their undeterred love and encouragement through this project. Jocelyn, you are the love of my life and I will never be able to repay the grace and patience you have shown me these past few years. I hope you get that support group going for spouses of doctoral candidates someday, you have so much to give! To Ruby, thank you for being the sweetest girl, and for leaving daddy alone all of those times when you really, really didn't want to. To my cheeky Nora, you were a good sounding board for me while in your mother's tummy.

To mom and dad, thank you for raising me to meet and love people wherever they may be, you raised me in the midst of a great adventure! This project began with you.

To my good friends and colleagues, James Campbell and David Childs, thank you. I will count our conversations in the bullpen and at countless lunches as one of the most important parts of my lifelong education. Thanks for sharing perspective and life with me. Next time we drive up to High Street why don't you let me sit in the front seat?

To my dissertation committee, thank you for all of your hard work in making this dissertation what it is. Dr. Knight-Abowitz, thank you for your advising, for all of the timely feedback, the endless pages of reading, and for all of the encouragement. You have been both professor and mentor to me. Dr. Lloyd, thank you for going above and beyond in your advising. You are a wonder with statistics and research organization! Dr. Quantz, thank you for your wisdom and your theoretical grounding. You show great kindness in your teaching. Dr. Rogers, thank you for your insight and the professional perspective you brought to this project. Dr. Boone, thank you for being a part of this dissertation!

Finally, I give thanks to God. Every good and perfect thing comes from You.

CHAPTER 1: A REVIEW OF THE SHORT-TERM MISSION MOVEMENT

My first experience with a short-term mission trip (STM) was brief but made a lasting impression on me. This experience occurred in Johannesburg, South Africa where I was raised by missionary parents. Due to its strategic location in Southern Africa, we often hosted other missionaries in our home who traveled to Johannesburg for medical treatments, supplies, or for layovers while traveling in South Africa or to countries like Zimbabwe and Zambia. Some of these guests became close friends and others were acquaintances that we knew only by the organizations and churches they worked with.

I met my first STM travelers as they stayed at our house for an afternoon before we took them to the airport to travel back to the United States. They were a group of eight college students who had been in South Africa for two weeks building a church building. At the time I had no framework for understanding what they were there for, and at the age of 15 I didn't really care. What did grab my attention was that one of the team members had bought a soccer ball for R120, roughly $50 at that time, as a souvenir of his time in Africa. The American traveler was something common to me, but I did not know any missionaries, and certainly no Africans, who spent so much money on soccer balls! I did not know it at the time, but I was making my first critical observation of budding phenomenon in American Evangelicalism.

Since that time I have continued to observe the STM movement from multiple vantage points. My family and I functioned as hosts to STM travelers who came to South Africa to work with missionaries and national church leaders. I have been a member of churches in the United States and have experienced the movement as it asserted its influence on American Evangelicalism and how it engages the world. I have been a participant in the movement as a leader of trips and as a consultant to other trip leaders. Finally, I am now a researcher of a movement that has grown large enough in its scope and influence to warrant a closer and more refined critique.

Short-term mission trips all have similar qualities, but the type of experiences that they produce for participants varies greatly. This largely depends on the aims of the trip organizers themselves but also on the mental, emotional, and spiritual preparation of those who visit foreign places. My own experience as a leader of trips that were planned

and organized by other groups has provided an opportunity to see both the positive and negative side of Western Christians invading developing communities with their hand sanitizers, digital cameras, bibles and a sense of adventure.

The first of these trips included 16 high school students and three adult sponsors working with a church in South America for three weeks. There were students on this trip who went with a strong sense of curiosity about their world and about the people they were visiting; they tried new foods and new rituals, and they attempted to understand day-to-day life in this South American city. However, the larger group of students and sponsors involved themselves in this trip with an entirely different set of expectations. They were interested in the adventure, being in an exotic place and doing exotic activities, but that is also where their interest in this place ended. When asked about his purpose in coming on this trip one high school graduate explained that before he went to college he felt he needed to do something that would serve as a right of passage into adulthood, and for someone who had never left the United States except for a trip to a resort in Mexico with his family, this trip would fulfill that purpose.

Even though the curriculum for the trip had an explicit emphasis on service to those people who were hosting these students in their homes, and to the church that was welcoming these students into their community, this foreign city instead became a site to fulfill personal goals and interests that often were unrelated to the hosts. What followed was an apathy towards the stated goals of the trip, to the rules and guidelines that were to facilitate those goals, and to the possibility of this trip being a conduit for change in the student's understanding of the world and their spiritual development.

In contrast to the South American trip was one I experienced with a group of nine University students visiting an orphanage in an African country. This trip had no explicit curriculum tied to it, and the details were mainly organized by the orphanage itself. Although these students embarked on this trip with the same sense of adventure as those who went to South America, they went with a stronger sense of serving the community to which they were being invited. This attitude combined with an informal curriculum and a partnership with our African hosts led to deeper discussions about the interconnectivity of the world, more time for reflection on our spiritual selves and on our sense of calling. We also managed to assist in the construction of a primary school building.

These two instances of STM reveal a small part of my experience with the STM movement. They serve to highlight the various experiences of the many STMs organized and led by Christians in the United States each year. They also serve to highlight the fact that very little is being done to study the impact of STM on the lives of participants or on the host communities that receive these groups around the world.

What research has been done in this area is almost exclusively from those inside the STM movement and has focused almost entirely on the impact that STM has on the American participants (ver Beek, 2008). Researching the development and current state of the STM movement means delving into the world of missiologists, anthropologists and sociologists who are engaged in efforts to professionalize the field of missions. It is also to delve into the world of the practitioners who come from a variety of Christian backgrounds and organizations. This literature presides almost exclusively in Christian periodicals like *Missiology*, *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* and *Chrisitanity Today*, and in books that appeal to Christian readers. This is to say that most of the literature on the STM movement in Christianity reflects the interests and concerns of this movement.

The ultimate concern of this movement, especially within the Evangelical tradition that comprises the focus of this research topic, is the proselytization of non-Christians. Although the world mission movement has also concerned itself with social responsibility and justice, the primary task, which these other concerns are acquiescent to, is evangelism. It is a motive that is so salient within the literature that it serves as a point of commonality from which internal critiques are launched and it is so ubiquitous within mission thinking that often times goes unsaid. This unspoken evangelical justification for theory and practice within the STM movement can leave those outside of this tradition disoriented within the literature.

A reference to Christian mission is a broad term that requires a great deal of qualification. This project begins this process by narrowing its focus specifically on campus ministry organizations that are expressly Protestant and Evangelical, terms which warrant an historical examination. The name Christian has an expansive use in the United States as it often refers to those who culturally or traditionally identify with the Christian faith. In his study on the involvement of Christians in STMs, Robert Wuthnow (2008) narrows this definition by excluding those who are nominally Christian, but rather

defines Christians as those who are active church members. Although this definition is more useful to a study of Christian involvement in world mission it still fails to distinguish between Roman Catholics, Mainline Protestants and Evangelical Protestants. Ideologically, each of these church movements has approached Christian mission work differently over the past few hundred years, which has a significant impact in the way in which they approach STMs.

This project will focus on Evangelical Protestants for three reasons: 1) There has been a rapid expansion in focus on STMs as an important religious practice within Evangelicalism; 2) There is a deficiency in critical research in the academic literature within Evagelicalism despite the exponential growth of STMs; 3) My own position within the Evangelical movement positions me in a way to study this phenomenon in a way that is both critical as well as sensitive.

Evangelicals & Christian Mission

Defining Protestant Evangelicalism can be a tricky undertaking due to the diverse religious and political practices of its constituents. The movement is most easily defined in contrast with other Christian religious movements like Catholicism and other Protestant mainline denominations like Episcopalians, Lutherans, and Presbyterians. However, Evangelicalism still encompasses multiple denominations with diverse views on church polity and practice including groups like Charismatics, Fundamentalists, and Pentecostals. Unity in the movement is rather found in shared core beliefs about the Christian Bible and the person of Jesus.

Evangelicals view the Bible as an authoritative source and have traditionally interpreted it literally. There are still many in the movement who hold to a literal hermeneutic, however in response to Darwinism and critical scholarship in the field of Biblical Studies, others in the movement have instead emphasized the inerrancy of the Bible (Balmer, 2000, *xvi*). In general, Evangelicals emphasize the event of Jesus dying on a cross and being raised from the dead, as it is recorded in the canonical Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke and John), as an historical event that functioned as an atonement for all people. Evangelicals believe that people must have some type of spiritual rebirth in

response to this event that shows an acceptance of this atoning act. The most important characteristic of Evangelicals to this study is the emphasis that is placed on proselytizing. The world is viewed as a broken place that is unable to restore itself. The act of informing others of the need for atonement and inviting them to accept the atoning act of Jesus is an imperative to the Evangelical faith. All of the activities of the Evangelical church are centered around this purpose (Bebbington, 2002; Balmer, 2000).

Evangelicals have also had a distinct political identity organized around movements like the Moral Majority, founded in 1979 by Jerry Falwell, and the Christian Coalition, founded in 1989 by Pat Robertson. These groups were ignited by the political movement of Conservative Christianity, adopting positions on abortion, marriage laws, and economic and social policies that were influential in legislature and governing around the nation. Although recently there has been growing disunity over political affiliation within the movement, evangelicals have played a significant role in politics on the local and national level in the United States. The modern evangelical political landscape finds increasingly diverse political views grounded in debates over the interpretation and application of the Bible.

The organizing principle of proselytizing or evangelism, the namesake of the Evangelical movement, is grounded in the authority placed in the Christian Bible. It should be noted here that special emphasis is placed upon the New Testament, the 27 books that focus on the life of Jesus and his followers. Jesus' command to his followers to be a witness to his life and teachings is recorded in several different places in the New Testament, but it is Jesus' last recorded words in the Gospel of Matthew known as the Great Commission that are referenced most often:

> All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you. And remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age" (Matthew 28:19-20. New Revised Standard Version).

"Everything I have commanded you" is interpreted as both the life and teachings of Jesus as they are recorded in the Bible, but it is also interpreted to mean the teachings of his Apostles or close students, who are believed to hold the authority to teach in his place after he was gone. These teachings include an understanding of Jesus as the Son of

God, norms for spiritual activities, ethical norms, an understanding of the temporary nature of this world, and an understanding of heaven and hell as places where people will spend eternity after their death (Matthew 25:31-46). Although the concepts of heaven and hell have been interpreted in different ways within the Evangelical movement, the predominant belief is that when people die they will go to one of these two places based upon whether they have known the person of Jesus and have accepted his atoning work. This is the proverbial fire that fuels the Evangelical emphasis on evangelism not only with priority but also with urgency.

The Christian Bible also contains narratives of the practice of evangelism by the Apostles and other followers of Jesus. Again, recognizing the role of the Bible as an authoritative source for Christian practice and ethics, these evangelistic narratives are interpreted as norms for followers of Jesus today. There are several different people featured in the evangelistic narratives of the New Testament, but none more prominently than Paul. Over half of the book of Acts, which records much of what we know about the early church's activities after the death of Jesus, tells of Paul's conversion from a Pharisaic Jew to an Apostle of Jesus. It goes on to record Paul's efforts to evangelize Jews and Gentiles throughout the Roman Empire. This essentially becomes the first detailed account of Christian evangelism done in a cross-cultural context.

From the beginning of Christian mission work there was also an element of service involved. It is recorded in the book of Acts that Paul and some of his traveling companions raised money from churches that he and others had established to take to the church in Jerusalem that was suffering due to a famine. Another interesting historical note is that although today Christians often occupy a space of political and economic capital, this was not the case of Christians in the first century. In many of Paul's missionary endeavors it is he who is relying on the generosity of recent converts to the Christian faith, and he was often oppressed by local governments and by the Romans. It is only after 313 CE when Emperor Constantine issued the Edict of Milan legalizing Christian worship that the Christian religion found favor in Western thought and culture.

Further development of coherent mission strategies can be identified as far back as the eighth century when Boniface traveled from England to the European continent to establish churches using the local Germanic languages (Beaver, 1999, p. 241). Since this

time there has been persistent work on behalf of Christian mission that has manifested itself in many different forms including dubious movements like the Crusades and Colonialism. Although the Crusades were as much about political and geographic expansion, this period of almost 200 years of European interference in the Middle East also proposed to proselytize through military aggression. The Crusades had ended by the thirteenth century but the political, cultural and religious tension between Christians and Muslims that they created still exist as an important context for mission work today.

The development of modern missions, with a renewed interest in the Great Commission, developed hand in hand with European Colonialism. A symbiotic relationship was sustained between the missionaries of this period and the diplomats and merchants representing "three forms of imperialism – political, economic, and cultural" (Kane, 1982, p. 93). Although the modern Christian mission movement considered its project to be something entirely different than that of the Colonial project, recent scholarship has pointed to the complicity of the missionary in subduing colonized people (Ani, 1994; Rodney, 1981; Sugirtharajah, 2005). In many instances mission groups were drawn to established colonial settings, but more frequently the Imperial powers followed pioneering missionaries into new territories that had not yet been subjugated. Walter Rodney further implicates the church's role in the Colonial project in Africa by pointing specifically to it's formal and informal education in relation to the slave trade:

> The church's role was primarily to preserve the social relations of colonialism, as an extension of the role it played in preserving the social relations of capitalism in Europe. Therefore, the Christian church stressed humility, docility, and acceptance. Ever since the days of slavery in the West Indies, the church had been brought in on condition that it should not excite the African slaves with doctrines of equality before God (Rodney, 1981, pp. 252-253).

The result was the church's implicit and explicit involvement in communicating a message that in retrospect many would argue was not within the confines of the intended purpose of Christian mission. Besides the gospel message the modern mission movement espoused cultural norms that were conducive to the interests of colonialism and arguably injurious to indigenous cultures. For this reason historical and sociological scholarship has looked on this movement disapprovingly and with little sympathy in their critique. This critique has resulted in a dominant narrative that says that the Christian mission

movement is largely unreflective on the sociological, cultural and political impact that it has on indigenous peoples. This narrative has been mirrored, and in return perpetuated in popular culture, and by popular literature such as the acclaimed novel by Nigerian author Chinua Achebe, *Things Fall Apart* (1959) and the more recent *The Poisonwood Bible* (Kingsolver, 1998). Each of these stories clearly identify a link between Christian missionaries and their colonial counterparts, and the struggles that an indigenous culture faces when asked or forced to change their beliefs about their world and their customs. Each story also hints at the futility of such exercises as important characters tragically lose their sanity and their lives.

In spite of this tainted past, Christian mission also has a long history of service to others even during Colonialism. Besides starting schools, hospitals and other social organizations missionaries are credited with confronting oppressive social forms which they encountered through their work. It was missionaries who appealed to European intervention to end the Arab slave trade in central Africa, and who opposed the immolation of widows in India, and the killing of twins in Africa, and who advocated for women and oppressed minority groups. In isolated cases missionaries even fought against the oppressive social policies of Colonial powers (Kane, p. 100).

In his seminal work on this subject, *Colonialism and Christian Mission* (1966), Stephen Neill surveys the historical and geographical influences of colonial expansion and the relationship of the church, concluding that this relationship is far more ambiguous than either side would admit. Neill's assessment was that although Christian mission was obviously conducive to colonial expansion, much of which was oppressive to those being colonized, their primary concern was usually the well being of the people despite that fact that their motives were never entirely pure (p. 413). The result was a relationship between Christian missionaries and indigenous people that was unintentionally paternalistic and in rare cases even contemptuous.

More recent postcolonial scholarship has not been this kind towards Christian involvement in empire building of the West. The work of critical scholars like Durkheim, Gramsci and Foucault have given postcolonial scholars the theoretical framework to challenge not only the results of Christian involvement in colonialism, but also their initial intentions. Postcolonial scholars like Said (1978) assert that the West has

historically viewed different cultures, especially the Arab world, as foreign and dangerous others. This act of othering on the part of the West has been the justification for a historical relationship with the rest of the world built on oppression rather than mutuality. As postcolonial scholarship explores the continued effects of colonialism on developing nations more details about the historical relationship between colonial expansion and Christian mission are sure to emerge.

Development of the Short-term Mission Movement

STMs in the context of Evangelical Christianity were born out of a long tradition – combined with service but always for the main purpose of evangelizing. The term "short-term missions" developed within the modern mission movement as a way to describe trips that were taken in the spirit of the Evangelical mission tradition, but by those who were not ready to make a career or long-term commitment. Although the institution of cross-cultural missions has been active for over 2000 years, in contrast the STM movement is brand new. However, the STM movement has morphed and expanded quickly in step with the acceleration of other transnational activities over the past five decades of globalization.[1] The Protestant Mission Handbook (2004) delineates STMs as trips lasting two weeks to one year, however Robert Priest's (2006, 2008) research suggests that a large proportion of STMs last from seven to 10 days. These numbers may account for the number of Junior High and High School students who go on these trips each year as part of church programming. Although the Protestant Mission Handbook also describes STMs as overseas trips it is beneficial to expand this periphery as well due to the number of STMs that travel to places within the United States such as Native American reservations, impoverished urban centers like New Orleans, and impoverished rural areas (e.g., Appalachian region). These trips may not involve the cultural distance and expense of trips taken to Africa and Southeast Asia, but they still fit a broader definition of Christian mission work within a cross-cultural context.

---

[1] Globalization is recognized as a process of diminishing local and regional constructs into global ones that has been developing over centuries of empire building, colonialism and now post-colonial migrations. Due to new technologies in travel and communications this process has accelerated significantly over the past 50 years.

Pinpointing the genesis of this movement in Evangelicalism is a difficult task largely due to the lack of research early on and also to the grassroots nature of the movement. Because of the unwieldy and disjointed nature of Christendom in the United States it is difficult to generalize the origin of many sociological trends that develop within it. It could be argued that STMs have existed as long as Christian mission has, however, there has been an obvious growth within the movement in both numbers and its perceived value within the Evangelical church over the past 50 years.

The popularity of STMs amongst the entire demographic spectrum of Evangelicalism has increased disproportionately to other travel trends under globalization. As the expense of travel has become more accessible to the middle class in the US over the past 30-40 years, increased international travel has allowed for large growth in the service tourism industry. However, there is a twofold reason for the disproportionate participation of Evangelicals in this area: 1) the perceived urgency and obligation to participate in fulfilling the Great Commission; 2) the communal funding practices of STMs making international travel more affordable. The first reason provides an ideological framework for this phenomenon, whereas the second reason provides an important practical framework.

There are some self-funded STMs, but there is a long tradition of mission work being funded by the church dating back to the Apostle Paul in the book of Acts. The interpretation of the church in Antioch financially funding Paul and Barnabas' mission work in Acts 13 has served as a norm for the Christian church for two thousand years and has been easily adopted by the STM movement. Today funding for mission trips typically involves participants writing a letter soliciting funds which is distributed to members of their church community, and this letter is typically also distributed to other family and friends who are sympathetic to their cause. The soliciting of funds is the impetus of the individual, however often times this money is thrown into a communal fund that offsets the excesses and shortcomings in the fund raising efforts of individual participants. Many Evangelical churches have mission funds that are used to support long-term career individuals and mission organizations, but there are a growing number of churches that have budget allocations specifically to fund STMs for their members. There are also

instances of Evangelicals funding their own STMs, but anecdotal evidence suggests that this is rare.

There has been at least one attempt to estimate the numerical growth of this movement since the late 1950s by McDonough and Peterson (1999). I hesitate to mention it here because of the lack of evidential support for the estimations, however it is an important study because of its ubiquitous use in the early literature discussing STMs in Evangelicalism. The influence of this study will be discussed further later in this chapter but it is worth noting the use of these numbers in missions literature (Guthrie, 2000; Loobie, 2000). The authors pinpoint the STM movement in Evangelicalism to two different individuals, George Verwer with Operation Mobilization (OM) and Loren Cunningham with Youth With a Mission (YWAM), who separately decided that young people could be involved in Christian mission for short periods of time. According to McDonough and Peterson this assertion sparked a movement in the late 1950s, which is the period that is pinpointed for the genesis of the current phase of globalization, that grew from 540 individuals involved in STMs to 120,000 in 1989. Using an estimation by John Kyle, the director of the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association (EFMA), they suggest that the movement had grown to 450,000 participants annually in 1998 (McDonough & Peterson, p. 1). By this time the authors assumed that their estimations were fairly conservative based upon the trends they were observing.

How accurate these numbers are will be difficult to substantiate, however they do point to the fact that this movement has grown significantly over the last 50 years in the United States. In an attempt to further quantify the modern STM movement, Roger Peterson (2003) notes that there was a significant boom during the 1990s in comparison to the first three decades of the movement. While qualifying these numbers were virtually impossible to reproduce he attempted to construct a conservative estimate of STM participants in the USA when considering that there were at least 35,000 churches, 3,700 North American agencies and 1,000 North American schools that were involved in planning and implementing STMs. Based on these numbers he conservatively estimated that the number of Christian STM participants in the United States had exceeded one million per year by 2003 (Peterson, Aeschliman & Sneed, 2003, p. 252-255).

This estimation has been supported by recent studies by both those within the Evangelical movement and those who are outside observers. The magnitude and scope of these trips would naturally draw the interests of outside observers, although this interest may not be developing quick enough. Based on the number of those participating in STMs and the amount of money that is being spent, scholars in the fields of anthropology and sociology are beginning to examine this phenomenon more closely. Robert Wuthnow, Professor of Sociology and Religion at Princeton University, conducted a national survey (n=2,231) of active church members in the United States in 2005. Based on this instrument, titled the Religion and Global Issues Survey, Wuthnow conservatively estimates that 1.6 million Christians participate in STMs to other countries each year. "The dollar value of this effort, using rates established by Independent Sector, is approximately $1.1 billion. At an average cost of at least $1,000 per trip, transportation conservatively totals at least another $1.6 billion" (Wuthnow & Offutt, 2008, 218). These numbers would significantly increase if the study were to consider the number of STMs that travel to inner-cities, Native American reservations and rural areas of poverty in the United States. The financial implications of this industry are sizeable, suggesting that billions of dollars in new or reallocated money are spent each year to send Christians from the United States into cross-cultural venues.

This growing trend has led to a more critical form of scholarship amongst Evangelical missiologists concerned with whether the STM movement actually addresses the purposes of the larger Evangelical movement and with the global impact of STMs. The most notable of these scholars is Robert Priest who teaches missions and intercultural studies at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Priest began his inquiry into STMs shortly after arriving at Trinity in 1999, and has since produced several important pieces of descriptive quantitative work, but has also been at the forefront of identifying the overtures and subtleties of the movement. Based on his work with missions and intercultural studies students he observes that seminarians, students studying for vocational ministry, are taking less missions related classes but were increasingly likely to participate in STMs. When surveying 120 Master of Divinity students at Trinity he found that 62.5% had already participated in a STM trip and that 97.5% of these students expected to participate in a STM trip in the future (Priest, et al, 2006, p. 434). These

numbers are noteworthy not only because they highlight the popularity of such trips with American students training for ministry, but also because they point to another trend in the STM phenomenon, participation in multiple STMs. This raises questions about what value is gained by those who participant in more than one STM, and what motivates them to do so? Further research is needed in this area.

In his most substantial work to date, Priest led a research group to survey classes from 48 different Association of Theological Schools (ATS) seminaries in North America which produced a sample of 1935 responses. These responses were combined with additional surveys distributed in general education courses at schools belonging to the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities and also included a few independent Bible Colleges. Of the combined sample of 5270, 30 to 70 % of the students from each school had participated in an STM. The survey collected valuable demographic data, but also descriptions of where participants were going, how long they were staying, how much money the trip cost per person, and what size STM groups were.

Priest's evaluation of the results of this survey are debatable based on how one defines the activities of STMs. He acknowledges that finding a similar program for contrasting and comparing is difficult, suggesting that a typical university spring break trip is a leisure activity with little or no correlation other than the fact that they involve travel to exotic locations. A closer comparison in his estimation would be university semester abroad programs where students spend a semester in another country continuing course work in their area of study, but with experiential learning of that country's history and culture included in the curriculum.

If one accepts the premise that semester abroad programs offer a reasonable comparison of programmatic form and function, the demographic contrast is substantial. Priest compares the data gathered from his sample of 5270 to the Association of International Educator's (NAFSA) report *Securing America's future: Global education for a global age* (2003) showing that semester abroad programs account for less than 1% of those who graduate from college, whereas roughly 50% of his sample was able to participate in a STM. STMs also scored better than semester abroad programs for inclusion of gender, minorities and socio-economic status as well. However, even though roughly 50% of the Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans who completed the survey

had participated in an STM, these populations made up only a small portion of the larger sample (Asian Americans n=188, Hispanic Americans n=200). African Americans were the only group that were significantly lower than other ethnic groups at 29% with a sample size of n=286. These figures also reflect the lack of diversity within Christian seminaries and colleges in North America.

A second contention with Priest's conclusion that semester abroad programs are the closest comparison at the university level for STMs is that it fails to recognize the number of cross-cultural service-learning trips and alternative spring break trips organized and led by universities. These burgeoning programs that seem to also be paralleling globalization trends more accurately reflect the time commitment, financial requirements, and the activities of STMs. This would especially be true considering that 74% of STMs in Priest's study lasted between one and 14 days, with 34% lasting between 10 and 14 days. The number of minority students participating in STMs may still be significant in comparison to cross-cultural university service learning programs, especially because of the communal funding of STMs, but more careful research is needed in this area to establish this claim.

Beyond the most recent quantitative research by Priest and Wuthnow (Priest, 2006, 2008; Wuthnow, 2008), there are other indicators of STM growth. Besides the proliferation of STM not-for-profit organizations there has been an increase in the 'how-to' literature on this subject. These books vary in quality and focus, but generally they include guides for spiritual and logistical trip preparation, what to expect in a cross-cultural environment, ideas and activities for post-trip processing, and ways to be culturally sensitive (Dearborn, 2003, Livermore, 2006, Stiles & Stiles, 2000). These authors are experts in the logistics of short-term work credentialed with leadership or participation in multiple trips.

Short-term Missions and Higher Education

The research conducted by Robert Priest et. al. (2006, 2008) highlights the growth of STMs amongst university and graduate students training for ministry, however there are also indicators that the movement is dynamic on non-religious university campuses as

well. This growth has been experienced amongst campus ministries and individual university students in the United States. One of the national campus ministry organizations participating in this study claims to offer over 200 different STMs for students each year. Based on their claims that they are active in 1,064 different campus locations and their programs reach over 12 million people, many students are engaging cross-cultural communities through this organization. The magnitude of Evangelical campus ministry involvement on university campuses is difficult to measure considering that these numbers represent only one of many national and regional campus ministry organizations that represent a variety of sects and denominations within Evangelicalism. However, the presence of Evangelical students and the campus ministries that serve them on university campuses is significant. Michael Coomes (2004), based on his summary of the *Spiritual Life of College Students Preliminary Report* (UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, 2003) states that "more than two thirds of third-year undergraduate students demonstrate a substantial level of religious engagement and commitment' (p. 22). The *Spiritual Life of College Students Report* (UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, 2005) found that 41% of college students classify themselves as Protestant Christians, which would include members of mainline denominations (as cited in Magolda & Gross, 2009).

The presence of campus ministries and religious activity on university campuses is coupled with the thought that participation in the STM movement has a special appeal to those in higher education. In the past Christian colleges and universities were places to recruit young people training for ministry who might be interested in missionary service as a career. Practically, today university students often have greater flexibility in their responsibilities that afford them the time and liberty to travel during the summer months, spring break, Christmas break, and for some even longer periods of time like an entire semester. But the participation in STMs by university students goes beyond career shadowing and convenience – STMs are fulfilling the growing interest in community service and travel that is prevalent in the university today.

There is also greater emphasis within Evangelicalism on STMs as a tool of spiritual and identity development in young people. The acts of service are important components in this new emphasis (Johnson, 2006), but the relational and disorientating

element of cross-cultural STMs provide equal opportunities for spiritual and identity formation. Changing the context in which students engage their faith can lead to a disorientated or unsettled feeling that causes them to ask questions anew about their role in the world and their relationship to others (Decker, 2008). Recent work has also explored the role that urban STMs in the United States can play in changing student's perceptions of racial and economic others, which can lead to a greater sense of trust (Richardson, 2008).

The combined growth of the STM movement with the significant presence of Evangelical university students on American campuses makes this population a worthy group to study. Although Evangelical university students are traveling around the world through trips planned and implemented by campus ministry organizations, there is very little research on what influence these activities are having on the students and the populations they are visiting. The strongly held assumption that participants and host-culture's lives are changed for the better has shielded the STM movement from a closer, more critical, examination.

New Tensions Within Evangelicalism

The growth and prominence within the STM movement has naturally created tension within the Evangelical mission movement. The main critique from missiologists is that even a basic understanding of cross-cultural mission work is absent in the work of many STM practitioners. This is what Priest and Priest call the "amateurazation of missions" where they "see everything but understand nothing" (2008). This critique is well founded, as there exists a mentality within the movement that anyone who is spiritually mature and willing to travel is qualified to organize and lead a cross-cultural STM. However, this definition of spiritual maturity rarely includes an understanding of self in relation to the "other." This is significant as the Evangelical movement has a tradition of racial segregation with many church groups consisting of fairly homogenous populations. When spiritual leaders have little experience with other races and ethnicities in their own community it is difficult to imagine that the same ideologies that created a lack of engagement with the other is not transferred into this new environment.

16

Many within the Evangelical movement who are aware of the disconnect between amateur STM travelers and missiologists are not concerned about it; in fact, they applaud it. Churches and independent Evangelical organizations that have not traditionally been involved in cross-cultural mission work are now getting involved through STMs regardless of whether they have the support of either missiologists or long-term career missionaries. Much of this is due to the lack of cohesion within the movement, but this trend is also attributed to a shift in thinking from the baby boomer generation. David Dougherty (1998), a member of Overseas Missionary Fellowship International (OMF) as well as a former church minister, has identified what he calls 'two major streams of action' (pp. 276-278). These two streams are: 1) Missions as process; and 2) Missions as project. According to Dougherty, the former represents the methodical, ongoing activities of mission organizations and independent missionaries, the later represents a new interest in reaching out to unreached, or least reached people groups through more intensive efforts. Another way of stating this difference is that missions as process focuses on the activities of missionaries while the project movement focuses more so on the accomplishments of mission efforts.

This new approach is influenced by a generation of people who want to use their spiritual gifts, or talents, as a way to contribute to the Great Commission. Dougherty believes that this interest is born out of an entrepreneurial spirit in the United States amongst baby boomers who have more time and resources to participate in STMs. These entrepreneurial talents include everything from retiring teachers, professional contractors who own their own businesses, and business professionals who have more vacation time at this point in their career. The later example is particularly relevant to this conversation as there is currently an interest in business partnerships within the modern mission movement as a way to establish sustainable churches in impoverished communities around the globe.

Implying that these two approaches are neutral, apolitical methodologies for accomplishing the same task is over simplistic. There is a palpable tension between missiologists, traditional long-term missionaries and their sending organizations and the ever-growing STM movement. Those advocating the traditional, process approach to missions are grappling with the explosion of STM interest, trying to figure out how to

best channel this emerging new voice in Evangelicalism. The purpose of that voice is to hopefully more effectively use the STM movement for the intended purposes of Christian mission, but also to do damage control. Christian Westerners visiting the slums and villages of the developing world with little or no preparation has the potential to be counter-productive for Christian mission, but it also creates scenarios for unethical human interaction and exploitation.

Another variable in this tension between long-term and short-term missions is the competition for resources. The proliferation of STM organizations and professionals has occurred within the context of a powerful and salient assertion around the movement. This assertion states that as people participate in STMs they are more likely to give money to support missions and more likely to become long-term missionaries. For missiologists concerned about Christian mission, the implication is that resources must now be shared with this growing movement with little evidence of the validity of this assertion. A missions pastor from Minneapolis, a ministry position founded in many Evangelical churches to organize and support both long-term and short-term missions, describes STMs in this way, "I think it is a stimulation to missions. I don't think it is robbing missions dollars from long-term supporters but rather widening the pool of informed missions supporters, both the returning short-termers as well as the support networks they have tapped into" (as cited in Guthrie, 2000, p. 111). While this may be true, this assertion is only supported by anecdotal evidence at this point. What must be noted in relation to this context is that this pastor has now become a stakeholder in the STM movement, where his paycheck and his career rely upon people from his church involving themselves in STMs. This is an especially sensitive issue in the Christian mission movement because of the not-for-profit status of churches and parachurch organizations like those that organize mission trips. Essentially both streams, borrowing Dougherty's term, are raising their funds from the same donor pool, which are Evangelical churches and the individuals that these churches represent.

The magnitude of this movement and the various ways in which North American Christians are getting involved is exemplified in the recent STM activity of a Midwestern Evangelical megachurch (defined as a church with membership exceeding 2000). In April, 2006 this church organized a STM for 300 people to travel to a southern African

18

country. This trip was received well by the church and in response they organized two trips of 300 each to travel to the same location in July, 2007. What has developed is an ongoing partnership where smaller groups of professionals travel to this same location throughout the year helping to support and continue projects that the larger group worked on. The church conducted another trip in 2008 and a fourth trip in 2010. According to the church's reporting, these groups consisted of medical professionals, IT professionals, business professionals, teachers and contractors who participated in projects related to their field as well as agricultural and construction projects. This church highlights some of the positive trends in the STM movement of prolonged engagement with distant communities and involving participants in areas of service that may not be able to be filled by nationals within those communities. However, while this church's activities may be reflecting trends in globalization and service tourism, the long-term missions movement would ask how much does it cost to send 900 people to Africa over a two year period? And, what else might this money be used for? Furthermore, it is also unknown how these many people are received and accommodated by the host community as there is no mention of investigation into the host community's perceptions and follow-up research with participants.

Initial Critiques of the Short-term Mission Movement

Despite the objections raised to the STM movement by a minority of stakeholders in Evangelicalism, like missiologists and long-term missionaries, attitudes amongst Evangelicals as a whole towards the movement are positive. This positive disposition towards STMs in the larger Evangelical context is due to the myth that participant's actions and thoughts are changed significantly during and after a trip and that the world is a better place because of these activities. This myth has recently been critiqued raising questions about the overall effectiveness of STMs on participants and the possibility of the movement's complicity in unjust global patterns.

The assumption that the actions and thoughts of participants are changed significantly because of their participation in STMs most likely developed out of anecdotal evidence and narratives of the varied experiences people had on their cross-

cultural travels. This assumption holds strong within Evangelicalism despite the research concluding that an STM experience is just as likely to reinforce previously held stereotypes and to increase ethnocentrism among participants (Priest, et al, 2006; Rickett, 2008). It is not difficult to envision throngs of American Christians going on a cross-cultural adventure for two weeks returning with stories of exotic foods and poor people with brown skin who truly appreciated their presence. However, within missiological circles this myth has also been grounded in the research from the Short-term Evangelical Missions (STEM) organization in Minneapolis, MN.

As mentioned before, there is very little quantitative research that has been done on STMs. Of the studies that do exist the most influential has been one conducted by STEM, which is an organization that organizes STMs and provides training for those interested in leading trips of their own. Their study, *Can Short-Term Mission Really Create Long-Term Missionaries?* (McDonough & Peterson, 1999) suggested that those who participated in STMs upon their return engaged more in positive activities like prayer, were more likely to consider full-time mission service as a career, and were inclined to give more money to fund mission services because of their experience. However, the recent historical influence of this survey is far greater as the authors claim that this study validates an earlier study by the same organization titled *Is short-term mission really worth the time and money? Advancing God's Kingdom through short-term mission* (Peterson & Peterson, 1991). These outcomes suggest a win-win situation for those who go on STM and those who host them. The popularity of this widely cited study has contributed to an already well-established myth within the Evangelical world as a whole, that STMs make a valuable contribution to the mission of the church. The residue from this study has also guarded the movement from further critical analysis for almost two decades.

At first glance there seems to be some validity to McDonough and Peterson's work as it includes a large percentage of the sample population (n=432 of a possible 2,035) and longevity (10 years). Their method was to administer an attitudes and behavior survey to participants in STEM organized STMs from 1985 to 1995 shortly after returning from their trip. The survey inquires about participant's giving habits, spiritual activities and their knowledge on the subject of cross-cultural evangelical

missions after they have returned from their STM experience. However a closer inspection reveals that there was no pretest before the trip and that no effort was made to triangulate their findings with other data like actual giving records of participants or other observable indicators. Instead, participants were asked to estimate how much money they gave to and how often they prayed for missions as far back as three years before their trip. Besides the suspicion that one might have about the ability of the participants to accurately remember what they were doing before they went on an STEM STM, the research bias of both the STEM researchers and the STM participants to portray a positive image of their efforts is a concern as well. These are both issues that the researchers acknowledge in their report (McDonough & Peterson, 1999, pp. 21-22). The most significant weakness was the researcher's inability to triangulate the data with another variable or data source, however this has not deterred STEM and other STM proponents of using this study as a justification for their work.

This research project has recently come under scrutiny along with other less influential projects for their research methodology by the missiologist Kurt Ver Beek. One of the critiques raised by Ver Beek (2008) is that most STM research by Evangelical organizations focuses almost exclusively on the impact on American participants and not on the host communities. Focusing specifically on quantitative research papers on STMs, of the 44 papers he reviewed only four attempted to survey the effects of STMs on host communities. This highlights the trend in the growth and development of the STM movement on the emphasis of benefits for individuals who are thought of as providers of service rather than the beneficiaries of service. This part of the myth surrounding the STM movement is demonstrated in the amount of literature emphasizing the value of STMs for attaining the goals of the Evangelical church in America (Hardig, 2001; Scherer, 2002; Slater, 2001).

In his own research on the experiences of North Americans who traveled to Honduras to build homes after Hurricane Mitch in 1998, Ver Beek's (2008) findings varied greatly from McDonough and Peterson. Ver Beek surveyed 127 STM participants and he also had a Honduran social worker and a North American social worker interview 30 families whose homes were built by the Americans. In a similar fashion to the STEM research project participants were asked about whether or not they had made positive life

changes in a variety of areas. One of the tangible areas that could be triangulated by third party data was whether or not participants had increased their giving to the Christian International Development Fund (CIDO), the sending STM organization. Of the 113 responses to the question of whether or not participants would be giving money to CIDO, 10% reported that their financial support had increased significantly two years after the trip, and 49% claimed that their giving to CIDO had increased somewhat. According to CIDO's donor records 75% of the 162 participants who had participated in their Honduras trips had not made any financial contribution to the organization during the two years after the trip. Furthermore, the total giving of the STM participants only went up 6% after the trip, averaged out this represented a change from $31 per year per participant to $33 (pp. 485-486).

Besides providing research findings that challenge the results of the seminal STEM research project, Ver Beek's study went a step further by surveying the recipients of the CIDO STM projects, which were the Honduran families who received a new home. Although the Honduran families helped in the building process and agreed to pay back some of CIDO's investment, they were generally grateful for the assistance. However, what Ver Beek did find was that "the North American work teams seemed to have no greater impact on the communities than the Honduran Christian organizations – either positive or negative" (2008, p. 478). This finding is all the more potent considering that the Honduran Christian organizations built the same houses for $2000 that it cost the North American groups $30,000 to build once travel and accommodation expenses were figured into the cost. For those who are concerned with the goals of Christian mission these findings are alarming on two fronts: first, the implications seem to be that national Christian organizations can be just as effective without the presence of STM workers regardless of their skill sets; second, the most basic form of cost/benefit analysis would question whether this is the most effective way for an organization or community to reach its stated goals.

Andrew Root (2008) echoes Ver Beek's concern that little to no positive life change takes place in STM travel, however, he offers a second critique with implications that exceed the concerns of Christian mission. Root's critique questions the second part of the dual myth surrounding the STM movement, that it recruits long-term missionaries

and increases giving to mission organizations, by suggesting that the STM movement is participating in larger global patterns that both highlight and take advantage of inequality and injustice in the world. Root grounds this claim in Zygmunt Bauman's (1998) theory that the globalized world creates two types of travelers, tourists and vagabonds. According to Bauman there are no natural borders anymore because technology and the ease of travel in a globalized world have established the sense that no matter where somebody is in the world, they could always be elsewhere (pp. 77-78). However, because this new postmodern world is stratified according to social class there are the welcomed travelers, the tourists who move freely through passport controls and borders, and there are the unwelcome travelers, the vagabonds who are immigrants, refugees, and those who desire to move but who don't have the means.

Root places the STM traveler in the tourist group because of their obvious resources but also because of the dichotomies and paradoxes of their activities. Based on his own experience Root paints the STM as a strange space where travelers go to exotic places in the developing world and spend one day in the slums and the next day at a resort on the beach. This description would not be accurate of all STMs but certainly many of them include explicit tourist activities in the vein of learning more about the country they are visiting or as a time of relaxation for the challenging work they have accomplished, while other trips might not be recognized as anything other than a vacation. By associating STM activities with Bauman's dichotomy of tourists and vagabonds in the globalized world he recognizes that STMs need poor and disenfranchised people to justify their activity, it is because of poor vagabonds that Christians give money to STM travelers. Root states: "The mission trip is a tourist event, but most insidiously, a tourist event that uses vagabonds as its activities" (p. 317).

Root uses Bauman's common understanding of postmodern people's desire to consume experiences as a way of understanding tourist activity. Tourists like to do things like visit museums, sample foods and visit interesting sites, but once they have consumed these things, they are ready to move on to the next experience. Root believes that the lack of positive life change in STM participants can be attributed to this desire to consume. Once the experience of feeding homeless people in a developing country is completed the STM tourist can move on to the next experience leaving this experience as just another

memory. The reason that this is possible is because STM travelers can occupy their minds with accomplishing tasks that can be easily measured within the context of a 10 to 14 day trip.

Instead, Root suggests that "our mission trips should not be about doing anything, but simply about being with people. They should be about seeing, hearing, and sharing existence with others, others who live as unwanted vagabonds in our world of tourism" (p. 318). This is not to say that STM travelers should go and do nothing, but rather that their focus should be on understanding the plight of those in the developing world and how those in the developed world benefit from it.

This is an explicit departure from the conventional wisdom of the STM movement, which has traditionally focused on acts of physical service. Much of this emphasis has been based as much on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs as it has been based upon any spiritual conviction, it making sense that a person's physical needs should be addressed before their spiritual needs can be met. However, there is a far more practical reasoning for physical acts of service (i.e. medical services, feeding programs, construction) based on the time restraints that define STMs. Although many STMs still claim to engage in forms of friendship evangelism and relationship building, it has been recognized that it is far more effective for a group of Americans in a foreign culture to build a house or assist in a feeding program due to the lack of cultural competency. Root's reasoning for abandoning such pragmatism is that "when our mission trips are about doing something, then like good tourists we are free to move on and eventually forget them, for we have done our part and now it is time to move on to another experience" (p. 318).

The solution Root offers, of just being with people rather than to be preoccupied by doing things for people, raises further questions about how the act of reflecting will insure life transformation and minimize global injustice. However, more importantly is that Root brings an important critique to the STM movement that is categorically missing from the literature on this subject. Asking STM participants to reflect on the experiences of others is a doorway to the possibility of considering social inequality in the world. Reflection on the experiences of others may also help STM participants confront the privilege and power they have as travelers from the developed Western world over those

in the developing world. It further raises the question of whether STM participants are perpetuating the dichotomy of helper and helpless without confronting the global political and economic arrangements that insure that the helpers will continue to benefit from the system while those who are helpless are trapped in their place. This is to say that an American traveler who is interested in helping the impoverished in the developing world might more effectively involve themselves in the Free Trade and Fair Trade movements rather than distributing clothing and rice somewhere in Africa. It further raises the question of whether it is ethical to use these exotic locations as a staging ground for adventure and spectacle (Linhart, 2006).

Furthermore, at one time people in the developing world may have accepted American Christians into their communities with few presuppositions about their connectedness through the streams of globalization, those days are coming to an end. Americans no longer travel to the developing world as innocent observers and good Samaritans who are in no way connected or involved in the lived experiences of the host-nationals who receive them. Thomas Friedman (2005) describes those in the developing world as the three billion people who now have the means and the desire to collaborate and compete in the global world through new technologies that have made a disconnected world connected (p. 181). As these three billion people are more aware of the world and its interconnectedness they will no longer receive American missionaries as just purveyors of the Gospel, but as the 'haves' in the 'haves and have nots' dichotomy. Missionaries must recognize that the message of their tourist lifestyle is as attainable as their Gospel message.

Conclusion

The Evangelical STM movement has developed out of a long history of Christian efforts to proselytize people all over the world. These efforts have been diverse in their methods and in their effects on the world and its communities. The STM method of Christian mission has now arrived at a place that warrants a closer and more critical view of its activities. The steady growth over 50 years and the sheer number of people who are traveling cross-culturally in the vein of Christian mission deserves to be treated with the

same level of academic inquiry as other religious and social movements of this magnitude.

This movement has been especially popular amongst campus ministry organizations and their students for pragmatic reasons, but also because of the growing interest that university students have in serving local and distant communities. Because of the importance placed on this type of activity by STM practitioners for personal and spiritual development, it becomes all the more important to analyze what learning and what transformation, if any, is taking place. Answering this question begins with analyzing how those who organize these trips think about their work and what they hope to accomplish through it.

Informing the STM trips planned by campus ministry organizations is a powerful myth that says that serving and evangelizing cross-culturally transforms student's lives and instills in them a greater interest in Christian mission and global concerns. This myth has yet to be established in any empirical way, and has inadvertently guarded STM travel from a more critical analysis of its work and accomplishments. Any analysis of campus ministry staff and their STM programs should question how this myth has influenced the assumptions they make about the activities they organize for their students.

An initial critical look at the STM movement as a whole suggests that it is likely guilty of promoting consumerism rather than true transformational life change. The movement is also likely to be contributing to global structures and patterns that are unjust and work to maintain the dichotomy of the haves and the haves not. Campus ministry organizations may be guilty of both of these shortcomings in their STM planning, and it is worth exploring to what extent they take into consideration the disparate levels of power they possess compared to the communities that they visit.

The challenges facing the Evangelical STM movement amongst campus ministry organizations to produce positive life change in participants and to have a positive impact on the communities they visit is an increasingly complex task. Although Christianity may offer a spiritual and moral framework to address these concerns they can too easily be lost in the Evangelical zeal for proselytizing. Instead, this movement is ideally positioned to be examined through the lens of service-learning with its interests in quality reflection and reciprocity through acts of service.

CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF SERVICE-LEARNING LITERATURE

Just as the short-term mission (STM) movement has been growing among Evangelical Christians in the United States, the notion of citizens involving themselves in service to their communities for the greater good has also been rising. Besides increased involvement in organizations like Habitat for Humanity and the Peace Corp, popular periodicals like *Time* magazine have devoted a special issue to community service each year since 2007. These special issues cover trends in service as well as motivations for service and notable figures who are making noteworthy contributions in this area. This emerging trend owes itself in part to the work that has been done in the field of service-learning by educators within the k-16 context.

In form, STMs and service-learning look very similar to each other. However, there are striking differences between the two fields of activities. The most notable difference between the two is the laborious amount of literature that has been produced by the field of service-learning that has not evolved in STMs. This large body of literature indicates a level of thinking in theory and practice surrounding service-learning that has yet to take place in the STM movement or, exists only as common assumptions within the movement. The simultaneous growth of these two movements warrants an exploration of their intersectionality, raising questions about how they might each inform the other. This chapter will identify these points of intersection between these two fields while exploring the literature on service learning. Consequently this chapter will also point to the limitations of this comparison while suggesting how service-learning might function as a lens for evaluating the STM movement.

Service-Learning in Higher Education

Broadly defined service-learning is a form of experiential education that seeks to combine elements of community engagement with student learning and development. It is grounded in a progressivist philosophy in the tradition of John Dewey's *Experience and Education* (1938) in which learning is connected to activities that help students tie current and past situations together in relation to their community to create new

27

knowledge. For Dewey, it is the experience of the individual in relation to the shared values of their community that leads to individual growth. In practice students are positioned to tie classroom content and theory into life application as they position themselves within familiar communities and sometimes in unfamiliar communities. Besides being a valuable learning experience, student's engagement in the community should also provide valuable assistance to that community through their work.

Service-learning is growing in standing in many areas of education and life today, but historically it has held a distinctive place in higher education in the United States. Many of America's first universities began with a service-oriented mission as they were founded as religious institutions. Furthermore, Jacoby (1996) notes that the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant Act by 1862, which provided federal land to universities in exchange for services to local communities, created an intertwined relationship of service between universities and local communities. Boyer (1994) points to historical events like the Great Depression and World War II in which American universities were called upon to serve their local communities and the nation as further examples of this unique relationship.

Within the context of this rich tradition there was a resurgence of community engagement in the 1960s that was formative to the culture of service on university campuses today. This resurgence was born out of the civil rights movement in the 1960s, with President Kennedy's institution of the Peace Corp in 1961, and with the establishment of Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) in 1965 (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, 2008). Among this resurgence was a smattering of faith-based organizations, which highlights one of several important intersections between the STM movement on university campuses and the field of service-learning in higher education.

This resurgence continued when President Clinton signed the National and Community Service Trust Act (1993), which led to the founding of the Corporation for National & Community Service (CNCS). The CNCS has since become an umbrella organization for the pooled resources of numerous community service organizations like AmeriCorps, which claims to engage 70,000 Americans in service to their communities each year (AmeriCorps, 2009), and Senior Corps, which engages Americans who are 55 years or older in their communities (Senior Corps, 2009). The CNCS was also responsible for transforming the organization Serve America into Learn and Serve

America, which specifically engages k-16 students in community engagement with the expressed intent of incorporating it with classroom learning (Learn and Serve America, 2009). Learn and Serve America has since become the premiere resource for educators and program directors interested in service-learning by offering a national service-learning clearinghouse through their website servicelearning.org (2009).

The proliferation of service and learning organizations has brought about increased participation in service activities by university students. One such organization, Campus Compact, is working to alter campus culture towards community engagement. Campus Compact represents a diverse collection of Presidents from diverse institutions of higher education that began as an effort to challenge the American university to 're-examine its public purposes and its commitments to the democratic ideal.' (Campus Compact, 1999, p. 1) It has since become an organization with 1,190 member institutions in 2008 (the latest year statistics are available) representing over 6 million students (Campus Compact, 2009) and important agent for renewing university's role in civic engagement.

One of Campus Compact's significant contributions to higher education is to track statistics of involvement and trends in service-learning. According to their annual member survey, the number of service-learning courses offered on participating campuses increased from 11,800 in 1998 to 24,271 in 2008 (Campus Compact, 2009). They also report that more than 712,000 students from traditional 4 year colleges and from community colleges performed over 17 million hours of service in 2000. During the 2007-2008 academic year member campuses performed over 242 million hours of service amounting to $5.7 billion in human capital (Campus Compact, 2009). Campus Compact's 2009 report also indicates that more schools are considering faculty involvement in service-learning for tenure and promotion, and that 94 % of their campuses have an office dedicated to community service, service-learning and civic engagement. Campus Compact's reporting is limited to its member campuses, which arguably should favor and legitimate service-learning based on their involvement. However, the increase from four member campuses in 1985 to the 1,190 in 2008 (Campus Compact, 2009) still points to growing interest and involvement in community service from American universities and their students.

The growing phenomenon of STMs amongst Evangelical university students in the United States parallels the growing number of university students involved in service-learning. This parallel development is possibly due to two historical intersections. The first of these two intersections is that the STM movement began to flourish at the beginning of the latest period of globalization beginning in the 1950s. Within the STM movement this was largely attributed to the increased accessibility to international travel by the middle class in America rather than to an ideological shift. The second intersection is that during the 1950s and 1960s as universities in America were taking greater interest in their communities and political activism, Evangelical campus ministry organizations were being founded and were beginning to enhance their involvement in campus life. Ministries like Campus Crusade for Christ was founded in 1951 at UCLA, while InterVarsity USA was officially established in 1941.

There is also a growing correlation between STMs and service-learning activities on American university campuses in more recent history. According to Campus Compact reporting member campuses offering alternative spring break programs grew from 47% in 2001 to 67% in 2006, and international service opportunities grew from 32% in 2001 to 52% in 2006 (Campus Compact, 2007 & 2002). These two categorizations of service most closely resemble what STMs look like in form, suggesting that college students are doing similar forms of service regardless of whether it is explicitly linked to a faith orientation. For many students faith is an essential part of their service, but the concept of service seems to be a common denominator for this current generation of students. The growth in international service-learning (ISL) opportunities can also be attributed in part to an increasingly globalized world and will be discussed further later in this chapter.

There is also an increasing body of literature on international service-learning that points to the growing popularity of more expensive service projects in exotic locations. In the past this type of travel was only available to affluent students who would spend time overseas for a year or more with the intent of studying rather than being involved in service. However, it is increasingly accessible to less affluent students who travel

30

overseas for a semester or less and (Green & Baer, 2001). Much of the influential work in this area comes from the International Partnership for Service Learning and Leadership, which is producing both theoretically grounded research as well as 'how to' books for practitioners (Berry & Chisholm, 1999; Tonkin (Ed.), 2004).

Current STM research shows that trips lasting from 7 to 30 days account for over 50% of the trips taken, and that trips lasting 10 to 14 days account for one third of trips taken (Priest & Priest, 2008, p. 4). Trips of this length fit the alternative spring break model for service opportunities, and in fact many STMs on university campuses are spring break alternatives. Trips of this length are also far more economical for students to participate in both financially and for the amount of time investment they require. More students are able to afford to go to Mexico and build houses for a week, or go to New Orleans to help with disaster relief from hurricane Katrina, than are able to spend a semester or a summer studying or serving in Europe, which is still the premiere destination for study abroad programs. These growing similarities in form between STMs and service-learning, including international service-learning, indicates a shared interest in university students being involved in community service both locally and internationally. How similar the service activities of these two movements are, and how each movement thinks about their work deserves more investigation as this chapter continues to explore service-learning.

The Value of Service-Learning

One of the reasons that service-learning has grown so rapidly in recent years is not only because of the interest of college faculty and administrators but because of its popularity with college students. Even though some criticize service-learning for not being academically rigorous, Eyler and Giles (1999) found when interviewing students that "when they talk about their learning, it is clear that they believe that what they gain from service-learning differs qualitatively from what they often derive from more traditional instruction" (p. 2). In part it is because service-learning ties them to a form of experiential education that is rarely found in the essentialist culture of schooling in the United States. Student participants have established qualitatively through their reflections

31

on their experiences that service-learning stimulates curiosity and pushes them towards new knowledge (Eyler & Giles, 1994, 1999; Eyler, Giles & Schmiede, 1996).

The benefits of service-learning to student participants has more recently been established through the use of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ) (Moely, Mercer, Ilustre, Miron & McFarland, 2002). Following rigid validity and reliability measures for this Likert scale attitudinal survey Moely et al. found that service-learning is related to increases in commitment to service and public works, interpersonal skills, commitment to using the political system to solve social problems, and reduced stereotyping and greater understanding of other cultures (p. 24). In a follow up project a sample of 217 students involved in service-learning was compared to a sample of 324 students not involved with each group taking the CASQ at the beginning and end of a semester.

> Students who participated in service-learning showed expected changes in civic attitudes and rating their own skills for community engagement, as well as expressing plans to be involved in civic activities in the future. A second group of students, similar to the first group in demographics but not involved in service-learning during the semester, showed little change in scores on any of these scales . . . showing service learning's benefits on personal conceptualizations of self, other and societal issues. (Moely, McFarland, Miron, Mercer & Ilustre, 2002, p. 23)

The instrument also revealed that those engaged in service-learning also enjoyed their classes more than those who were not engaged.

Moely et al's study also found that one area that did not change over the semester for service-learners was attitudes towards diversity. This is significant because it challenges a commonly held assumption that the benefit of cross-cultural interaction is that it makes people more aware of, and open to, other people and cultures that are different than their own. If student's attitudes towards diversity are not changed by interactions with new people of difference, then it is possible that these interactions work to reinforce already held stereotypes about others. In the service-learning context these "other" people mainly include the impoverished, the elderly, minorities, immigrants, foreign nationals in the developing world, and other people with little or no cultural and social capital. These are concerns that are addressed by critical service-learning that will be discussed later in this chapter.

Other important studies have found that service-learning also enhances student's academic development and civic responsibility (Astin & Sax, 1998). Much of the service-learning literature deals with the impact that service-learning has on the participants. This is especially true when considering the importance placed on service-learning and interaction with others of difference in the development of personal identity (Jones & Abes, 2004; Rhoads, 1997). The question of benefit is not only reflected on by scholars who study service learning, but has also been identified by university students reflecting on their own service (Eyler, Giles & Schiemde, 1996; Rhoads, 1997, pp. 22-23).

The concept of spiritual development as a product of service to others is beginning to find its way into the literature on service-learning as well (Johnson, 2006). What is unique about this development is that spiritual formation is being linked to developing concerns for social inequalities and overall lack of justice in the world and for developing habits of critical self-reflection, a concept that will be developed further later in this chapter, in students. The concern for social justice, and the necessary self-reflection that accompanies these concerns, has been present in mainline denominations in Christianity for some time, but has more recently started to find its way into Evangelical communities. Evangelical involvement in movements like the New Monasticism figure headed by Shane Claiborne (2006), and organizations like Sojourners headed by Jim Wallace (sojo.net; Wallis, 2005; 2009) highlight this new concern for the injustices of poverty. This is also evident in the literature critiquing the STM movement as it focuses only on how effective STMs are in fulfilling Christian mission rather than the social impact that it has on receiving communities (Ver Beek, 2008). What little study has been done in the area of spiritual formation and the development of identity in STMs suggests that there is a clear lack of critical self-reflection, and that there is a greater tendency to project established stereotypes formed within participant's home culture onto the others they encounter (Linhart, 2006). Linhart's findings echo the concerns of Moely et. al. (2002) that service-learning experiences do little to change students attitudes towards diversity.

Another important point of intersectionality between STMs and service-learning is that each movement aspires for personal transformation in participants. One large discrepancy between the two movements is the amount of research that has been

produced by each, with the service-learning movement producing substantially more research and theory. Despite this there have been efforts within each of these movements to determine that personal transformation is being accomplished within participants (Moely et al, 2002; Peterson & Peterson, 1991), however the validity of research within the STM movement has been substantially challenged (Ver Beek, 2008). Spiritual formation in participants is a primary justification for STMs, and if this assertion about spiritual formation is accurate, it would be valuable to know in what ways those who organize STMs believe they are accomplishing this.

Reciprocity and Reflection: The Ethics of Service-Learning

Establishing criteria or parameters for what constitutes good service-learning in higher education is not an easy undertaking. Neither is it easy to establish criteria for what constitutes service-learning of any quality. Instead, there is an ever-increasing body of literature exploring and theorizing about how university students serve their communities, what motivates them to do so, and what learning takes place in the process. There is also an important ethical component to this literature as it concerns itself with serving in responsible ways, developing responsible and active citizens, and working towards both democracy and social justice. This ethical component is one of the characteristics that distinguishes service-learning from simply volunteering. Service-learning is volunteering tied to a curriculum with the intention that participants will learn about the community that they are serving and explore the larger social, political and economic issues that tie them to that community. It also emphasizes serving needs that are identified by the community which is receiving the services rather than by those doing the serving. This reciprocal ethic insures that both parties benefit from the interaction through service rather than it simply being an act of charity.

Taking the concerns of responsible community service along with quality learning experiences into consideration, there is still a lack of cohesion within the numerous programs that are labeled as service-learning on university campuses. A program that involves students volunteering at a homeless shelter for a 15 week semester while attending seminars on homelessness in the United States falls under the designation of

service-learning, however, a university may have incoming freshman go out into the community and pick up trash for an hour during orientation and also call it service-learning. Eyler and Giles (1999) suggest that the lack of cohesion in the type of programming and pedagogy labeled as service-learning is an advantage to explore the multi-faceted programs on university campuses that may have positive learning outcomes. However, they do acknowledge that they are most interested in programs with an optimum mix of both service and learning (p. 5).

Eyler and Giles reference Sigmon's (1996) work to describe what the optimum mix should look like in a service-learning program. Sigmon describes four different approaches to service-learning based on four varying nominal emphases. The first two typological classifications are 'service-LEARNING' and 'SERVICE-learning,' where either service or learning goals are the primary concern and the other is a secondary concern respectively. The third classification is 'service learning,' where the goals service and learning are separated from each other. The fourth classification is the ideal approach, 'SERVICE-LEARNING,' where both parts are connected by a hyphen emphasizing that both are equally weighted, and each compliments the other for the benefit of all participants. Because service-learning is both pedagogy and community service, the difficult task of a service-learning program is to balance the concerns of the student and their education with the concerns and needs of the community. This concept of reciprocity is a difficult balance to strike, and it is one of the foremost concerns of the service-learning movement.

Barbara Jacoby (1996) emphasizes the importance of reciprocity in her succinct definition of service-learning in higher education:

> Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service learning (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5).

Jacoby identifies the dual emphasis that makes service-learning more than just a program that one might institute, or a pedagogy that one might practice. Although it is both of

these things, it is also a philosophy that asks what is ethical and what is just within human interactions (Jacoby, p. 9).

Reflection in service-learning is placing acts of service within deep and intentional thought. The intention is to reflect on the broader and multi-layered context of the service situation (Rhoads, 1997, p. 181). The reflection should ideally include levels of context; social, political and cultural, of which most students are not immediately aware. The outcome of this type of reflection is quite different than other forms of pedagogy that aim to be ideologically and ethically neutral. Instead, service-learning as a pedagogy and philosophy aims to transform student's thinking to be more socially conscious and more disposed towards social justice. Jeffrey Howard (1998) believes that it is this "insistence on advancing students' commitment to the greater good" that not only separates service-learning from more traditional, individualist forms of pedagogy, but also from other form of experiential education. This non-neutral pedagogy highlights another intersection with the STM movement that also is interested in orienting participants towards a moral and ideological disposition.

In pragmatic terms, reflection should be done immediately after the experience and be ongoing. Reflection should also focus on events and experiences of the participants in such a way to dispel stereotypes that may have developed or been reinforced through their experience and also to dispel any alienation that participants may have from service because of their experience (Campus Outreach Opportunity League, 1993). These guidelines work to dismantle the idealism and simplistic understandings of the world that students bring to a service opportunity with their limited life experience.

An important document that speaks to the commitment to reflection and reciprocity in the service-learning literature is the *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning* (Honnett & Poulsen, 1989). As service-learning became more popular in the 1980s the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) organized the input of over 70 different organizations to establish a set of principles by which the quality of service-learning ventures could be evaluated. The work of the NSEE led to the Wingspread Conference held in Racine, Wisconsin in 1989. This conference supported by the Johnson Foundation produced a list of 10 principles for best practices in service-learning, and sought to provide guidelines for service-learning programs that

were academically sound and sustainable in academic institutions. These principles have become foundational for the field of service-learning and are ubiquitous in service-learning literature (Campus Compact, 1999; Mintz & Hesser, 1996; cite).

The following 10 principles were produced by the Wingspread Conference as essential components of service-learning practice.

1. An effective program engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.

2. An effective program provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.

3. An effective program articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.

4. An effective program allows for those with needs to define those needs.

5. An effective program clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.

6. An effective program matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.

7. An effective program expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.

8. An effective program includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.

9. An effective program insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved.

10. An effective program is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

(Honnett & Poulsen, 1989)

These 10 principles from the Wingspread Conference echo Sigmon's (1996) nominal emphasis on SERVICE-LEARNING as the ideal mix of service and learning in partnership. Committing this optimal mix of service and learning to reflection and reciprocity insures that equal emphasis and benefit is placed on both those engaging in service and those who are receiving those services (Principles 1, 3, 4, 5, 7). The

possibility of achieving a truly reciprocal relationship is only possible with intentional reflection on the part of those who pursue service (Principle 2). Within this emphasis on reflection by those serving, is a subtle acknowledgement that service-learning as a pedagogy engages students in relationships of disparate power with those they are serving. Acknowledging this disparity and addressing it in a responsible way (Principle 1) is one element of the unique ethical component of this pedagogy. The disparity in power relationships between those being served and those serving is an important component that will be addressed further when discussing critical service-learning.

The 10 principles of good practice produced by the Wingspread Conference provide a common starting place to address issues concerning the quality of education and ethical concerns in service-learning. Much of the service-learning literature struggles with the challenges of meeting the expectations for reciprocity and reflection stated so clearly by the Wingspread Conference while trying to produce meaningful educational experiences. Concomitantly, establishing reflection and reciprocity within a non-neutral, ethical framework is the value that service-learning has for evaluating the STM movement.

The influence of service-learning's concerns for reciprocity and reflection may already be evident in some areas of the STM movement. Recently, a growing number of organizations in the STM movement have adopted a set of principles for excellence in STM practice. The organization called U.S. Standards of Excellence (SOE) in Short-term Missions (www.stmstandards.org, 2003) currently has 72 member organizations that have 'covenanted' with SOE to adopt 7 standards that will govern the way in which their organizations practice STMs. The process of determining that there was a need for such standards began with informal discussions during the 1990s. The organization Fellowship of Short-term Mission Leaders (FSTML) assisted in formalizing the discussion amongst Evangelical STM leaders resulting in the final draft of the 7 principles in 2003. The 7 standards are:

1. God-centeredness

2. Empowering partnerships

3. Mutual design

4. Comprehensive administration

5. Qualified leadership

6. Appropriate training

7. Thorough follow-up

(US Standards of Excellence in Short-Term Missions, 2003)

These 7 principles are listed in a minimalist way requiring some unpacking to fully understand their intent for directing STM practice. However, a possible point of influence by the service-learning literature is revealed in their unpacking, as there is a strong call for reciprocity (Standards 2 & 3) within this new effort. There is no empirical evidence that the creation of these standards was influenced by the 10 principles developed by the Wingspread Conference (1989), or the service-learning literature that has originated in response to the principles. What is known is that these principles were developed by consulting the already existing work of similar efforts in Canada and the United Kingdom (U.K. Global Connections Code of Best Practice in Short-Term Missions; www.globalconnections.co.uk, 2011). Regardless of how the SOE principles were decided upon, there seems to be a shared ethical concern for the respect of people's autonomy within these two sets of principles. Each one implies that those being served should have an equal say in what service is needed and how it will be carried out, and that there should be an ongoing relationship between those serving and those being served that is constantly re-evaluated.

The shared concern for reciprocity between important literature in the service-learning movement and a small, but growing movement within the STM movement offers a point of intersectionality that allows the latter to be evaluated by the former. The reason for positioning service-learning as a lens for evaluating the STM movement is because of the relatively lengthier tradition of, and more robust interest in establishing reciprocity in service activities within the service-learning literature. The limitations of the SOE's efforts to institute their 7 principles is due to the highly independent nature of churches and parachurch organizations in the Evangelical that do not have any formal responsibility to a set of standards set by and external organization. The efforts of the

SOE are further hindered by the fact that many STM trips are planned by people who have no background in Christian mission or in service education, therefore they are unaware of research and trends in the field. However, the fact that the SOE has attracted 72 members should be seen as a positive initial effort in transforming STM mission practice, rather than currently having a sizeable impact on the actions of the millions of Christians who participate in STMs each year.

Research as a Challenge to Reciprocity

One of the greatest challenges to establishing reciprocity in service-learning is in the area of research. Despite the assertions of organizations like Campus Compact, who track the monetary value of the service hours that are logged by their participating campuses, or the work of Cruz and Giles (2000) who also assert that service-learning benefits communities, there has been almost no research on the quality of the impact that service-learning has on communities (Wade, 2001). Crabtree (2008) cautions that, "little has appeared in the academic literature about preparing communities for international service-learning (ISL) visitors, community member perspectives on the cross-cultural encounter, or the long-term impact of that encounter on those individuals and communities" (p. 22). It has been far easier to study the impact on student participants in service-learning, which has generated numerous studies (Astin, et al, 2000; Eyler, Giles & Schiemde, 1996; Mooney & Edwards, 2001). A true concern for reciprocity would ask whether educators truly are interested in the communities that host them, or whether they struggle to see past the development of the students that they are technically responsible for.

As it was mentioned in chapter 1 the STM movement struggles with the same deficiency in its limited research, as almost all studies of STM impact focus on those who are going rather than on those receiving (Ver Beek, 2008). The implications for this lack of reciprocity are more complex for the STM movement than it is for the service-learning movement because of the intentions of the activity. Because such a high priority is placed on proselytizing, the quality or effectiveness of any other form of service can easily be overlooked. Quality research, of the kind that is currently being used to evaluate the

impact of service-learning on student participants (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax & Avalos, 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Moely et al., 2002a, 2002b) on receiving communities would help to evaluate the excess of anecdotal evidence, both positive and negative, that surrounds the STM movement.

Time, Location and Relationship as Challenges to Reciprocity

One of the greatest challenges to establishing reciprocity in service-learning programs is the amount of time that participants spend in service. This is especially true of service-learning tied to curricular programs in higher education. In the academy service-learning is often tied to the classroom which is effectively confined by the traditional fifteen week semester, or even more restricted by shortened, time intensive summer classes. Not only is student's participation limited by the length of the class, but they are also limited by the time constraints and pressures of the typical college student experience. The shortcomings of short-term service learning, defined as a semester or less, are not only realized in the learning experience of the students, but also in the stress and work that it creates for community organizers and academic leaders (Eby, 1998; Enos, 2003; Tryon, Stoecker, Martin, Seblonka, Hilgendorf, Nellis, 2008). The implications for agencies and groups who facilitate service volunteers is that they have to invest a lot of work in training and preparing students who will likely not be involved in the program after the curricular requirement is fulfilled.

Despite the time constraints on students involved in service, and the amount of work that it takes to prepare students to be involved in service, a recent study by Tryon et al (2008) found that many volunteer organizations still value the participation of students in their organizations. Tryon's research team conducted 67 open-ended interviews with representatives from 64 different organizations covering topics from managing service learners to communication and relationship issues in an attempt to understand the challenges of short-term service-learning on host organizations. This study is important because it represents an exception in service-learning research in an effort to understand the impact of service-learners on host organizations. What they found is that although participants expressed the concerns that they have with their limited resources and the

41

taxation that service-learners are on those resources, many still valued their input. They valued the energy that the students brought to the organization and many viewed mentoring the students as an extension of their own organizational mission (p. 21). This speaks to the level of reciprocity that is attainable between the university and community service organizations in service-learning.

There is both significant contrast and comparison between the STM movement and service-learning in the areas of time constraints and relationships with host organizations. There are Christian service projects within campus ministry organizations that fit the semester time constraints, however, these are not generally considered STMs. As noted in chapter 1, STMs most commonly last for 10 to 14 days (Priest, 2006), which limits the engagement of participants in host communities even further. During that time it is a much more intense interaction than a student would have working a few hours a week with a local organization, but it very difficult for individual student participants to have prolonged engagement after the trip is over. Further hindering this experience is the distance that many STM participants travel away from their own community to serve more distant and exotic communities. Even though a university student involved in a service-learning program may not continue their involvement in a community service organization after their semester requirement is completed, they still have opportunity to continue interaction with and reflection about that community when it is located in the same town or city in which they study. A community that is a plane flight away and more culturally distant from the students' own lived experiences may not allow for that continued reflection.

Tryon et al's (2008) work raises a second contrast between local community service and international STMs in the relationship between the one's serving and the organization and people being served. Arguably there is an unequal balance of power between the community service organizers interviewed by Tryon's research team and their partnering service-learning students and organizers. The students provide free help to these community service organizations that they would not have otherwise, even if it requires some resources to train and motivate them. The contrast is not in the relationship that sending organizations have with the impoverished communities that they often go to

serve, but rather the relationships with the professionals who are responsible for receiving and coordinating service-learners or STM participants.

In the examples offered by the research of Tryon et al, students may be serving impoverished communities or distressed populations, but the community service organization workers stand as a buffer between them. From a socio-economic perspective, the balance of power is far more equitable between students and their professors and these community organization coordinators. If we broaden our definition of poverty beyond economic resources to include a lack of understanding of the hidden rules that govern those in higher socio-economic classes, there is a greater chance of a person employed in a community organization occupying the same socio-economic class as participating students and professors in a service-learning program.

In contrast to the relationship between service-learning program coordinators and their counterparts and community service organization, the relationship between STM coordinators and those living in impoverished countries around the world look far different. The reason for this contrast is STM participants from the United States travel abroad representing one of the most powerful and influential countries in the world regardless of what ideological assumptions they carry with them. They also represent those with the means to travel freely across borders, what Bauman (1998) calls the tourist in contrast to the unwelcome vagabond. The privilege afforded to US nationals for these reasons often sets them apart not only from the larger populations that receive their services, but also the many service or mission coordinators who are also nationals of the host country. This discrepancy in privilege or power must be seen as a significant concern for reciprocity because of the ability of the STM travelers to dictate the nature of the relationship, even if they do so unwittingly.

Even when comparing STMs to international service-learning programs, which are increasingly pursuing service opportunities in the impoverished and underdeveloped countries that are frequented by STM trips, there is still another important factor that complicates reciprocity. That factor is the communal funding that supports the majority of STM activity mentioned in chapter 1. Consider the following scenario that took place in a Caribbean country recently: A national of this Caribbean country studied in the United States and developed a strong network of churches and church leaders to support a

Christian mission organization that he began in his country. Through this arrangement he lives and works in his home country, but his salary, which is substantial compared to the average household income in his country, comes from this network of churches and individuals in the United States. This money given is provided in the context of Christian mission. A significant part of this man's mission organization is to host STM trips from these different churches and individuals that support him, and include them in some of the many valuable projects that he has started, including new churches, medical clinics, and schools.

One of the churches that supports this man and his mission organization sends a STM group to his Caribbean country each year to do construction work. Early on in the relationship between this church and Caribbean mission organization a building was needed, and an STM was organized consisting of a group who were knowledgeable in different areas of construction. This initial STM led to greater interest in the church of doing construction in this Caribbean country to assist this mission organization in accomplishing its goals of proselytizing and improving the quality of life of those in the community. However, as the relationship progressed the mission organization was no longer in need of construction projects, but did request other types of expertise (eg. educators, medical professionals, etc.). The church in America did not respond to this request, but instead continued to insist on sending construction teams to this Caribbean country based on the interest and expertise of those in the church who had formed an interest in this country.

The result of this relationship is that the man who operates the Christian mission in this Caribbean country continues to have groups from the US come and build buildings that he does not need. His reason for doing this is twofold: 1) each time the group comes they bring over $30,000 for supplies and other costs, of which only a portion is used for the construction costs – the rest of the money is used to support the programs identified by the Caribbean national as important to his organizational goals; 2) this church not only supplies a construction crew each year for him to host and keep busy, but they also pay part of his salary through their mission giving.

Even though there may be host nationals and long-term missionaries that serve as a buffer between the server and the served in this context, categorically the financial

support for these two groups of people come from the same churches and parachurch organizations that send STMs. As churches in the United States, which are affiliated with the same denominations that campus ministries are, increasingly support foreign nationals financially the way in which they used to support long-term missionaries, the likelihood of those individuals critiquing the people that pay their salaries is diminished.

One perspective of the relationship between the American church and the Caribbean mission organization sees ongoing institutional commitment that is providing a great deal of resources to the mission organization. However, a perspective that is enhanced through an eye for reciprocity sees this situation very differently. Not only are the needs not being defined by the community receiving them, but the relationship between the church and the mission organization is defined by an imbalance of power. The host national receiving STM travelers may respond positively to them in the same way that community organization workers in the United States expressed an appreciation for the local university students who came to work with them through service-learning programs, but in the context of STMs, that positive response may have as much to do with a struggle for livelihood for the long-term missionary or host national as it does for the type or quality of service that is done.

Karla Ann Koll (2010) provides another perspective on the relationship that many STM organizations have with host national leaders and the implications that these specific relationships have for the larger host community. She draws upon Eric Law's (1993) conceptualization of wolves and sheep in cross-cultural context, which he derives from the work of sociologist Geert Hofstede (1987). Hofstede describes western European culture as "low power distance culture" in which individuals have a high degree of personal agency and are basically intolerant of high degrees of social inequity. He contrasts this to cultures that he describes as "high power distance cultures" in which people do not believe they have much influence on their world and they are more accepting of high levels of social inequality. Law describes people in these cultures, which are generally the types of places that western STM travelers go, as lambs because they don't believe they have personal agency and are more susceptible to the relatively few power brokers in their cultural context.

Koll carries this theory further by suggesting that the few power brokers within these cultural contexts are not only the wolves, but they are the people that American STM workers most easily identify with. In her experience these national wolves are usually male, they speak English and they can relate to Americans in the types of ways that Americans value and appreciate. However, what ultimately happens is that the American STM travelers will project their own cultural understandings of personal agency onto the host culture and quickly make the mistake of thinking that the host leaders they are connecting with are speaking for their entire community and not there own self-interest. When this dynamic is coupled with the financial relationships that quickly develop between Americans and host national leaders, the potential for a distorted understanding of the needs of a host national community quickly escalates.

The challenges to real reciprocity in relationships between those who engage in service activities from the United States with those who will receive those services around the world is hindered by time commitments, geographic distance and the quality of the relationship between the two entities. Reciprocity is significantly diminished in each of these three areas because those choosing to serve within the context of an STM or a service-learning program ultimately have the power to set the time limits, transverse geographical barriers and ultimately to define the parameters of the relationship. The value of service-learning literature in the tradition of the Wingspread Conference is that it elevates the concern for reciprocity as an ethical discussion, and the nature of power within reciprocal relationships as a key question within that discussion. As mentioned before, the 10 principles produced by the Wingspread Conference point to the idea that reflection should make service-learners more aware of the problems that power and privilege play in establishing reciprocal relationships, but the 10 principles do not deal with power explicitly. The literature in the area of critical service-learning explicitly names disparate power relationships as the primary factor in preventing ethical, reciprocal relationships.

The most common underlying assumption in service-learning literature is that America is currently in a state of weak democracy, indicated by low levels of societal participation and trust. Lisman (1998) attributes this in part to a fractured society in a state of high social stress. He says that:

> One can expect a lack of social commitment in times of social stress involving a sense of ethical fracturing in the civic infrastructure. Respective groups become competitive rather than cooperative whenever it appears to one group that another group is not pulling its own weight. Thus, social disfunctionality undermines our commitment to society. In the best of times a lack of societal commitment can be problematic. But in times of great social stress, a society without the civic resources to collaborate in solving its problems is in great danger of further fragmentation. We are seeing symptoms of such divisiveness. (Lisman, 2006, pgs. 1-2)

In her review of Rahima C. Wade's book *Community Service-Learning: A Guide to Including Service in the Public School Curriculum* (1997) educational philosopher Knight-Abowitz (1999) situates this communitarian approach to service learning within Deweyan progressivism. There is a reasonable optimism in this approach to the problem of weakening democracy, suggesting that greater participation in civil life can strengthen the democratic foundation. However, Knight-Abowitz suggests an alternative view to democracy and democratic change that is far less optimistic. The view held by critical pedagogues (Freire, 1970, 1985; Giroux, 1983; McLaren, 1989) is that there are ways of knowing the world and acting in the world that are taken for granted and are assumed to be natural and unchangeable, but instead these are created social structures that benefit some at the expense of others. The task of rescuing democracy is to question these assumptions and tear down these walls to democratic reform.

Knight-Abowitz goes on to suggest that service-learning can address both of these ideological concerns for democracy in practice. This is also the claim of proponents of critical service-learning, a concept that was first developed by Robert Rhoads (1997) when he referred to his thinking in this field as critical community service. Critical service-learning shares the same concerns for prolonged engagement, needs being defined by those receiving services, and other principles that are congruent with

reciprocal relationships as traditional service learning does. However, critical service-learning theorist Lisa Pompa describes her discomfort with traditional service-learning this way:

> . . . I have never been comfortable with the phrase "service-learning." Unless facilitated with great care and consciousness, "service" can unwittingly become an exercise in patronization. In a society replete with hierarchical structures and patriarchal philosophies, service-learning's potential danger is for it to become the very thing it seeks to eschew . . .

> The crux of the problem revolves around power issues. If I "do for" you, "serve" you, "give to" you – that creates a connection in which I have the resources, the abilities, the power, and you are on the receiving end. It can be – while benign in intent – ironically disempowering to the receiver, granting further power to the giver. Without meaning to, this process replicates the "have-have not" paradigm that underlies many social programs.

(Pompa, 2002, p. 68)

Pompa's fears for the disempowerment of those on the receiving end of service-learning are echoed by John McKnight (1989) in his determining work *Why Servanthood is Bad*. According to McKnight, not only do "service systems teach people that their value lies in their deficiencies," but it also leads to the establishment of a service industry that relies on people remaining in a state of "need" for the industry's existence (pg. 462). The self interest of service industries like healthcare then become focused on providing health services rather than helping communities organize themselves to become healthier. He suggests that good service should recognize a community's strengths and develop them further for the good of the community. This is an approach that he calls Asset Based Community Development (ABCD).

The results of a paternalistic service orientation are only one part of the concern that critical service-learning brings to service activities because of its orientation as an educational practice. In evaluating efforts to establish a reciprocal relationship between two groups that can be defined by their inequitable access to power and resources, critical service-learning also asks what other kinds of learning are taking place. While communities that are receiving service-learners may be learning that their value is in their deficiencies, the service-learners themselves may be reinforcing already held stereotypes and unrecognized notions of privilege while addressing these perceived deficiencies

(Boyle-Baise, 1998; Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002; Pompa, 2002). This argument is reinforced by the research showing that student's attitudes towards diversity is unchanged in service-learning experiences (Linhart, 2006; Moely et al, 2002). This is especially true when service activities give students limited or superficial exposure to new environments, cultures and communities.

A Freirian Theory of Power and Liberation

Educators like Pompa and McKnight draw from critical theorists like Freire for their understanding of power relations. It was Freire in his seminal work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) who theorized that caution is needed even when those with power and resources desire to help those who do not. He observes:

> . . . the fact that certain members of the oppressor class join the oppressed in their struggle for liberation, thus moving from one pole of the contradiction to the other. Theirs is a fundamental role, and has been so throughout the history of this struggle. It happens, however, that as they cease to be exploiters or indifferent spectators or simply the heirs of exploitation and move to the side of the exploited, they almost always bring with them the marks of their origin: their prejudices and their deformations, which include a lack of confidence in the people's ability to think, to want, and to know. Accordingly these adherents to the people's cause constantly run the risk of falling into a type of generosity as malefic as that of the oppressors. The generosity of the oppressors is nourished by an unjust order, which must be maintained in order to justify that generosity. Our converts, on the other hand, truly desire to transform the unjust order; but because of their background they believe that they must be the executors of the transformation. They talk about the people, but they do not trust them; and trusting the people is the indispensable precondition for revolutionary change. A real humanist can be identified more by his trust in the people, which engages him in their struggle, than by a thousand actions in their favor without that trust. (p. 60)

Echoes of Pompa's concerns for disempowering people through serving them and McKnight's concerns for teaching people to find their value in their deficiencies are easily recognizable in Freire's thought that those who hold power easily transfer their paternalistic attitude and distrust of poor and oppressed people to their work with those very people.

Freire developed much of his initial theory teaching literacy to peasants in his native Brazil in the 1960s as literacy was a necessity to participate in presidential elections. He sought to end this cycle of oppression through the process of critical consciousness, which is an educational process that engages oppressed people in identifying the political, historical and social situation that they are in. The process that Freire used to teach 300 illiterate peasants to read and write in 45 days is described in his book *Education For Critical Consciousness* (2005). He first sent out groups to do ethnographic studies to better understand the lived experience of Brazilian peasants who worked in the sugar cane industry, and then to richly describe the social and political barriers that hindered their liberation. Once Freire and his assistants analyzed their findings they formed community groups, which were groups of peasants gathered together in circles to participate in dialogue. The center of their dialogue were pictures, called generative themes, that enabled the peasants to pinpoint the areas of their lives that have led to their oppression. Through this process of dialogue, the peasants were able to read their world before they began to read the written word. This is another important concept that Freire originated, recognizing that one of the ways in which oppressed people are dehumanized is for their lived experiences to not be legitimated.

Freire's conceptualization of the oppressed and the oppressor has since been critiqued by postmodern and feminist scholars who suggest that he is too vague and too universal in his thinking. The concern of postmodernism is whether Freire's theorizing about oppression is able to recognize that the oppressed/oppressor binary is not an absolute demarcation, that oppressive relationships will look different based on their context and that a person can be both an oppressor and oppressed within different contexts. In a dialogue with fellow critical pedagogues, Donaldo Macedo (1993) addresses these critiques by admitting to a hierarchical structure of oppression, and that his original conceptualization of oppression was limited to class.

According to Freire, his thinking on this subject cannot be limited to *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* which often overshadows the rest of his written work. Peter Roberts (2003) finds in an excavation of writings throughout Freire's life that he saw no contradiction between postmodern thought and dialectical thought, but rather that they complimented each other. Roberts states, "for Freire there are certain features all

oppressed groups have in common which transcend the particularities of their specific oppressive situations" (p. 457). This is to say that racism looks different from sexism, and racism may look different from country to country, or even city to city within the same province or state, but that there are elements in both racism and sexism within any context that are the same.

The commonality of oppressive situations for Freire is that they are dehumanizing to both the oppressor and the oppressed. The importance of Freire's work as a modernist project for the field of critical service-learning is that he separates the dialogic world, the world in which objects and ideas are known in relation to other objects and ideas, from the symbolic world, the world in which objects and ideas are known by the words and narratives used to point to them. The implication for critical service-learning is a platform from which to point to oppressive relationships of disparate power regardless of the symbols or narratives that are attached to them.

Freire offers two important parts to the conceptualization of power within the context of critical service-learning. The first of these is that those with power have the ability to influence how those who do not have power perceive themselves whether they do it consciously or subconsciously (Freire, 1970, p. 63). Therefore, as Pompa suggests, one can engage a community in service with the best of intentions, but because they have more social and political power, they can project a destructive image of that community that may be adopted by members of the community. The second important conceptualization of power is that regardless of the names and stories that are attached to service-learning activities, they can still lead to oppressive relationships if they restrict the liberty of oppressed groups in any way.

Critical Service-Learning and Ethical Relationships

Rhoads (1997) developed his own 8 principles defining his concept of critical service-learning to acknowledge and account for the discrepancy in power between the server and the served. The same concerns for reciprocity and reflection that are found in traditional service-learning are central to Rhoads' principles, however they also speak to

mutuality and reflection on the self in relation to others. Important principles from Rhoads' list that speak to these concerns are:

> 1. Critical community service calls attention to the notion that a commitment to working with others is fundamentally tied to an individual's sense of self and vision of others.
>
> 2. Critical community service demands that mutuality undergird all service activities and projects.
>
> 5. Critical community service must include reflective action linked to broader social concerns, with the goal being to foster a critical consciousness among students.
>
> 7. Critical community service is intended to create social change, and therefore it is expected that participants engage in the larger struggle to improve social conditions.

(Rhoads, 1997, pp. 219-221)

In Rhoads' thinking mutuality is more than just asking a community what their needs are so that they can be met through service. Instead, it is directly linked to reflection in relation to the other, which is most often a person of a different race, ethnicity or socio-economic class. He explains, "Through the other, we come to experience the self. Mutuality is about how we both give and receive because we connect to the other through a concern, which, in the name of caring, bridges whatever differences we have" (Rhoads, 1997, p. 139). Mutuality is about more than doing things for people, it is inherently seeing the needs of others as ones own need to change the social structures that lead to need in the first place. The ethical concerns for how people with less resources should be treated is unmistakable in Rhoads' thinking.

Pompa and McKnight both raise the concerns of critical pedagogues like Freire (1970) who not only asks how power is distributed, but also asks who benefits from this power distribution? This is an important question for any type of service activity because self-interest can cloud the judgment of those engaging in these activities both knowingly and unknowingly. Knowingly, many people engage in acts of service, especially international service, because they enjoy experiencing new places and people. Enjoying travel in itself is not problematic, however, using poor and oppressed people as an arena for travel is ethically unjustifiable. Unknowingly, service participants can participate in

larger social structures that subversively work to keep impoverished people from being able to improve their own quality of life.

It is for these reasons that critical service-learning is a valuable theoretical model for analyzing the STM movement. Historically modern Christian mission was far too complicit with colonialism and its abuse of power relationships, and now there may be a danger of the STM movement being far too closely aligned with oppressive elements within globalization. As Christian STM participants in the United States become a greater contributor to trends in globalization trends, it should be asked to what extent organizers and participants are aware of their role in the social, political and economic systems that so heavily influence the communities that they travel to visit.

In the spirit of critical service-learning, Ivan Illich famously gave a speech to the Conference on Inter-American Student Projects (CIASP) entitled *To Hell with Good Intentions* (1968) where he asked group of educators and service organizers to stop all trips to Latin America. In his appeal he calls this form a service 'mission-vacations' which cause more damage than good amongst the poor in Latin America, and are a product of the power that they hold as Americans. Illich is also important because he makes the connection that for many American students serving the poor in a foreign international context is more appealing than serving communities of equal or greater poverty in their own country because they do not hold as much relational power in that environment.

Illich was obviously at the forefront of a more skeptical view of the service-learning movement, and he did not offer much compromise on his views. However, his relevance to this study is compounded because he began his work in coordinating mission work in Latin America as a Catholic priest within the context of Christian mission. Of equal relevance is that Illich's sentiment was echoed by a Kenyan Evangelical pastor almost 40 years later speaking to a gathering of academics and practitioners at an STM conference at Trinity Evangelical Seminary in Deerfield, IL. Reverend Oscar Muriu (2009) thanked the largely white, American conference attendees for their interest, and then politely asked that they stop sending American STM groups to Kenya as they are not needed. Instead, he suggested that they are a taxation on the local church and its resources to host and entertain Americans for three months out of the year. Nairobi,

53

Kenya is a popular destination for STM arguably because of the combination of their stable infrastructure, excellent wild game reserves and their location on the exotic "dark continent."

It is naïve to think that Kenya and other developing countries will be able to avoid the trends of an increasingly globalized world. Even if STMs and international service-learning trips were to leave Kenya alone, there are far more powerful political and economic forces in the world today that will not. The value of Rev. Muriu's presentation is threefold: 1) it is abrasive enough to cause those within the STM movement to pause and re-examine what they are doing; 2) it is an effort to reclaim a balance of power between people living in the developing world and those in the developed world; 3) and it demands that those who are interested in STMs ask how a truly mutual relationship can be established without assumption or preconception.

A point of hope or possibility raised by Rev. Muriu's request is whether those interested in STM practice may be able to approach Kenyan church leaders in a new way that expresses an apology for past assumptions and an interest in a mutual relationship. Another hopeful possibility is that through an approach to reciprocity that is influenced by critical service-learning, STM participants might share God's love with Kenyan churches by working together to change some of the elements of globalization that oppress people in Kenya and strain relationships between the global north and the global south.

Reflection and reciprocity should help students come to an understanding of the interconnectedness of the world and the systemic issues that lead to local and global poverty and injustice. Students who embrace these concepts and be transformed by them are in return served by the community that hosts them. Again, this is especially true for the Evangelical STM movement and its foray into some of the poorest places in the world. Ideally, a student who has gone to help people in Africa by distributing food may learn that the most helpful thing that they could do for the people who they have just met is to stay home and write their elected representatives pressing for both fair and free trade with the African country they visited.

Conclusion

Much of the continued growth in the area of service-learning has come from the desire of university students to be more fully engaged in community. At the same time educators and organizations like Campus Compact are rediscovering the role of the university in developing active citizenship in their students while serving communities both locally and globally. These developments have led to an ever-increasing body of literature theorizing and how to incorporate learning as well as responsible service into service-learning programs, and researching the effects of these programs on students.

The increasingly shared form of service-learning in a globalized world with the Evangelical STM movement offers new opportunity to evaluate an STM movement that has been evangelistically myopic in its purpose. Not only can the STM movement benefit from the large body of research and literature that the service-learning movement has produced, but also from the ethical theorizing that underpins the service-learning movement. The service-learning literature serves as a platform to ask in what ways STMs establish reciprocity with the communities that they work with and what type of reflection are participants encouraged to engage. Furthermore, the critical service-learning literature asks in what ways might STM practices contribute to larger, unjust strands of globalization, and how STM participants perceive the people that they travel to work with. These important concepts provide an excellent opportunity to ask to what extent current STM practices amongst campus ministry organizations in universities in America reflect the principles of good practice in service-learning and critical service-learning.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

The close relationship in form and perceived value identified between the practices of the short-term missions (STM) movement and the literature of service-learning and critical service-learning offer a valuable way to evaluate STMs in a way that has not yet been done. A review of the literature on service-learning suggests that reciprocity and reflection are the key elements of this pedagogy. Critical service-learning adds questions about the differentiation of power to service activities. This research project asks to what extent are the practices of those who plan and implement short-term mission trips for Evangelical university students in the United States congruent with perceptions of good practice in critical service-learning literature? Posing the question in this way acknowledges that questions about reflection and reciprocity are often answered in the planning of service activities. Answering this research question will involve exploring the activities of campus ministers on STMs that they have organized and implemented, but also how they make sense of their work.

Methodology

This research project will be situated in the interpretivist (also called constructivist) research discourse. Much of the grounding of this discourse is owed to Max Weber and the distinction that he made between the social sciences and the natural sciences. Whereas the natural sciences hold to an objective reality in the world that can be measured and quantified, Weber believed that research in the social sciences could not be that easily simplified. Instead, he argued that the social sciences were "primarily concerned with meaning, and in particular with individual meaning or the ways in which shared cultural meanings affected the actions of individuals" (Benton & Craib, 2001, p. 76). Therefore, the meaning that individuals make of their lived experience then becomes the object of discovery within this discourse.

The way in which people express the meaning they make of their world is through language and symbols. This elevates the importance of hermeneutics as a process of

understanding words and symbols within their context and concomitantly using that meaning to provide further context for the entire collection of words and symbols, a process called the hermeneutical circle. This means that it becomes imperative to understand people's use of language in an ongoing relationship to other symbols in their world.

The reason for adopting the interpretivist discourse for this research project is not to place limitations on the usefulness of my research, but rather to recognize the importance of maintaining a consistency between my ontology and epistemology. Recognizing the essential role of individuals in constructing the reality of their world suggests that it is not possible to observe their lived existence and draw conclusions about how the world is, but rather the researcher can only hope to know how individuals make meaning of their world. Therefore, an interpretivst discourse rarely claims to be able to generalize its findings, but rather looks for transferability of trends and concepts found in people's meaning making (Quantz, 2007, p. 2).

Another important premise of an interpretive discourse is that the role of the researcher is not neutral. Just as those who are the objects of research are the product of their lived experience within a particular cultural and historical context, so is the researcher. Because researchers are ensconced in their own lived experience it is not possible to cast this aside to become an objective observer of others. Often times, as in my case, the researcher has strong ties to the area of study, and those strong ties foster strong opinions and critiques. This is not a free pass for the researcher to discard neutrality and objectivity entirely, but rather it calls the researcher to the act of self-reflexivity. Self-reflexivity is the process undergone by the researcher of reflecting critically on their own actions and beliefs as it relates to the research. The process of self-reflexivity will challenge me to be honest about my own opinions and beliefs about STMs and the value that I place on them, not so that I can consider myself to be objective, but so that I can constantly be aware of those thoughts as they reveal themselves in my work.

Based upon this research discourse my goal in this research project is to be able to describe how campus ministers are planning and implementing STMs with members of their campus ministry, and then to describe how they make meaning of their actions. The

57

final piece of this project will be to juxtapose that meaning to the meaning that is made by those within the field of service learning for the purpose of evaluation.

Research Method

This project uses a mixed-methods research approach consisting of an online survey and follow up interviews with volunteer participants. The online survey, *Campus Ministry Short-term Mission Trips*, developed by the present author, was sent to the listservs of 5 different campus ministry organizations with the request that those who are responsible for organizing or leading STMs fill it out. The final question of the survey asked participants if they were willing to participate in an in-depth follow-up interview to provide contact information. These interviews were conducted by phone, and asked broad, open-ended questions about participant's STM experiences.

Survey Study

Participants

The participants for the online survey were recruited from five national Evangelical campus ministry organizations. The responses of the participant organizations as well as the individual participants were anonymous to allow respondents to be as open as possible. From the five different campus ministry listservs, 154 respondents began the survey, while 99 of those respondents completed the survey (64.3% completion rate). However, analysis of the survey results is based on the 101 respondents who completed 57% of the survey. This sample size is based on those who completed the first three sections of the survey (except for questions 3.5). This is a natural divide, because the last two questions of section three and the first two questions of section four are more involved and time consuming and would naturally discourage some from continuing. From question 3.5 as many as nine and as few as five of the 101 respondents considered skipped questions until the end of the survey.

An overall response rate for the survey is unattainable because the contact people at each of the campus ministry organizations were unable to estimate the size of their organization's listserv, or were unable to determine the number of people to which the survey would be relevant. For example, one organization estimated that they might have as many as 2,000 people on their organization's listserv, but only 200 to 300 of them may have led or organized an STM.

The first section of the online survey asked demographic information. Of the 101 respondents 54 were male (53.5%) and 47 were female (46.5%). Just over half of the respondents lead one STM each year (52%) while one tenth lead over five STM each year (10%).

Measures

The online survey used in this study is a unique measure developed specifically for learning about the activities of Evangelical campus ministers pertaining to their STM activities (see Appendix A). There are many different tools available that can be used to study areas like spiritual development and attitude assessment, but none that look specifically at the unique cross-section of the STM experience and the ideals of the dominant service-learning literature. For this reason, the online survey titled *Campus Ministry Short-term Mission Trips* was developed from my own experiences and understanding of STM practice and knowledge of the service-learning literature.

Face validity was established for this instrument by referring it to experts in the fields of both Evangelical campus ministry with STM experience and research faculty in the area of service-learning. There were nine different people who critiqued the survey I developed to establish its ability to adequately cover the experiences of campus ministers who lead STMs, and whether it adequately covered concerns like reflection and reciprocity in the service-learning literature. The survey was reworked to reflect the critique of these nine experts before it was distributed to the five campus ministry listservs.

Of those offering critiques, four are campus ministers from two different campus ministries. There was also some diversity in the positions of these four campus ministers,

as one of them was a state director for multiple campuses, and two of them were associate campus ministers working with multiple staff. Critique was also provided by two missiologists from different Christian seminaries who study the history and practice of Christian mission, but who have each also led STM trips. A person who works for a not-for-profit Christian organization that plans and leads STM trips for college students and campus ministries provided another critique. Finally, two professors of education with expertise in the field of service-learning provided critique to establish that this survey adequately accomplishes what it claims to accomplish.

The online survey consisted of 29 questions and tookd 15-20 minutes to complete. The questions were grouped into five separate categories:

1. Demographic Information (Personal)

2. Short-Term Mission Trip Demographics

3. Short-term Mission Trip Planning

4. Activities On Short-term Mission Trips

5. Post-trip Activities

The demographic questions in sections one and two were created in an attempt to establish a general context for STMs planned and implemented by Evangelical campus ministers. Besides the basic demographic information like gender and age, sections one and two were also designed to understand the level of autonomy that a campus minister may have in organizing a STM. Autonomy in these activities may be gained by age and experience (Questions 1.2, 1.3 & 1.6), but it should also rely heavily on the nature of their campus ministry position and the organization that they work with (Questions 1.4, 2.2). Basic demographic questions about the trip (Questions 2.3-2.6) were borrowed from Robert Priest's work (Priest & Priest, 2008) in efforts to establish data that may be more easily correlated in future research.

The questions in sections three to five of the survey are unique to this research project. The questions represent an attempt to establish how time was spent by STMs organized by campus ministry staff from the preparation period to the post-trip activities. These questions were fundamental in their attempt to know what was done on these

STMs, but they also specifically asked questions that were concerned with reflection and reciprocity. Several questions were asked about the relationship between the campus minister and their ministry organization and the host nationals they visited (Questions 3.3, 4.4 & 5.3). A number of questions dealt specifically with the amount of time devoted to student reflection and to the curriculum (which should be an aide to student reflection) (Questions 3.1, 4.2 – 4.5, & 5.1). There are also several questions that asked about the goals of the STM, how those goals are assessed, and how feedback is used in future planning (Questions 3.2, 3.6, 5.2 – 5.4).

Procedures

The *Campus Ministry Short-term Mission Trips* survey was created using the www.surveymonkey.com website. The links to the survey were sent out to 5 different campus ministry organizations in March and April, 2009, and responses to the survey were received until August, 2009. Communication with these five different campus ministry organizations, which will remain anonymous for this research project, began in October and November, 2008. I initially identified contact people from each organization's website and called them on the telephone. Rather than asking to have access to their listservs, I asked if they would be willing to distribute the link to my survey through a proprietary email, or to send it embedded within another email communication they have with their listserv. This approach was taken to relieve the hesitancy of these organizations to release their listserv to an outside researcher.

There was some reluctance on the part of some of the campus ministry organizations to use their listserv for this purpose, but all five agreed to send the link to the survey with an explanation of its nature and purpose. None of the five organizations were able to give me exact numbers of the people on their organization's listserv, or the number of people to which the survey would be relevant. One organization estimated that there could be as many as 2,000 people on their listserv, but that the survey would only be relevant to 200 to 300 people. A second organization initially sent it out to 10 to 12 regional directors, but could not say how many people the regional directors would pass the survey onto.

The data collection for the survey was compliant with the guidelines of the Institutional Review Board of Miami University. The form of consent was sent out as an email with the survey embedded at the end, and it was embedded as the introductory page to the survey on the SurveyMonkey website (see Appendix B). Responses to the survey were kept anonymous and were protected by the security of the SurveyMonkey website, and the downloaded responses were kept on a computer that was locked in an office.

Interview Study

Procedures

The final question of the online survey asked whether participants would be willing to participate further in a detailed interview. Respondents who were interested provided contact information through the SurveyMonkey questionnaire, and were later contacted by me to set up a time to conduct the interview. Each of the interviews were conducted by telephone due to the geographical distance of the interviewees. These phone interviews were recorded by me and later transcribed by TranscriptionStar (www.TranscriptionService.com). Funding for the transcription costs was provided through a grant by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) Educational Leadership Foundation. Each interview was preceded by a script guaranteeing anonymity and informing participants of their rights to discontinue the interview at any time (see Appendix C).

Interviews were conducted with 14 of the 37 campus ministers who volunteered to participate in the interview. Each of the five campus ministry organizations that distributed the survey to their listservs were represented within the interviewee pool. Like the online survey, interviewees were promised anonymity in their participation so that they could be as candid and honest as possible. The interview consists of 11 questions and it took participants an average of 50 minutes to complete (see Appendix D). The interview consists of mainly broad open ended questions in the interpretivist tradition, which are designed to allow interviewees to talk about the aspects of their STM that they think are important. Through this type of questioning, and with the use of follow up

questions, I also sought specific details about the trip (e.g. length, location, number of participants, curriculum, and stated goals).

Participants

Each of the 14 participants was assigned a pseudonym to protect their anonymity. The following is a brief description of each of the interviewees preceded by their assigned pseudonym. A summary table at the end highlights important details of each interviewee (see Figure 3.1)

Theodore: led a group of 10 students to a Middle Eastern country for 6 weeks to conduct friendship evangelism[2] with university students from that country. The American students spread throughout the city and initiated conversations with university students with the intention of connecting them to established ministries for university students in that city. Theodore has led multiple trips to this country.

Liam: took a group of students to a Christian children's home in the United States over spring break. Liam had a student from his campus ministry organize this trip as a leadership experience. The children's home was from the same denominational background as the campus ministry. The group had minimal interaction with children from the home, but spent the majority of their time doing construction and repairs on facilities. Liam has led two trips to this location.

Gerald: led a seven day trip to major metropolitan area in the United States to work with multiple ministries in that city. They visited another campus minister who helped them establish connections to other ministries to do things like construction, prayer walking and food distribution. Part of the reason for this trip was to experience a culture that he referred to as post-Christian.

---

[2] Friendship evangelism is a form of proselytizing that focuses on relationship building and hospitality. It is based on the theory that it is much easier for an individual to have conversations about spiritual subjects with someone with whom they have taken the time to develop a relationship with.

Kenneth: led a group of 35 students to popular spring break destination over spring break. The students partnered with other campus ministries to offer free rides to spring breakers and provide free breakfasts for them in the morning. Kenneth's group partnered with an organization that collaborates the efforts of multiple campus ministries for this spring break experience. This group fed pancakes to over 1,000 spring breakers each morning. This was one of four spring break trips that this campus ministry organized for their students.

Sean: led a group of 40 to 50 students and staff to an African country for seven weeks during the summer. Students on this trip participate in an orientation program in this country and then are sent out in small groups to different ministries throughout the country (rural churches, hospitals, impoverished slums) and then return to the larger group to do more ministry and then process their experiences at the end of the seven weeks.

Lilly: led a group of students to an Eastern European country for a month. The team works with long-term missionaries in that country by offering conversational English classes for university students and doing service projects with a local church. Much of the time was also spent doing friendship evangelism. Lilly led a team of five students.

Terence: led a group of 16 students to a North African country for two weeks. Terence and his staff traveled throughout this country with the students praying for the country and raising awareness for his students about the need for evangelism in that country. They also participated in friendship evangelism with the help of long-term missionaries.

Emma: helped lead a group of 40 students and staff on a trip to an Asian country. The trip lasted for 53 days. Students came from two different campuses in the United States and were split up into multiple groups while working at universities in a city in this Asian country. Students took language classes at the university and made efforts to build relationships with Asian students.

Larry: led a group of 27 students to the same popular spring break destination as Kenneth. His group worked with the same ministry organization doing the same project. Larry has led nine different STMs to this location.

Clara: led a group of nine students to an Asian country to conduct sports camps at schools there. During the two week trip her group was prohibited from conducting the sports camps so they visited public parks to develop relationships with people and share the gospel with them. They participated in friendship evangelism.

Wendy: led a group to a garbage village outside of a major city in a North African country. Students worked at several different internships (school for the handicapped, a hospital, other educational facilities) and were encouraged to consider committing part or all of their future to working with the urban poor. Students spent five weeks living in the slum. This program was part of a larger global program.

Ruby: led a group of four students and two other leaders to a Central American country. They worked in a slum that is built on top of a garbage dump in a major city. Students lived with local families and worked in a local school. One of the main purposes of the trip was to challenge students to consider working with the urban poor. This program was a part of the same larger global program as Wendy's program.

Susan: participated in a team of eight campus ministers in a trip to a European country. Susan first visited this country for six weeks and later returned for two years, participating in two, one-year programs with a university campus in that country. Susan served as a campus minister to this campus, participating in friendship evangelism.

Clinton: led a team of campus ministers to a European country. Clinton's team was the first group from his campus ministry organization to go to this campus in this European city. He initially went for a six week trip and later returned for a two year period.

Clinton's team worked as campus ministers to this university developing relationship with students and evangelizing.

Table 3.1: Interviewee Reference

Interviewee's Pseudonym	Gender	STM Location	Group Size (Including Leaders)	Number of Trips to this Location
Todd	Male	International: Middle East	12 (10 students)	Multiple
Liam	Male	USA – rural Christian children's home	12 (11 students)	2 trips
Gerald	Male	USA – Major metropolitan area	16 (15 students)	Single trip
Kenneth	Male	USA – Popular spring break destination	35 students	Unsure
Sean	Male	International – African country	40 – 50 students and staff	Multiple trips over a decade
Lilly	Female	International – Eastern European country	6 (5 students)	Multiple
Terence	Male	International – North African country	19 (16 students)	2 trips with students, multiple trips with other groups
Emma	Female	International – Asian country	40	Multiple trips
Larry	Male	USA – Popular spring break destination	28 (27 students)	Multiple trips over 6 years
Clara	Female	International – Asian country	10 (9 students)	2 trips so far
Wendy	Female	International – North African country	25 (17 American students, 7 North African students)	Multiple
Ruby	Female	International – Central American country	7 (4 students)	Multiple
Susan	Female	International – European country	8 (all campus ministers	1 trip
Clinton	Male	International – European Country	10 (all campus ministers	1 trip

Analysis of these interviews will be done using the Constant Comparison Method (Dye, Schatz, Rosenberg & Coleman, 2000), which is also known as the Kaleidoscope Method. This means that categories, or themes, will be derived from the interviews themselves rather than imposing established themes on the data. As general themes begin to emerge they will be compared to each as well as the bits of data that don't fit within these larger categories. This process should lead to a refining, and possibly redefining of these broader themes, until they become more consistent with the data. The interviews will then be further analyzed using concepts derived from the literature on service-learning. These concepts are reciprocity, reflection and questions of power.

Conclusion

The lack of research in the STM movement as a whole and specifically in the field of campus ministry provides opportunity for diverse research designs and methods. A mixed methods approach, using both quantitative and qualitative tools, is ideal for this initial study because it will provide greater and thicker description of this phenomenon. Historically qualitative and quantitative research have been thought to draw understandings that the other approach cannot (Jick, 1979), however, they are also complimentary in their ability to address bigger population sizes and a fuller context in which to place this population. The result of this mixed methods approach is a more robust understanding of the meaning that campus ministers who organize and lead STMs make of their efforts.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Survey

Quantitative data and qualitative data together provide opportunity for a fuller understanding of the meaning Evangelical campus ministry leaders make of their STM experiences, but also provide another layer of complexity to the analysis of these data. Due to this complexity, this chapter will attempt to be as systematic as possible by first analyzing the quantitative survey data and then the qualitative data generated by the interviews. However, this analysis must inevitably be intertwined, highlighting the ways in which each informs the other. This form of analysis is fitting for the way in which both the survey and interview questions were constructed by initial conversations with campus ministers. As these two research instruments arose out of those conversations they in turn informed each other as well. This method of analysis may get a little messy at times, but it is a necessary process to establish the robust understanding that can come from mixed methods research.

Descriptive Results

Analysis of the data produced by the survey began with an overview of the different topics covered by the instrument. Besides producing helpful demographic information about the participants, it also provided information about trip participant demographics, trip resource requirements, and how time was spent before, during and after respondent's most recent STM. This initial analysis was an effort to describe the nature of STM trips organized by Evangelical campus ministers, and what tasks and experiences they value through their planning and execution of these trips.

Of the 101 respondents 54 were male (53.5%) and 47 were female (46.5%). When asked about their age (see Table 4.1.1, Appendix E), the largest group was aged 23-30 years old (43 respondents, 42.6%). The numbers grew smaller as respondents grew older with 31-40 years old being the second largest group (19 respondents, 18.8%) followed by

41-50 year olds (16 respondents, 15.8%) and 51-60 year olds (14 respondents, 13.9%). The two smallest groups, 18-22 year olds and 60 years old or above, had 3 respondents (3%) and 6 respondents (5.9%) respectively.

Nearly half of the 101 respondents had 2-5 years of campus ministry experience (43 respondents, 42.6%), representing the largest category in response to this question (see Table 4.1.2, Appendix E). The second highest group of respondents had 6-10 years of campus ministry experience (19 respondents, 18.8%), while those with 11 years of experience or more represent over 1/3 of the respondents.

Just over 1/3 of the 101 respondents described their position as a lead campus minister associated with one university campus (36 respondents, 33.6%, see Table 4.1.3, Appendix E). The second largest group was associate campus minister, with multiple staff for one university campus (24 respondents, 23.8%). These two groups suggest that in smaller campus ministries, the lone campus minister oversees and participates in all aspects of the ministry, whereas in larger campus ministries an aspect of the ministry like STM would be delegated to an associate minister. It is highly likely that the regional director category (11 respondents, 10.9%) represents people who are STM directors for a regional or national campus ministry organization.

The majority of the 101 campus ministers responding to this survey hold a Bachelors degree (66 respondents, 65.3%, see Table 4.1.4). Almost 1/4 of the rest of the respondents hold a Masters degree (15 respondents, 14.9%) or a Master of Divinity degree (9 respondents, 8.9%). The Master of Divinity degree is typically a 90 hour post-graduate degree that is required by many Christian denominations to be ordained as a minister. This degree is offered by Evangelical seminaries, but is not usually required for ordination in most Evangelical churches.

Finally, nearly half of the 101 respondents said that they had served as a missionary in a full-time capacity (44 respondents, 43.6%), which is defined as living and working cross-culturally in a Christian ministry context for a year or longer. This was a surprising response to this question, which suggests that it needs further exploration. It may be that there are shared qualities between campus ministry and long-term mission work that draw the same type of individuals, or it could be that respondents interpreted

the definition of a long-term missionary loosely. The majority of the respondents (57 respondents, 56.4%) had no long-term missionary experience.

Statistical Analysis

The next step in analysis of the survey data was to run selected tests comparing various demographic information of respondents to their trip activities. Although there is a level of evaluation in the topics that are covered by the survey, it is these comparison tests that truly begin to evaluate what campus ministers are doing in the area of STMs using the lens of service-learning. In this step I ran multiple comparison tests on five separate variables which were defined by a question on the survey.

The first variable that I tested was gender (Question 1.1) to determine if males and females differed in their STM practices (see Table 4.2.1, . Gender was first compared to the length of the trip (Question 2.5), which divided the five possible responses into two categories; 15 days or less, or 16 days or more. Gender was next compared to the location of multiple trips (Question 2.7), which was divided into two categories; same location each time, or different location each time or varies. When compared to a trip curriculum (Question 3.1), the four possible responses were divided into trips that had any type of curriculum and those that did not have an explicit curriculum. Gender was also compared to the amount of time that was spent preparing for the trip (Question 3.4). The six possible responses to this question were paired down to 0-10 hours of preparation time, which accounted for 50.5% of the respondents, and 11 hours or more, which accounted for 49.5% of respondents. The final two comparison tests asked if gender influenced whether students were asked to focus on international social and political issues (Question 4.4) and whether they were asked to focus on domestic social and political issues of their own country (Question 4.5). The three possible answers to these two questions was divided into yes or no/unsure. The Chi-Square test revealed one significant difference, $X^2 (2) = 7.39$, $p < .05$, showing that women tended to lead longer trips than men (Appendix E, Table 4.2.1).

The second set of tests asked whether the number of years of experience in campus ministry (Question 1.3) influenced STM practices. The seven possible answers to this question were divided into five years or less, which accounts for 48.3% of the

70

respondents, and six years or more accounting for 51.7% respondents. These two categories were then compared to the same six questions as the gender tests, using the same categorization of data as outlined in the previous paragraph. Chi-Square tests revealed that these trip characteristics did not vary as a function of leader's years of campus ministry experience (Appendix E, Table 4.2.2).

The third set of tests asked whether full-time missionary experience, which is defined as living and working cross-culturally for one year or longer (Question 1.6), influenced STM practices. The long-term missionary experience/no long-term missionary experience binary was compared to the same 6 questions as the gender tests, using the same categorization of data as outlined in the previous paragraph. There was one significant difference, X^2 (2) = 5.246, p < .05, demonstrating that those who claim full-time missionary experience tended to lead longer trips (Appendix E, Table 4.2.3).

The fourth set of tests asked whether a STM having an explicit curriculum (Question 3.1) influenced student reflection and the amount of time that was spent preparing for the trip. Explicit curriculum was defined as having specific learning objectives with activities to meet those objectives. The four responses to the question about curriculum were divided into those that had a specific curriculum whether it was unique to each trip, standard for all STMs, or it varied; and those that did not have an explicit curriculum. Trips that had some form of explicit curriculum accounted for 69.3% of the respondents while 30.7% did not. Curriculum was compared to the questions about trip preparation time (Question 3.4), reflection on international social and political issues (Question 4.4) and on domestic social and political issues (Question 4.5). These questions were categorized the same way as they were for the three previous tests. Chi-Square analysis revealed no significant difference in trip characteristics based upon a campus minister's use of curriculum (Appendix E, Table 4.2.4).

The results of these four sets of Chi-Square tests were surprising because I was expecting to find greater difference between the various groups tested. I especially expected to find greater difference in practice based on a campus minister's level of experience in their field and on whether they considered themselves to have full-time missionary experience. Each of these categories might not be expected to influence the length or location of a campus minister's STM planning, but it is reasonable to think that

71

these experiences might influence the type of reflection students should engage in and how much time it takes to prepare for a meaningful STM.

The initial survey response revealing that 48.8% of respondents answered that they have had one year of missionary experience or more, suggested that there might be some correlation between campus ministry and long-term mission work as career paths. This survey response resulted in an interview question to explore whether there was a correlation between the two professions, or whether there may be another explanation. None of the interviewees had served in a full-time missionary capacity, however, some defined their work on university campuses as being a cross-cultural ministry because the environment is much different than other ministries in the United States. These responses suggest that the relationship between these two careers might not be as strong as the survey indicated, but instead offers some insight into how campus ministers think of their work on university campuses. The interview respondents also included two people whose STM experience lasted for a year, which may have also caused some confusion in categorizing their work.

Asking campus ministers about their previous full-time missions experience was originally intended to explore whether this would influence their STM practices. The assumption was that someone who had spent a year or longer working in a cross-cultural situation would think about their work differently than someone who had not. Despite the strong possibility that some survey respondents used a different definition of long-term mission work than the way it was operationalized for this study, I still thought that it would be interesting to test these respondents against those who did not claim long-term mission experience. It is reasonable to think that respondents might think about their STM planning for students differently whether they had lived internationally for over a year or whether they view their work on a campus in the Mid-western United States similarly to working in Beijing, China.

Discussion of Survey Results

Themes from the survey data were derived in two different ways. Firstly, themes like reciprocity and reflection were predetermined because the survey was designed

around the interests of service-learning literature. Secondly, themes emerged as a result of the description provided by the survey and the Chi-Square tests that were performed. The most salient theme produced by the data was the importance of evangelism as a common purpose amongst campus ministry STM organizers.

Evangelism as a Unifying Purpose. The initial disappointment in the lack of difference between the groups tested gave way to new interpretive possibilities. Instead of learning about differences in the STM practices of varying demographics of Evangelical campus ministers these sets of results seem to suggest a unity in thought and action within this sub-demographic of the Evangelical movement. When campus ministers who have less than two years of experience are similar in planning and practice to their counterparts who have over 20 years of experience, they may be conceptualizing their purpose in organizing STMs for their students in a similar way. The same would be true when comparing those who consider themselves to have worked cross-culturally for over a year to those who have not. Based on the known characteristics of this movement it would seem plausible that this shared culture around STMs would be based on the propensity for evangelism.

The assumption that evangelism is the factor that explains the unity amongst the diversity within campus ministers may be difficult to justify based on how long their STMs were or whether they had an explicit curriculum or not. However, all of the tested factors combined allude to a shared ideological foundation that these campus ministers make the same meaning out of their work with students through STMs, and consequently the people they work with during their trip. This interpretation is supported by how survey respondents spent their time during their latest STM (Question 4.1), which shows that on average respondents spent 25% of their time building relationships with members of the host culture and 22% of their time doing acts of service specifically related to evangelism or discipleship (i.e. preaching, teaching, vacation bible school, etc.). Relationship building can be considered an act of mutuality, as it can be a learning experience for all involved, and a source of personal satisfaction from new and dissimilar forms of socialization. In spite of these possibilities, the emphasis placed on friendship

evangelism in the Evangelical community suggests that time spent on relationship building must at least in part be focused on evangelism.

Comparing the nearly 50% of time that is spent doing more evangelistic oriented work to the 15% of time spent doing more humanitarian forms of service (i.e. manual labor, construction, painting, cleaning, etc.) also suggests that this sub-demographic of campus ministers practicing STMs may be more oriented towards a more traditional form of Evangelicalism rather than the more progressive form discussed in chapter one that has a greater focus on issues of social and economic justice. The interviews also support this conclusion as the majority of them included some form of relationship building for the sake of evangelism.

As noted earlier, the choices made in the Chi-Square tests reflect the interests of service-learning literature, reciprocity and reflection. Questions about how time is being spent on each trip, whether campus ministers are returning with their students to the same location each time, and how much time they spend preparing students for their STM experience all speak to the quality of the relationship they build with the host nationals they spend time with. Concurrently, the types of reflection that students are asked to engage in speaks to the concern that service-learning theory has for the type and quality of this activity in service programs.

The initial findings in the areas of reciprocity and reflection is that there seems to be an ideological unity amongst the respondents regardless of their gender, level of campus ministry experience, or their level of education. Based on the consistency in how time is spent on these trips, the ideological and logistical unity that may bind these campus ministry leaders together is a focus on evangelistic efforts through relationship building and evangelistic oriented acts of service. How the interest in evangelizing fits into reciprocal relationships in a cross-cultural setting is a complex discussion that will be explored further in the next chapter, but is entirely necessary because of its foundational importance to what these STMs are accomplishing.

Findings on the possibilities for critical reflection are also significant based on this initial look at the survey data. When taking into consideration that the act of critical reflection is difficult under any circumstances because it challenges the common sense assumptions that people make about the world and the power structures that govern it, the

possibilities for this type of reflection are heavily influenced by the level of preparation that campus ministry leaders and their students have before the trip and the quality and content of their curriculum. More about these types of reflection will be uncovered by the interview analysis, but the unity within the practices of these survey responses are an indicator that their reflection is influenced by an evangelistic preoccupation that could distract from the opportunity for any type of critical reflection that goes beyond a spiritually focused agenda.

Reciprocity in the Survey Data. An important element of reciprocal relationships is that organizations establish ongoing relationships with communities they are serving through prolonged engagement. There are some positive results from the survey data in this area, where 25% of respondents said they traveled to the same location each time (Question 2.7, see Table 4.3.2 Appendix E). Concerns are raised at the number of respondents who travel to a different location each time (8%) and the number of respondents whose trips varied between the same location and different locations (61%). It would be helpful to know more details about the activities of those respondents whose trips varied in location, as it is such a large portion of the respondents to this question, and this response is ambiguous in what forms of prolonged engagement are possibly being established. Return trips to the same location point to prolonged organizational engagement with those communities and are far more conducive to truly reciprocal relationships. It is also encouraging to see that only 8% organized trips to different locations each time, which is a practice more likely to support suspicions that STMs are an opportunity to participate in more accessible global travel at someone else's expense.

Another factor pointing to the potential for reciprocal relationships with host national communities are the ways in which objectives for trips are determined (Question 3.2 see Table 4.3.4 Appendix E). Nearly 34% of respondents based their trip objectives on needs that were defined by the host national communities, and over half based their objectives on a combination of needs defined by the host nationals and on the student participant's interest. The significant amount of contact that 56% of respondents reported to have with host nationals during the planning of their trip (Question 3.3) and the

feedback that 75% of respondents collected from host nationals after the trip for future planning also point to efforts to establish reciprocal relationships (Question 5.3).

While these results are initially encouraging they do not address the questions of power raised by theorists of critical theory and critical service-learning (Kroll, 2010). These questions would include how effectively host nationals could communicate their needs to those who have the privilege to choose whether they will accept a relationship on truly reciprocal terms. How aware campus ministers are of the power they have as American travelers, or as Bauman's tourists, will be difficult to establish, but it is more likely to be found in the language of the interview responses than in the data produced by an online survey.

Reflection in the Survey Data. An initial review of the survey data suggests that campus ministers are directing their students towards positive practices in the area of reflection. Most notable is that 99% of respondents provided opportunities for their students to reflect on their experience during the trip (Question 4.2). Eighty-one percent of respondents said that they provide opportunities for their students to reflect on their experience after they have returned home from their trip, which must be an important element in preventing STMs from being an experience to consume and forget (Root, 2008). The effect of this reflection is certainly qualified by the quality and the longevity, but its implications for reciprocity are also substantial considering that it may encourage students to remain engaged with the community they visited, and that their experiences with that community may continue to influence how they live their multifaceted lives in the United States.

Also notable in the area of reflection is that 79% of the respondents encouraged their students to reflect on social and political issues related to their trip (Question 4.4 see Table 4.3.5 Appendix E), and that 63% made an effort to have students connect those social and political issues to their own cultural context (Question 4.5 see Table 4.3.6 Appendix E). The responses to questions 4.4 and 4.5 are noteworthy because traditionally it would be expected that an STM would include reflection within a spiritual and religious context, but to include social and political issues would be at best a secondary purpose.

There are several areas of concern within the data that could have a possible impact on the type and quality of reflection that students engage in. The first of these concerns is that 79% of the respondents organize their STM themselves without the use of an outside organization (Question 2.2). This is not to suggest that professional STM organizations engage students in better ways of reflecting than individual campus ministers can, but it does raise the question of what expertise a campus minister has in understanding the spiritual, social and political life of a geographic location they are possibly visiting for the first time themselves. Considering that there are 99 different respondents who plan their trip themselves, there is bound to be a vast spectrum in the quality of reflection opportunities offered to their students. Even though this varied spectrum of reflection would apply to professional STM organizations as well, it is a reasonable assumption that the combination of the leadership of a campus minister and of a professional STM organization would improve the quality of reflection on a trip. A campus minister's expertise in the spiritual and developmental makeup of university students along with the expertise of an organization that has a continued relationship with an STM host community increases accountability and perspective in introducing university students to a new cross-cultural experience.

Considering the varied background of the campus ministers planning these trips with the response that only 25% of them had an explicit curriculum that is specific to the individual trip/location, the quality of the reflection is questioned further. When 31% of respondents have no formalized curriculum and 20% have a curriculum that is general and not specific to their geographic location, the ability to raise relevant social and political issues related to that country lies with the campus minister leader or professional STM organization whose qualifications to do this competently is questionable. The preparation of the STM leader/organizer to lead students through quality reflection on social and political issues is troubled further by the response that on average these STMs spend only 9% of their trip preparation time learning about the historical, social and political issues of the host national culture and 14% of their preparation learning about cultural norms of the host culture (Question 3.5). One possible point of optimism, especially in the areas of social and political reflection, is that many of these trips work with host nationals or long-term missionaries who are more knowledgeable. However,

their ability to lead students through effective reflection would be conditioned by the disparate level of social capital discussed in chapter two.

The concern raised for the quality of reflection above has real implications for the level of reciprocity that is being established between campus ministry organizations and their STM hosts. Evangelical campus ministers are likely to have expertise in addressing the spiritual needs of their students within an American religious and spiritual context, but this does not translate into an expertise in understanding spirituality, religion and culture in other geographic contexts. Cross-cultural interactions are complex and fraught with ethical pitfalls that even those with much experience are more often aware of what they don't know, or have yet to learn, after a few weeks in a new place. This often times leads to an uncomfortable resonance with the snapshot assessment of a new people and their culture that inevitably comes from this short-term experience. Without this self-awareness, it is far too easy to draw conclusions about a new group of people and measure their quality and worth through an ideological lens that has been forged in a myopic cultural and ideological fire. This type of preparation can lead to social interaction and service relationships that are not mutual and open to evaluation, but that are predetermined or concreted in a superficial understanding of each other's respective cultural backgrounds.

Comparison to Existing STM Research. There are two other highlights from the online survey findings that stand out in relation to the STM study by Priest and Priest (2007), the foundational STM study on which many of my demographic survey questions are based. This comparison is valuable as an effort to contribute to standardized categories on which to build future research on STMs, and by establishing similarities and differences that exist between two groups of STM practitioners, campus ministers in traditional university settings and university students in ministry training college settings. In their survey of 5,270 Seminary and Christian college students there were notable differences in the length of trips, and their associated costs. Eighty-seven percent of respondents to Priest and Priest's study participated in STMs that were 30 days or less, compared to 69% of campus minister respondents. More significant is that Priest & Priest's largest category was 10-14 days at 34% while the largest category for campus

minister respondents was 31 days or longer at 31%. In relation to cost, Priest and Priest found that the largest category of respondents was for $501 to $1,000, while the largest group for campus ministers was $3001 or more (35%). 39% of Priest and Priest's respondents participated in trips that cost $1,501 or more while 55% of campus ministers organized trips for the same amount.

While discrepancies between Seminary and Christian college student's STM practices and those of campus ministers in traditional university settings in trip length and cost are interesting, they must be highlighted with some caution. Priest and Priest's research involves a much larger sample size and includes students who participated in trips, whereas the campus ministry research surveys only those who organized trips for Christian students. The lengthier trips and higher costs for the campus ministry may be due to the interest that someone who is more involved in the STM movement may have in taking a survey related to the subject. Regardless of the possible explanations for the difference between the two groups, it can be concluded that these trips are expensive, and that they are traveling to geographic locations that are more culturally distant from the United States. The expense and location of these trips are further highlighted in the interview responses.

The Interviews

Of the 14 campus ministry leaders interviewed, 10 of their STM trips traveled internationally while four of them traveled with their students within the United States. I have chosen to focus only on the 10 international trip interviews for two reasons: 1) three of the four domestic trips did not involve any contact with people who were notably culturally different than the students, including one trip that had no contact with the people they were serving at all; 2) because of the history of Christian mission this project is specifically interested in the relationships between STM travelers and their hosts within the context of international geo-political and socio-cultural barriers. This is not to say that domestic STMs do not encounter imbalances of power and ethical dilemmas that should be subjected to the discourse of reciprocity and reflection. However, as two of the

79

domestic trips from the interviews served partying college students by providing them free transportation and breakfast during their spring break week, they do not characterize the interaction between the tourist and the vagabond that Bauman (2000) describes with all of the social and ethical implications subsequently involved. The difficulties in establishing truly reciprocal relationships, and the type of reflection that is required to do so, is different enough within these two contexts to warrant separate treatment.

Analyzing the 10 international interviewees revealed many similarities between them in logistics as well as their intended purpose and the way the campus ministers made sense of their work. However, three of the respondents, who all represented the same program from the same campus ministry organization, stood apart from the other seven in their focus. In an effort to treat them fairly, and to consider all of the interviews as a representation of the evangelical campus ministry community that is conducting international STMs, there are times where the corpus of interviews will be treated as a whole, and the three unique interviews will also be given separate consideration at the end of the discussion. For the sake of convenience I will refer to these three interview respondents as Program X because of their shared programmatic influence.

Primacy of Evangelism

It should not be surprising that evangelism was the primary focus of the 10 trips represented by these interviews. Even the three interviewees who stand apart from the rest, which had a primary goal of challenging students to live and work alongside the urban poor for two years after graduation, still were concerned with evangelism. One of these three unique trip leaders noted that one of the positive things that came out of their trip was that several of their students started a Christian church in a Muslim neighborhood back in the United States. The other seven respondents were unable to recall their exact mission statement, but each one included some remark about introducing people to Jesus in their broad understanding of their purpose in leading students on an STM. This is consistent with the majority of mission statements that respondents to the online survey provided (Question 3.6). Question 3.6 of the online

survey asked respondents to list their stated goal/s for the last STM they participated in or led. Some of the responses to this question were:

> *To expose as many college students as possible to the gospel of Jesus Christ in (City, Country withheld); for our American students to come away from the trip with a greater heart for God, for other nations, and for their fellow students in America.*

> *To cast vision to students for what God is doing and how He could use them to spread the gospel in host culture.*

> *Give students a vision for reaching out with earthquake relief, growing together and showing the nonbelievers the gospel in tangible ways.*

> *Evangelism with college students.*

> *Share the love of Jesus through words and deeds with those that have never heard.*

While all of the mission statements given in response to Question 3.6 of the online survey involved evangelistic efforts many of them indicated that their STM trip also included hurricane relief work in New Orleans, or earthquake relief work internationally, or construction projects in impoverished areas. The 10 interview respondents stand apart from many of these internet survey mission statement responses because of the primacy of evangelism and relationship building over these other forms of service. The seven interview respondent trips did not include any physical acts of service besides one trip leader that conducted sports camps and several trips that offered English language classes. The Program X trips all involved 'internships' working in schools, hospitals and farms. Even the STM leader who planned to conduct sports camps in an Asian country did so with students who were not highly proficient in the sports they were to instruct, and in some cases they had not played the sport at all.

The geographic locations that the 10 interview respondents traveled to with their students also speak to the more relational nature of these trips for the purpose of evangelism when compared to more traditional forms of service trips. The quintessential STM travels to poor communities that are receptive to American Christian guests, exemplified by the numerous STMs that travel to Mexico to build houses or travel to Haiti to build schools and church buildings. However, the majority of the 10 interview

respondents led STMs to countries that are not receptive to American Christians, known as "closed countries" in Evangelical discourse, or to countries in the developed world. Of the 10 trips, three respondents were hesitant to reveal the name of the country they had traveled to for fear of repercussions for the people that they worked with or for future trips they might make to that country. Three of the trips traveled to predominantly Muslim countries where proselytizing is either illegal or culturally unacceptable. One of the respondents, Terence, describes being monitored by state police during their trip, and at one point being escorted through a city while traveling throughout this country by the state police to insure that they did not attempt to evangelize while they were there. Their response was to pray for the city and then move on. Two other STM groups traveled to a communist country that has a tense relationship with the United States and closely monitors religious activity.

Of the remaining five trips, only two of them traveled to countries that would be considered developing or impoverished. While the other three trips traveled to Europe, one of those trips was to an Eastern European country that would certainly be more impoverished than the rest of the Western world. The two trips to Western Europe highlight the interest that Evangelical Christianity has in what it would consider post-Christian countries, that is countries that may be Christian in cultural orientation, but not in spiritual orientation or in some sort of regular Christian church attendance. This evangelical interest would also apply to Eastern European countries that are deemed to have lost their Christian spiritual orientation under communist rule during the Soviet Republic era. All of this is to suggest that interest in these geographic locations would be based more on the potential for engaging groups of people who are not Christian rather than to offer other physical acts of service that are inaccessible to disadvantaged or impoverished people. The explicit purpose is to convince individuals and communities in these countries to join the Christian faith.

Themes of Evangelism and Reciprocity

Possibly the most important question of this research project is whether an evangelistic bent, like the one found in STMs, can foster truly reciprocal relationships

with host communities. Ideological orientation and intent would be an important part of any service-learning program, but it is especially important in the context of these interviews where in many instances evangelism is the extent of the "service" being offered. This question will be dealt with in more detail in the next chapter, but there are two distinct responses from the interviewees that highlight themes of evangelism and reciprocity that will facilitate this discussion.

Overemphasis on a group of people's deficiencies within a service context has the potential for creating non-reciprocal relationships that are harmful to host communities and visitors alike (McKnight, 1989). In the first interviewee response, Todd took students to a predominantly Muslim country for the purpose of relational evangelism. His STM trip involved a group of students working in a major city in this country, visiting different university campuses to engage students in conversation with the intent of moving that conversation towards the topic of spirituality and ultimately Jesus. When asked to describe the people who they had worked with in that country, one characteristic he raised was:

> *. . . their integrity probably was not the best, but they would say something that was not truthful, they would do it to protect themselves and to protect you in some aspects.*

This description was in relation to the fact that the local university students they befriended would often times not keep appointments, or would be consistently late to agreed upon appointments even though Todd recognized that this was probably due to the emphasis they place on relationships over punctuality. However, when it came to his description, he placed this cultural expression in explicitly moral language, making his cultural observation a judgment on their character. This is further troubling when Todd recognized that host nationals would sometimes be reluctant to engage them because their culture dictated that to do so would mean a significant time contribution on their part if they did not want to be rude to their new acquaintances. In his observation of these efforts to be polite, Todd failed to place their concern for etiquette in the same moral language that he used of their tardiness.

When Todd's understanding of these host nationals as lacking integrity is compared to the methodology that his STM team used to try to evangelize them, it is

difficult to argue that mutuality is being established. Their STM evangelism methodology was to approach students and say "we are from the United States, we are trying to understand the culture . . . if you could answer a few questions for us." This line of questioning would lead to questions about the spiritual life of the host national student and then into an evangelistic presentation. This raises the question of whether Todd would describe his own deception as lacking integrity, or whether he would describe it as a pragmatic necessity to be able to have a spiritual conversation with a stranger. For both Todd and his STM group as well as the host national students from this predominantly Muslim country, deception is a means to a greater and more important end, evangelism and politeness respectively. However, from the perspective of mutuality Todd does not extend the same understanding to the host national student's use of deception as he does to himself and his group's interests.

Deception as a necessity for evangelizing in "closed countries" was a common theme that came out of the interviews from within this context. In itself, this type of deception does not have to be an impasse to mutuality in relationships. One of the respondents found, in her host country, that host nationals assumed that if you were there to teach English that you must also be a Christian missionary, because it is popular for Christians to travel to countries that will not allow them to come for the purpose of religious work. One might argue that it is deceptive to the bureaucracy, but not to the host nationals themselves. Regardless, deception for the purpose of evangelism raises concerns for reciprocity between ideologically distant groups of people.

In the second distinct response interviewee Clara's STM team also went to a closed country to conduct sports camps, but their true mission statement was loosely "to build relationships so that the truth of the gospel can be shared." While this type of statement does not suggest any uncertainty within her worldview, or that of her students, she went on to say that she hoped her students would grow through challenges to their faith. In relation to what she hoped her students learned from their experience she said:

> *I think that it's very important to realize, you know, I don't know all and how can I share if what I have is very limited? You know, how can I honestly be able to engage another person's culture unless I have some understanding of it? How can I help to speak intelligently on certain topics unless I'm prepared?*

She goes on to say that what may work in their own culture may not work in this new culture they are engaging.

Clara never uses the word humility herself, but the sentiment seems to fit in the learning that she hopes her students brought away from this STM. For her students it is the interplay of being prepared to share your faith with other people, but also recognizing that your ideology should be challenged by the context of a new culture and new people.

The three Program X trips take the possibilities for reciprocity even further with their challenge to students to think about the implications of their faith in the here and now, and not just as something that matters at death. When explaining what she wanted her students to get out of the trip, Ruby said:

> . . . *we hope they will come to have a holistic understanding of a personal relationship with God, so not just this eschatological – I'm going to be saved and that's what is important, to heck with the rest of the world – but to the restoration of his Kingdom on earth.*

Wendy, whose trip was also a part of this unique program called this Shalom, expressing her emphasis on "everybody to live a healthy life and have access to education and not be eating garbage!" At the same time that students are doing evangelistic Bible studies, they are also expected "to learn from the poor about God." These serve as examples of STMs that are focused on evangelism, but not at the cost of open-ended relationships that are potentially equally influenced by the people they are working with.

Types of Reflection

The relational nature of the STMs represented in these interviews suggests that an analysis of the reflection students engaged in is important for the learning that took place, but also for the spirit of the relationships they established with host nationals. How campus ministers focused the reflection of their students before and during their trip influences the way in which their students think about other people and the entire context of their cross-cultural experience. Based on the primary focus of these trips, evangelism is certainly a significant part of the reflection that these campus ministers engaged in, but

there were other themes generated by their reflection as well. The presence of an explicit curriculum and its content are good places to begin an analysis of reflection.

There was once again significant difference between the three Program X participants and the rest of the interviewees in the area of curriculum. Most of the other seven trips had an explicit curriculum, but it was mainly confined to an orientation program before the trip began. In this sense much of what these seven trips described was a basic survival guide to the host country or culture they were visiting. This included customs that they should be aware of so as not to offend host nationals, and other cultural expressions that were different or foreign from cultural orientations of the STM students. However, some of the trips also included historical and political information about the country. In at least three of the interviews, learning about the host culture was directly linked to the implications of the cultural norms in the host country for the methods that they would use to share their faith.

Another important aspect of the curriculum during these trips was reading and studying the Bible. In most of the trips this included both personal study as well as corporate study. While personal Bible study included prayer and reflection, and was thought of as "spending time with God," corporate Bible study also functioned as a way in which leadership was developed amongst college student participants as they took turns leading a Bible study on a given day for the group.

Most of the interviewees suggest that the curriculum points students towards specific parts of the Bible for study, but in at least four cases they named a specific book of the Bible that the students studied. One of the trips studied the New Testament book of Romans, which is possibly the most theologically significant book for Evangelicals because of its broad outline of the Evangelical worldview on topics like grace and sin. However, two of the trips studied the Old Testament book of Nehemiah, while the fourth trip studied the Old Testament book of Amos.

The trips that studied Nehemiah are particularly interesting because of the context of the book. Nehemiah was a Jewish leader with high standing in the Persian court during the exile of the Jews in Babylon. The author of the book expresses the hope of the Jewish people as they return to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, while at the same time expressing the struggles they encountered from political persecution and their efforts to re-establish

their national identity in the context of the Law. Interview respondents did not elaborate on their focus in their reading of Nehemiah, but this choice raised for me the possibilities for reflection on spiritual or cultural isolation, perceived persecution, or on Christian identity.

When interviewees were asked if they focused on issues of justice or social justice there were three categories of responses. The first was that the trip planners did not focus on issues of justice at all because of the hostile nature of the country they were visiting made it dangerous to facilitate those types of discussions. This involved mainly those trips that traveled to closed countries, but did not include all of them. The second group did have discussions with their group about issues of justice and social justice, but they focused only on issues of justice within the country they were visiting. Most notable within this group was a focus on how individuals or the government of the country they were visiting acted in unjust ways towards the host nationals that the STM group was working with. This included stories of persecution because of their Christian faith, but also included comments about how corrupt local governments were and how steeply businesses were taxed.

Interviewee Susan had the opportunity to reflect on the problem of homelessness, which she identified as an issue of social justice. She identified the Western European country where she was as a Socialist country (although I believe it would more accurately be described as a capitalist economic system with a strong governmental commitment to social equity) as she described this attempt to do ministry with the homeless:

> *We tried one night to pass out blankets to the homeless downtown. We lived in a city of half a million people and we had bought 30 blankets and all of our students headed out downtown to pass out these blankets and we came back that night, we've got 25! We didn't find homeless people. So, pretty much the (country withheld) government takes care of people. So there's not . . . that gap.*

When asked how she and her team made sense of this, she did not demonstrate much reflection on the significance of this new revelation other than it was good and that this was a ministry that they wanted to do, but couldn't, so they would have to focus on other things.

The inability to, or the lack of interest in, making associations between issues of justice and social justice and law and social policy in the United States or characteristics

of globalization is contrasted by the third group of responses. Again, this group is represented by the three Program X interviewees with ministers employed by a single campus ministry organization and its STM program. Their reflections were characterized by a curriculum that included challenges to student's personal faith, but it also included books on global poverty, and on the justice issues that surround urban slums. Interviewee Sean used this analogy to describe what this reflection looked like:

> *. . . we talk about, you know, there's somebody at the top of the cliff just pushing people off the cliff onto the rocks below. There's people that need to tend to the people on the rocks, and you know, that's what a lot of missions and ministry is about, dealing with the people on the rocks, but there's also got to be somebody dealing with the people at the top of the cliff, to keep people from tossing them off the top of the cliff.*

Noticeable in this analogy is not just a sense of awareness that much of the misery they are encountering in this underdeveloped country is the result of injustice, but that this STM experience should be a motivation to do something about it.

One thing that is missing from all of these interviews in areas of justice and social justice is the role that their own STM activities might have in unjust global trends. This is not entirely surprising because people don't generally like to think that they do things that are unjust or harmful to others, especially if that activity is widely accepted in Evangelical thought as helpful to others. It is also difficult to find popular literature on globalization that highlights the risks of people with social and monetary capital going places where people have very little. Friedman's popular book *The World is Flat* (2005) is a great example of literature on globalization that describes what is going on, and offers some suggestions as to how this might affect the way in which people live and do business in the future, but does not delve into discussions of what an ethical response to these changes might be. He also fails to develop a concept of citizenship in an increasingly globalized world.

One of the things that Clara had her students reflect on is how their experience in this new country might help them identify with international students studying on their campuses in the United States. The isolation and loneliness that many international students feel may not strictly be considered a justice issue, but asking American students

"to realize the plight of international students" certainly can lead to more empathetic and culturally aware students and citizens.

Reciprocity and Prolonged Engagement

Within the context of service-learning one of the more positive things to come out of these interviews was the prolonged engagement that the campus ministers and their ministries had with their host partners. At least eight of the 10 interviewees had ongoing relationships with the organizations they worked with while on their STM. Most of the interviewees traveled to their various locations either once a year or every other year with students. In most of these cases even though the student participants would be different each year, the campus minister leader would be the same, so there was personal prolonged engagement beyond just institutional commitments.

In more specific incidences this prolonged engagement has gone beyond the involvement of campus ministers and their ministries and has extended to students. At least two of the interviewees spoke of students who participated in their most recent trip or in previous trips moving to that country to live and work in a full-time capacity. In other instances, even though student participants did not return to the community or country they visited, they did purposefully move to impoverished communities in the United States to live and work. This does not have a direct influence on the host community of the STM they participated in, but it does resonate with the concept of the global citizenship that is a much desired trait of service-learning participants.

While this chapter already has a lengthy discussion of evangelism and reciprocity, there is still much to be discussed about the quality of relationships that are formed in a service context that focuses heavily on relationship building. It should be qualified again that relationship building and evangelism, or friendship evangelism, was not the only focus of the 7 more traditional approaches to STM represented in these interviews, even though it was the most notable service they offered. Several of interview respondent's trips taught English language classes, which in many developed countries or developing countries is one of the few valuable skills that a university student from the United States has to offer. Even so, because of the importance of English comprehension for

educational and economic success in many of these countries, it is a valuable service that these students provided.

It is impossible to place value on the quality of friendships that students build during the time that they spend in their host country. This concept of friendship with host nationals is even harder to clarify when you consider that much of the prolonged engagement is a result of relationships with American long-term missionaries. Lilly is an example of an interviewee who has led STMs to this Eastern European country in the past, and her campus ministry organization is connected to American missionaries working in this country. Before she was asked to describe her relationship with the Eastern Europeans that she and her group worked with while they were there, she refers to them throughout the interview as her friends. Since her time there she has contact with some of them through the social networking site Facebook, which was a common response from several of the interviewees. There is much research to still be done on the quality of relationships through internet social networking sites, but in these circumstances this may be the best that STM participants can do if students can only commit to one international trip.

The three Program X interviewees once again distinguish themselves from the other 7 because of their efforts in prolonged engagement and reciprocal relationships. While also maintaining contact with host nationals through Facebook and emailing, they don't use the word friendship like the others as if they recognize a certain naiveté in this thinking. When asked to describe what she thought her group accomplished working in a garbage village in a North African country with a heavily persecuted minority, Wendy responded:

> *I'm really convinced that the biggest thing, . . . the most practical thing I think is that they have a sense of hope because they are not forgotten.*

She says this in the context of a variety of service acts that her and her students participated in; working in hospitals, teaching in classrooms, taking care of the disabled, etc. However, she embodies the approach of this unique STM program by admitting that there is not much they can accomplish through their service, even though these trips are significantly longer, five to seven weeks, than other trips described in the interviews.

The approach of the Program X trips accomplishes a greater level of reciprocity than other trips in more practical ways as well. Two of the three trips included host national students in their service and learning activities. In both of these situations, the result was to introduce host nationals to parts of their own country that they would not have visited or served because of social stigmas and fear. Much in the same way that without service-learning programs in the United States, many students would not visit impoverished urban areas on their own for the same reasons. Also, two of these trips have resulted in students or the organization raising money to bring host national leaders to the United States to conduct workshops and interact with students. Even though it is may be at the most diminutive level, it still moves campus ministers and their students away from the voyeuristic, consumptive tendencies of international travel and power, towards a mutual sharing of life.

Reciprocity and Learning

The first interview question that was posed to respondents was to ask them to tell a story about their trip that embodied the goals and or intent that they had for the trip. Some interview respondents found this difficult to do and quickly resorted to broadly telling what they did on their STM, while the rest told stories about how this STM influenced one or more of their students. This was a common theme throughout all of the interviews; respondents found it difficult to not conceptualize the focus or intent of their trip in terms of the effect it had on their American students. This was so much the case that in one interview when asked to describe the people who she went to work with, one respondent began to describe her American students.

There are numerous reasons why campus ministers would have a tendency to do this, the foremost being the close relationships they have with their students that are formed before the trip and in many cases intensified by the trip. The tendency for educators to overemphasize the transformational effects that service can have on their students is the reason that service-learning literature and pedagogy concerns itself so vividly with establishing reciprocity with communities being served. The same concern

for emphasizing goers rather than receivers seems to be present in STMs without the mantra of reciprocity and mutuality to temper it.

Even within the context of trips that had a more concentrated focus on issues of justice, there still appears to be a tradition within the STM movement of using these trips as spiritual retreats for American students. Throughout the interviews respondents spoke of their hope that their students would grow in their faith, or be more bold in their faith when they returned to their campuses in the United States. Very little was said about what their hopes were for the community that they visited, or for individuals they may have worked with, or become friends with for that matter. Even if given the benefit of the doubt that time may have tempered their stories of host nationals, there is so much emphasis on the learning and transformation of American students that it can be a severe obstacle to true reciprocity.

There was evidence of learning that took place throughout all of the interview responses. Each respondent revealed something that they had learned about the people or the country that they had visited that I found to be really interesting. Many of these details reveal too much about the countries that they visited to be recorded here, but they involved topics like local dating rituals, governmental policy on the disabled, effects of governmental policy on family structure and the resulting effects on education, and how industry works around a garbage dump of a major urban center. Even with the recognition that much of this learning is value-laden, and open to the cultural and ideological interpretation of the American travelers, I still found evidence in the interviews that respondents took time to try to better understand the context of the country and community they were visiting, and to try to understand the world that their hosts were living in.

STMs and the New Monastics

The Program X interview responses have been referenced throughout this analysis, but their objectives and activities warrant a brief discussion on their own. These trips were altogether different in their focus from the other trips, as they had a greater social consciousness from their evangelism-only counterparts. As mentioned before, it

was not that these trips were not concerned with evangelism, but their primary focus was to challenge students to commit to live and work amongst the poorest of the poor for two years. Again, it was not that the other trips were not interested in the possibilities of recruiting students to serve as long term missionaries, it was that other trips' primary focus was on evangelism rather than assisting the poor and engaging the political and social forces that perpetuate and reinforce their poverty.

While these three trips could be reasonably be referred to outliers in this research project, they represent a burgeoning movement within modern Evangelicalism. The association with a different vein of Evangelicalism is evident by these interview respondents referencing people like Shane Claiborne, the figurehead of a movement in Evangelicalism called the New Monastics, which is discussed in chapter two (Claiborne, 2006; Wallis, 2005; 2009). This is a movement that emphasizes the teachings of Jesus in the New Testament that focus on nonviolence and care for the poor. It therefore has a social and political agenda that is far different than previous Evangelical social and political action. It is a relatively young movement with the potential for growth, which may begin to alter the form of the STM movement amongst university students.

The Project X trips traveled to some of the worlds most notorious urban slums because of what students can learn while they were there. Even though these trips demonstrated elements of reciprocity in their planning and implementation Wendy, one of the Project X trip leaders mentioned previously in this chapter, recognized that there was little her students could do within the capacity of their STM to serve this community despite their best efforts. However, she also realized there was a great deal her students could learn about poverty and injustice by being there. An example of this approach is found in the Project X curriculum which required students to read *Dispossessed: Life in Our World's Urban Slums* (Kramer, 2006). Kramer's work discusses what life is like in urban slums, but also talks about the global economic patterns that cause this phenomenon. In a sense these trips had a realistic approach to what could be accomplished in the immediate context of their STM trip by emphasizing the greatest impact their students could have on these urban slums, which is to live differently because of this experience as powerful agents in the world.

Limitations

Overall the greatest limitation to the *Campus Ministry Short-term Mission Trips* survey was that some of the questions were too general. It would have been useful to get more detailed information about the STM trip locations, especially if the trips were international or within the United States. It also would have been useful to have an option of 0 for the question about how many non-white people participated in respondent's last trip (Question 2.4). In light of Priest (2006) suggesting that STMs may be a way for minorities to participate in global educational opportunities where they are currently underrepresented, and with 70% of respondents answering 1-3 non-white participants on their last trip, it could be important to know how many trips had no diversity in their participants. Finally, the question about whether participants had any full-time missionary experience (Question 1.6) could have been stated more clearly. The high number of campus ministers claiming to have served in a full-time missionary capacity (47%) suggests that the question might have been misunderstood.

The greatest limitation to the interview responses was my own interpretation and ideological interests as the researcher. As much as the questions were designed to allow respondents to tell about the sense they made of their STM experience, the questions were also designed to explore themes identified in the service-learning literature.

Conclusion

While there is some diversity in the Evangelical campus ministry movement, these data suggest that the movement as a whole is unified in its emphasis on evangelism. This is not surprising as evangelism has been the primary motivation for all Evangelical mission work. However, the online data suggest that there is not only seems to be a unity in ideology, but that Evangelical campus ministry STMs look similar regardless of the campus minister who is organizing it. A difference in the objectives for student learning and long-term objectives for the host community within this subculture of the STM movement came to light in the analysis of the interviews. The Project X STM program identified in the interviews would suggest even though these trips look the same in what

they do, it is the objectives of the campus minister organizing the trip that make them different. Those objectives are stated explicitly in the curriculum, but also implicitly in the ideology of the campus ministers who organize and lead them.

This project has identified reciprocity, reflection and imbalances of power as key concepts in the service-learning literature to evaluate STMs within the Evangelical campus ministry context. Analysis of the online survey data and the interview data reveal that there are elements of reciprocity and reflection in STM trip planning as they exist thus far. In the next chapter I will further evaluate the quality and extent of reciprocity and reflection in these trips as well as the important recognition of a differentiation of power between STM travelers and their host communities.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

This research project began by asking to what extent are the practices of those who plan and implement short-term mission trips for university students in the United States congruent with perceptions of good practice in critical service-learning literature. As we begin to draw conclusions about what the analysis of the online survey data and the interview data shows it will be helpful to review how service-learning as a body of literature has been established as an evaluative lens for this particular subset of the STM movement. This review will involve establishing the abundant literature in service-learning as a suitable lens for STMs organized and led by campus ministers, and also the need that this movement has for this evaluation.

Drawing comparisons between the growing short-term mission (STM) movement on university campuses and the field of service-learning in higher education is, to an extent, unavoidable. At the surface many of the service activities that service-learning university students and STM workers are engaged in look very similar as students with resources for education and travel, and who have time to volunteer, are going to unfamiliar communities and spaces to help others. The underlying ideologies that motivate students to serve may be very different, but both movements touch on a growing interest and ethic of service to local and global communities amongst college students. This current generation of university student shows a greater awareness of the world around them than their parents did, as well as an awareness of the agency that they have to interact with and change that world. This generation also seems much less likely to allow old metanarratives, ones that explain away disadvantaged people as lazy and uninspired to change their circumstances, to keep them from helping. This new attitude in students and the growth in both the field of service-learning and the STM movement have positioned them for comparison to each other but also to explore broader subjects like this new ethic of service and how global citizenship is perceived and influenced in college students by these experiences.

The STM movement was primed for the current wave of globalization that has been transforming the world for the past 50 to 60 years because of its roots in the cross-

cultural and international focus of the modern Evangelical missions movement. Global travel by American missionaries for the purpose of Evangelical mission has been well established for 200 years; all the STM movement did was drastically shorten the length of the mission trip and drastically increase the number of participants while benefiting from the foundational networks of the long-term missionary. While that network of missionaries could be found within the continental United States, it took awhile for the STM movement to recognize local and national locations like inner-cities and Native American communities as new possibilities for STM trips, effectively broadening the scope of the movement by staying closer to home.

The service-learning movement in higher education has moved in the opposite direction, with a focus on local communities being the foundation of the public university's commitment to service. In the past international education programs like study abroad were certainly experiential, but it offered little in terms of service to global communities. This too has changed with the current wave of globalization as international service-learning is taking its place in hearts and minds of service oriented educators who are increasingly aware of the needs of transnational communities, and access to these communities is more accessible than ever through travel. These intersections of length of service and focus on both local and global communities, along with the already mentioned service activities, have brought each of these movements to an ideal place in their development for comparison.

As the STM movement has grown it has been inviting critique both by those inside and outside of the Evangelical mission movement, based on the sheer size of the numbers and influence of this trend over the past few decades. The critique from within the movement questions whether inexperienced, and poorly equipped, short-term travelers are accomplishing the original objective of Evangelical mission work, which is evangelism. However, there are voices from within the Evangelical mission movement that echo the critiques of outside observers who question whether STMs might be contributing to unhelpful and unjust trends in globalization. Both of these vantage points are born out of a suspicion that much of the STM movement has no foundational purpose and at best has poorly defined objectives for their participants and host communities. A vague assertion of what success in evangelistic efforts should look like, and a seemingly

blind acceptance of a massive deficit in resources spent on STM programming versus the number of Christian converts that they produce, has fueled these critiques of STM purpose and effectiveness. The unclear purpose of the STM movement as a whole is further complicated by the efforts of a growing number of Evangelicals who would use STMs as a platform to raise awareness of issues of social justice within the context of globalization.

Such ambiguity in purpose of many STM trips is not only an occasion for criticism of the unintended side effects of the entire movement, but can also be read as an opportunity to suggest how this phenomenon could be accomplishing so much more than it is. There is much that service-learning can do to make STMs a better educational experience. What is more significant than this is that principles of service-learning like reciprocity and reflection can help Evangelicals place their work within a set of ethical considerations that are congruent with broader Christian ethics, like that of loving or treating other people the way in which you would be loved or treated.

There is already a small but growing Evangelical response to these questions of purpose and ethics in STMs to which this dissertation hopes to contribute. This response is in the form of the U.S. Standards of Excellence (SOE) in Short-term Missions, which echoes the service-learning themes of reciprocity and prolonged engagement. This is at least a start for addressing a movement that has historically justified reciprocity through its evangelistic accomplishments. However, the fact that these principles were developed from the work of Christian groups in Canada and England doing cross-cultural work suggests that the thinking behind the principles, and even the acknowledgement that they were needed, may be born more out of mimicry rather than from any identifiable ethos within the American STM movement. This suggests that not only is there an opportunity to develop the SOE further through the lens of service-learning, but that a way must be found to raise awareness of the standards in the STM movement, and ultimately make them a part of the identity of the STM movement.

A review of the service-learning literature in higher education points to a movement that is ultimately concerned with producing a more engaged and more democratic citizenry. The goal is to produce citizens who have experienced personal agency in cooperation with community involvement and reflection to address social

problems and strengthen American and global democracy. However, there are also service-learning theorists who see the potential of service-learning to name and deconstruct societal structures that perpetuate injustice and oversimplified binaries of those with resources and those without, binaries that identify people based on their perceived deficiencies. All of these themes are also accompanied by a great deal of research that has established the effectiveness of service-learning as a pedagogy to accomplish these goals, along with research that points to some weaknesses in the movement.

Principles of reciprocity, reflection and questions of power are prevalent in the service-learning literature, and are used by this project in evaluating the data from campus ministers who organize and lead STMs with their students. The concept of reciprocity, which includes concerns for prolonged institutional engagement with mutually beneficial planning of service activities, articulates the foundational ethical premise of service-learning as a philosophical project. The act of reflection and its insistence upon an explicit curriculum, stated learning goals with intentional activities to reach those goals, articulates the distinctiveness of the movement as a pedagogical project. Finally, there is a growing movement of dissatisfaction within the service-learning literature that has introduced the concept of power with important questions of how aware those in service-learning activities are of the power they possess and how they are using it. Critical service-learning's practice of troubling notions of power in service-learning relationships articulates this movement's contribution to the ethical framework of the larger movement.

STMs and service-learning are two separate movements with their own ideological contexts and history, but they have increasingly overlapped in their form and participant motivation over the past few decades. The overlapping nature of the two movements is so significant that it invites comparison and critique. The sheer amount of research that exists on the service-learning movement and its inclusion of more diverse ideologies and even religious or faith-based movements naturally places this movement in a position to evaluate STMs, especially within the context of Evangelical campus ministries in higher education. The rest of this chapter will focus on the conclusions derived from applying this evaluative lens to the Evangelical campus ministry STM

movement, and then will conclude with a brief discussion of implications that this movement has for service-learning educators in higher education.

Can Short-term Missions and Service-Learning Get Along?

The main challenge of evaluating the STM movement through the lens of service-learning centers on addressing the differences in their respective ideologies. While service-learning educators are generally concerned with developing engaged and informed citizens who will perpetuate democratic life, Evangelical STMs are ultimately concerned with evangelism to which any other outcome is secondary. I anticipate that an initial response from Evangelical campus ministers to any comparison or evaluation is that these differences in purpose are too important to make this process useful or relevant. This is to suggest that for Evangelicals the divine command to evangelize people who are not Christian would trump any ethical or pedagogical concerns that the field of service-learning might bring to their work. This response requires a sympathetic ear from those who would like to inform and reform the STM movement as any dialogue with Evangelical campus ministers is going to require ideas and solutions that allow campus ministers to live consistently with their worldview.

To those campus ministers who would question the value of service-learning theory to their work I would suggest that there is an important shared ethical foundation between Christianity and the service-learning principles of reciprocity and reflection. This ethic, attributed to Jesus in the three Synoptic Gospels and repeated by Paul and James in their New Testament Epistles, is the call to love your neighbor as you love yourself. It is a widely repeated maxim in Christianity that basically insists on reciprocal relationships. In a society like ours that is inundated with the language and mental framework of capitalism, it might better be stated that one should place the self-interest of others in place of one's own self-interest. When thinking about the worst intentioned STMs this ethic would say that if you hate it when your uncle and his family come for a reunion because you suspect they are using your home as free accommodation for their family vacation, then you shouldn't use some mission organizations hostel in Africa or Europe for the same reason.

The complexity in the simply stated ethic of loving your neighbor as you love yourself is found in perspective, and its reliance upon the context of experience. I might be able to argue that I can understand how another white, middle-class, male living in the United States would like to be treated because we have had similar experiences and possibly hold similar social and cultural understandings. However, this would be a far less convincing argument if I were to assume to understand how an immigrant woman, living in extreme poverty in the United States would like to be treated. I might be able to determine the most fundamental aspirations of the human condition like survival and dignity, but I could not internalize how this woman arrived in her current state, or how she thinks about her situation. This is where the service-learning ideal of reflection intersects with reciprocity. Reflection is the opportunity to try and consider the world from this woman's perspective in synergy with her, and then ultimately to find where I fit as an agent in her world, and where she fits as an agent in mine. For campus ministries who do STMs, this is the complex work that is needed to truly love people who are very different from them, in the same way in which they would be loved.

One of the more salient questions that has arisen in my thinking during this research project is whether evangelistic relationships can truly be reciprocal. While I will argue later in this chapter that in some STM contexts the myopic emphasis on evangelism corrupts any chances for reciprocity or mutuality, I also found examples of STMs that were concerned about evangelism but in the context of a host of other concerns including social reform, imbalances of power and issues of justice. These outlier STM programs are an important discovery in this research project and suggest that even if the broader STM movement is struggling to establish reciprocal relationships, that there are existing models that are successful in doing so.

It would be easy to dismiss Evangelicals from consideration and dialogue from the service-learning movement because of their primary emphasis on changing the ideological framework, or worldview, of the people with whom they work. This approach certainly does not fit the thinking of service approaches like Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) that insists on helping communities develop through strengths that they identify in themselves rather than deficiencies identified by outsiders. The organization of service trips around perceived spiritual and moral deficiencies in the

101

receiving communities will always be a source of tension for reciprocity. These are legitimate concerns for a movement that has rightfully emphasized mutual learning between those who come to serve and those receiving services.

However, one of the privileges that comes from cross-cultural experiences like STMs or many types of service-learning projects is the opportunity to share how you think about the world with others who may not have that same understanding. Wanting another group of people to understand how you view the metaphysical world and its implications for everyday life could reasonably fall into this same activity. It might even be expected that in an intensive short period of time that is designed for relational development with people of difference that conversations would naturally move towards deeper more personal topics about religion and faith. In my own experience as a leader of STM trips, I participated in an intense conversation about how Americans can call a game, in which players rarely use their feet, football. I also witnessed a conversation between a group of national police officers in a conversational English class which began with them asking a group of American high school students how they felt about the USA's invasion of Iraq. I have also debated with a group of men from Zimbabwe about the economic policies of their president and his reputation in the international community. I have witnessed university students discuss their faith and their church experience back in the United States with South African laborers while helping to build a school building.

What these conversations suggest to me is that in many cross-cultural interactions between people, the mutual learning is the most significant service being offered. This would include mutual learning about one's worldview. The subject of these conversations varied in their level of personal connectedness, but they were all born out of a mutual inquisitiveness between people wanting to know more about others with whom they don't normally get to interact. In an increasingly globalized world, where one of the keys to success is a person's ability to engage and understand people of difference, this can be understood as a really valuable interaction.

I believe that this is the type of STM trip that Andrew Root (2008), the theorist from chapter one who used Bauman's description of vagabonds and tourists to describe unjust trends of consumption in globalization to conceptualize the STM trip, is

102

suggesting when he says that STMs should be about being with people and not doing things for them. Interestingly, this is the same type of reflection that Rhoads (1997) advocates as an element of critical service-learning. Doing activities for people allows STM travelers to focus on their actions and to not be pressed to justify their trip through their relationships. Wendy, the Project X leader from chapter 4, expressed this same sentiment as she recognized that there was little value in the physical services they offered to people living in slums over a 5 week period. Classifying the act of "being with people" as a service may be difficult to defend, but it is certainly worth consideration in the context of short-term trips that bring students into contact with people who are culturally very different.

This project will hopefully work to ease some of the tension that evangelism creates in forming reciprocal relationships, while at the same time helping Evangelical campus ministers realize the unfulfilled potential of their STM trips. The quality and largesse of research in service-learning is well positioned to assist STMs to become more distinct learning experiences for their students and to improve the quality and meaning of their service activities. To progress in this direction requires a frank discussion of the relationship between STMs and their primary organization around evangelism. The discussion that follows must take place on a categorical level, encompassing the entire STM movement, and then also within the specific context of the findings of this research project.

When Evangelism Isn't Enough

I will highlight three critiques of the concept of evangelism as a primary organizing principle for Evangelical STMs planned by campus ministers. In each of these critiques I will identify how the primacy of evangelism may actually be counter-productive to evangelism efforts and concurrently suggest how service-learning theory regarding reciprocity and reflection can inform these critiques. In this exercise I am not suggesting that STMs cannot be evangelistic in their character and form, however, what I am suggesting is that evangelism should not be a self-serving, opaque skin stretched over

103

the frame of STM organizing and practice. Pulling back this covering skin allows us to see the guts of the movement to see what is healthy, but also to see the parts that are sick.

There is an important characteristic about Evangelicals and how they conceptualize the process of evangelism that might be best described as the concept of seed planting. Within the larger Evangelical culture there is a maxim that is ubiquitous in evangelistic efforts that one never can know what kind of seed they have planted through their work. The idea behind this is that often times a Christian will plant the seed of the Gospel in someone's life without seeing any signs of their accomplishments, and that seed may only sprout and bloom into a flower or a tree many years later after it has had time to germinate. It serves a variety of purposes, including to help Christians not to become discouraged by the seeming lack of results for their evangelistic efforts. For those outside the movement it helps in understanding how so much effort and resources can be spent on a process that may seemingly yield few visible results.

The first of these critiques of evangelism as a covering principle for STMs is not derived directly from an analysis of the data gathered in this research project. Instead, this is a critique born out of reason and out of an appeal to the most basic Christian ethic of treating others the same way in which one would like to be treated. For this reason this critique is best stated by turning the tables on the Evangelical STM traveler to ask whether or not they would consider changing their thinking on the most foundational and important aspects of their way of life based upon a two week interaction with someone from another country who does not know their culture, does not speak their language and does not fully understand the worldview that they are hoping to replace. To suggest that this model would work on a middle class Evangelical Christian in the United States would be absurd, and yet this is the dominant premise of the modern STM trip.

The absurdity of thinking that a two week investment in another person's world is the foundation on which to question their current worldview is not only recognizable to those of us who would apply a critical lens to the STM movement. It is recognizable to those communities that host STM travelers as well. We so often mistake the silence or elusiveness of STM receiving communities on their perspective of our activities as being an indiscriminate consent to our purposes rather than it being a result of a relationship that is defined by an imbalance of power. Often times when we are affirmed in our

104

evangelical purposes, it is by nationals who speak on behalf of their communities without their consent or knowledge (Koll, 2010). And yet, when I asked a Christian student from a Eastern European country studying in the United States about her many experiences with STM travelers in her own country she expressed both confusion and suspicion of their purposes. She had never expressed this to STM travelers in her country, but here in the United States as a student at an American university, the balance of power had shifted between us to a level where she could speak openly about her perspective. To not acknowledge the absurdity of evangelism as the sole organizing principle for the STM movement is disrespectful and insulting to those host communities, and this is no way to begin conversations about faith.

The ethics and theory of mutuality through prolonged engagement in service-learning has something to offer to the STM movement in these instances of disrespect and ineffectuality. If it is indeed absurd to suggest that someone's worldview is so easily changed by culturally and personally distant strangers, then the work of evangelism should be attributed to people who are willing to invest much more of their time, energy and life into these communities than can be accomplished in the context of a STM trip. Practice that is born out of an emphasis on prolonged engagement would suggest that the role of the STM traveler is to assist those who are doing the long-term work, and that they should do this through institutional commitment to those people and their corresponding organizations. This type of ongoing institutional commitment would be evidence of the level of interest and care that STM travelers could have for the communities they visit, and about the interest in establishing reciprocal relationships with those communities and the organizations that work with them.

While there were some positive results discussed in chapter four from the online survey concerning prolonged engagement, there is still a lot of ambiguity in this area. The numbers of campus ministers who are traveling to different locations each time they organize a trip (8%) and the numbers whose trips varied between the same location and different locations (61%) supports the narrative that the interests that drive the STM movement are the same interests that drive global tourism. This type of travel does not look like caring relationships with host communities, but more like trips of consumption and exploitation. Trips that look like consumption and exploitation are not only unethical

105

within the Christian worldview, but they are also a poor way to begin faith conversations. More importantly, long-term mission organizations and missionaries who host exploitive STMs undermine their own ability to engage in these conversations.

A second critique of evangelism as an organizing principle for STMs is derived from the responses of the interviewees. Although most of those who were interviewed included some evangelistic theme in their STM purpose statement, their implicit focus was not on the resulting spiritual condition of the host communities they visited. When asked to tell a story that they felt embodied the goals and meaning of their STM trip, those who were able to think of a story beyond what they did while they were there focused on the spiritual growth of their students from the United States. This theme was carried out throughout the interviews as the campus minister respondents repeatedly focused on their students and what changes they saw in them.

This should not be all that surprising because of the ongoing relationship that campus ministers have with their students, and we should fully expect that a cross-cultural adventure like a STM trip would only deepen that relationship. This focus parallels the deficiencies in the service-learning literature that focuses almost entirely on the effects that service-learning engagement has on those serving rather than on the receiving communities (Cruz & Giles, 2000; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). While this lack of focus in the research on host community impact is an area that needs attention in both the fields of service-learning and STMs, its immediate implication here is that in practice evangelism is not the primary goal of these campus ministry STMs, it is the spiritual development of their participating students!

This focus by the campus minister respondents on the spiritual development of their American students is problematic for two reasons, which I will list in the order of the weight of their implications for ethical and best practices. Firstly, it often comes at the expense of the host communities that they were visiting in ways that showed a lack of interest in forming reciprocal relationships. Several of the respondents expressed hopes that their students would develop skills and interest in evangelizing others, something that they were not doing on their university campuses back home. This is an arrangement challenged by Henry and Breyfogle (2006) who counter, "Rather than depicting the community as a laboratory in which university participants 'try out' their skills and ideas,

106

the principle of reciprocity suggests that parties work together to assure that their mutual interests and needs are accounted for in the programs that result from the collaboration" (p. 29). A STM in which students "practice" evangelism, treats the host community as a means to an end, and does not recognize the relationship with them as an end in itself.

Secondly, the stated goals of these STMs and the implicit, or hidden, goals are not congruent with each other, creating a scenario where neither of these two goals can be reached effectively. I have already discussed the absurdity of truly meaningful evangelistic efforts within the STM context, however, when that still remains the primary organizing principle of the STM movement, it does not make campus ministers think critically about what type of educational experience they should reasonably expect for their students during and after the STM experience. Misrepresenting the actual purposes of their STM, which is almost certainly done unintentionally, creates a program that does not accomplish what it claims and is unorganized and haphazard in its efforts to accomplish what it implicitly tries to. It is a recipe for poor programming, a poor educational experience, and potentially poor outcomes for the community that hosts them.

I will qualify here that many evangelicals think about their efforts to evangelize within a much larger, lifelong context. Therefore, an STM experience for a campus minister and for their students might just be one piece in a lifetime commitment to Christian ministry, which might be offered as their explanation for the lack of evidence of Christian converts or meaningful long-term relationships with host communities in STM practice. This still means little to those communities who host the STM travelers and who don't have any say in the activities that the Americans engage, or the meaning that they assign to those activities, or what type of relationship they are establishing together. Acknowledging the limitations of what can actually be accomplished on a STM trip in the context of Evangelical interests will allow for campus ministers to think more intentionally about the learning their students will engage and how to form more meaningful and ethical relationships with their hosts. This ultimately should be addressed in the form of an explicit curriculum that will be discussed further in the next section.

The final critique of evangelism as the organizing principle for STM trips organized by participating campus ministers is that it has the tendency to blind them from

107

the implications of their work. The unintended side effects of the STM trips represented by the campus minister interviews vary in their implications for the host communities from minor cultural insensitivities to larger global injustices. In the case of Todd in chapter four, the campus minister who took students to the Middle East to conduct friendship evangelism, we could argue that in their efforts to evangelize the group was rude and culturally insensitive to the hosts by not extending them the same understanding that they were expecting in return.

The implications of these STMs not taking into account their unintended side effects becomes more serious in the example of Terrence, who took his students to a predominantly Muslim country in the Middle East. He described driving throughout the country while stopping to pray for the people as they would travel through different towns. He also described times when police in this country would monitor them, and times when they would escort them out of cities ensuring that they did not speak to anyone. Terence recognized this as an oppressive element of this country's government on its people, but he did not reflect at all on why the police would be uncomfortable with their presence. This is especially startling considering that this country hosts millions of tourists from Europe each year, and that Terence concluded through his conversations with people there that Muslims in this country assume that all Americans are Christians, and that all American cultural products are Christian products. It is impossible to know for sure the motivation of the police in this country, but it may have something to do with the observation that Americans don't come to the Middle East to contribute to their economy like the Europeans, but they do come to meddle in this country's affairs and impose their ideology on the Middle East. This does little to improve the Muslim world's perceptions of Americans, and it raises serious questions as to whether American university students are the best people to be doing evangelistic work in this country.

The final way in which campus ministers seem to be unaware of the full implications of their evangelistic work in these international contexts is the role that they play in globalization and concomitantly the role that globalization plays in connecting them to these international contexts before and after their trip. The Project X trips, the three unique trips from the interview responses that distinguished themselves through their focus on issues of justice, did a much better job at this through their curriculum,

where they had students explore the interconnectivity of the world through trends and streams of globalization. However, the rest of the campus ministers failed to make any connection between their STM activities and the economic, social and political forces that are quickly changing the world and its interconnectivity. An overemphasis on the spiritual condition of their host communities kept them from delving into discussions that are difficult to avoid in an international context like how global trade works today, and who most benefits from it; or how American foreign policy influences political movements elsewhere in the world, or the influences foreign companies have on this country's economy and working conditions, or the influences STM travelers have on the social and political influence of the church in this country. This is a small sampling of ethical the ethical concerns brought about by globalization, but does well to represent the types of discussions that should arise easily out of a thoughtful interaction with a cross-cultural community that is not hindered by an overly myopic focus on proselytizing.

An overemphasis on evangelism and the dichotomy of those who are Christian and those who are not within the STM movement has led to practices that I have shown to actually be counter-productive to Evangelical interests, and they do not lead to reciprocal relationships. It seems that it would be in the best interest of the Evangelical campus ministry community that organize these trips to begin to imagine what other goals their STM programs can accomplish for their students and their host communities. This is not to say that these trips cannot still have an evangelistic focus to them, for they would cease to be missional if they did, however, that focus needs to be tempered by a much less idealistic and naïve approach. This new approach is not only more pragmatic in the sense that it would encourage campus ministers to be more intentional about something that they are already doing implicitly, which is focusing on the personal and spiritual development of their students, but it would also lead to more reciprocal, or more "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" relationships. To accomplish this will require a change in the focus of these STMs through addressing the types and quality of reflection that campus ministry students engage in.

The most effective way to address the type of reflection that students engage in while participating in an international service context is through the curriculum, as having an explicit curriculum is one way to support some type of intentional learning during these service trips. This is extremely important in the case of short-term service programs that are in a cross-cultural context like STMs. Within this context not only are the participants not prepared to navigate the foreign context in which they find themselves, but most campus ministers have little or no expertise in cross-cultural service work. The lack of understanding that novices bring to any foreign context results in them applying their own ideologies and mental models to that context, which usually results in enforcing stereotypes that they have already unwittingly adopted. I would suggest that a well-planned, intentional curriculum is vital for helping students understand their own biases and mental models.

One of the more encouraging findings to come out of the survey data was that 70% of the trips represented had some form of curriculum. Even more encouraging was that 25% of those who had an explicit curriculum tailored it to an individual trip, with another 25% having a specified curriculum for some of their trips. These data were supported by the interviews, all of which had some form of curriculum. However, it was not an explicit curriculum in the sense that it had stated goals with activities and experiences with which to meet those goals. Instead much of the interview respondent's curriculum consisted of learning about the country they were visiting; including information about the history, culture and language, and also about specific customs that were more likely to be misunderstood by Americans. Most of the curriculum also included some instruction on how to evangelize and what faith practices look like in the cultural context they were traveling to.

Interviewees were asked to describe the country they traveled to, and were also asked if there were any interesting social, cultural or political differences or similarities to the United States. The responses to this question suggested that the campus ministers and their students had made interesting observations in all of these areas during their STM trip. It is difficult to give examples of these responses from the research because they are

specific enough to reveal which country they were working in, but they were the type of fascinating cultural details that only become significant to Americans when they experience the effects of these cultural differences within the context of day to day living. Several of the examples offered fascinated me, which is one of the privileges of doing qualitative research of this nature.

While the interviewees did make interesting social, political and religious observations they fell short in making connections to their own cultural context in the United States, and more importantly, to see the interconnectedness of those two worlds. The field of service-learning, and specifically the literature on critical service-learning has a great deal to offer these STM programs in this area. The discussion of critical service-learning in chapter two proposes that a curriculum designed to include this pedagogical approach would lead to more than just content about global, social and justice issues that the STM movement has largely failed to address, but it also would lead to more intentional reflection on the role that the STM participant plays in these issues.

Critical service-learning calls for the type of critical self-reflection that Freire calls critical consciousness. In her efforts to interject critical reflection into the STM movement Karla Ann Koll (2010) suggests:

> The goal of critical reflection is awareness. For Freire, awareness is not simply an understanding of geopolitical and economic forces at work in the world. Awareness also means being able to locate oneself and the community of which one is a part within those global dynamics. This is especially necessary for the citizens of the nations whose per capita consumption rates far outstrip those of any other nation on earth. (p. 94)

This is not the type of reflection that is garnered by asking students to reflect upon what God is doing in their life through this experience, which was a common component of the interviewee's curriculum. The type of reflection that Freire, Koll and critical service-learning theorists like Rhoads call for would ask STM participants to recognize their own role in global trends that can be positive, but certainly are also negative and unjust.

The most disconcerting finding from the interview responses was the inability of most to reflect on the role that they as American citizens play in global dynamics. When asked to discuss issues of social justice, respondents either did not deal with the subject, or they observed unjust social structures within the country they were visiting. These

responses seemed to come from a position of passive observer with an overly paternalistic view of the host nationals and their country.

This is the type of overly judgmental ethnocentrism that can be cultivated from an overemphasis on evangelism. A curriculum that focuses entirely on information necessary to change a people's worldview approaches a short-term cross-cultural situation focused on a group of people's perceived deficiencies, and approaches the entire relationship with answers to assumed questions rather than with any humility or inquisitiveness. This attitude creates a scenario for abusive relationships with host nationals that are built partially on the naivety of the American travelers and partially on their self-interest. These types of relationships are only possible because of the imbalance of power that is inherent in cross-cultural, global relationships today, and it is for this reason that STM trips must think about the ethics of what they are doing in the context of reciprocity.

A curriculum that aides American Christians to think about the world in ways that impoverished, marginalized, vagabond communities do must deal with differentials of power. To develop relationships that are ethical in a reciprocal Gospel context, is going to require American STM organizers and participants to see the world through the eyes of people they cannot begin to relate to without a great deal of cognitive and experiential work. It is a process that should challenge the perception that they have of their work as altruistic givers who have sacrificed their time and money to help others. It should also confront them with the power they have as American travelers to dictate the parameters of the STM relationship and define the needs of the host community in a spiritual context. This is something that must start in the hearts and minds of STM organizers and leaders and then find its way into STM curriculum to challenge students to think differently about the lives they live in the context of a STM as well as the lives they live in the United States, knowing that those two worlds are connected through global trade, commerce, politics and social movements.

There are some positive findings to come out of these data that should be encouraging to both STM organizers and to service and global educators. The STM movement amongst Evangelical campus ministry programs is a growing, thriving entity. Based on the online survey results from this study alone, anywhere from 1,906 to 2,814 or more students participated in STM the previous year. Much of this growth is due to the interest that university students have in service and community engagement, but the number of students who are traveling in the STM movement must also be attributed to the communal funding in Evangelical missions. This communal funding makes travel more accessible for students who may not otherwise have the resources to participate.

University students are also traveling to really interesting places in the context of STMs that have great potential for experiential learning. The interest in places like the Middle East, Asia and Africa is generated out of a desire to evangelize people who are not of the Christian faith, but these parts of the world are also playing an important part in globalization. While there should be a lot of concern for what American students are doing in these places, with the right curriculum there is the potential to foster a type of global citizenship in students that would be difficult to accomplish through educational experiences in the United States.

For these types of STMs to realize their potential for fostering global citizenship will require the type of frank discussion that this chapter has suggested. Conversely, the potential for transforming STMs into trips that focus on citizenship, justice and globalization and not just a myopic focus on evangelism is found in the same structure that has allowed this movement to be evaluated by the service-learning literature. The practical framework of service oriented trips that already include elements like prolonged organizational commitments and a curriculum, as well as other elements of reciprocity and meaningful reflection.

Furthermore, the potential for Evangelical campus ministry STMs to become quality service-learning trips is already being realized by some STM programs. The Program X interview respondents represent a program that is already asking their students to think about their place in larger social issues like globalization, poverty and

injustice. Including host national university students in service activities along with the American students enhances this type of reflection. It is an STM program that has adopted elements of quality service-learning and critical service-learning.

Implications for Service-Learning Professionals in Higher Education

The potential of Evangelical campus ministry STM programs to become quality service-learning programs should be of interest to service-learning educators and student affairs personnel in higher education. The most significant implication for service-learning educators and student affairs personnel in the United States concerning the STM movement on university campuses is awareness of the magnitude of this movement and its influence on the lives and learning of university students. With Robert Wuthnow's (2008) estimate that 1.6 million Christians are participating in this type of religious ritual each year, and considering that this number does not account for the number of university students and those under the age of 18 who travel with church and parachurch ministry groups, there are many university students who have already worked cross-culturally in some type of service capacity, or will do so while they are a university student in a way that is not formally recognized by the university.

This project drew participants from a network of five prominent campus ministry organizations, one of which states that it leads over 200 STM trips each year, but this project does not take into account the many independent Evangelical campus ministry organizations practicing similar programming on university campuses. The inability of the five campus ministry organizations that participated in this study to begin to predict how many people on their email listserves were responsible for organizing and leading STMs makes it difficult to quantify this particular sub-culture of the STM movement. Regardless of these difficulties, it is reasonable to assume that participation in STMs by Evangelical university students either rivals or supersedes the level of participation of previous generations of Evangelical Christians. This is an area for future research, but it could be hypothesized that this is a cross-cultural service movement that would at least rival the number of participants in other forms of international educational experiences like international service-learning and semester abroad.

114

A greater awareness of this movement by service-learning educators and student affairs personnel will allow them to think creatively about how these experiences might be used to develop expressions of global citizenship in STM participants and in the larger student body. It is also not inconceivable to think that student affairs personnel could influence the theory and practice of these disconnected campus ministry organizations by including them in forums and seminars on service-learning and international service-learning. By recognizing the efforts of campus ministry professionals to develop habits of service in their students, an occasion for dialogue is opened for student affairs professionals to introduce concepts of reciprocity and reflection that can lead to new understandings of global citizenship for campus ministers. Essentially, by giving the campus ministry STM movement legitimacy in campus life through recognition would give student affairs offices and service-learning departments more influence in what STM participants do and learn.

Conclusion

The challenge before the campus ministry STM movement is to recognize that even within the context of its own tradition of Evangelical Christian mission, it does not fit within its originating purposes. It has evolved in a direction that does not represent mission alone, and therefore needs to be reexamined. The fact that these STMs are going to highly churched areas like South America, or going to areas where Americans are probably the least effective people in evangelizing like the Middle East and Asia raises serious questions about whether evangelism is an appropriate organizing principle for their work. For this reason the movement needs to look outside of itself as it redefines its goals for Christian university students who have an interest in serving outside of their own communities. The field of critical service-learning is one positive way to reinvent the STM as an educational experience that focuses on developing reciprocal relationships with host communities while providing opportunities for spiritual growth for traveler and receiving communities.

REFERENCES

Achebe, C. (1959). *Things fall apart.* New York: Anchor Books.

Ani, M. (1994). *Yurugu: An African-centered critique of European cultural thought and behavior.* Trenton: African World Press.

Astin, A. W. & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *The Journal of College Student Development.* 39(3): 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J. & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *The Review of Higher Education.* 22(2): 187-202.

Balmer, R. (2000). *Mine eyes have seen the glory: A journey into the Evangelical subculture in America* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Globalization: The human consequences.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Beaver, R. P. (1999). The History of Mission Strategy. In R. D. Winter & S. C. Hawthorne (Eds.), *Perspectives on the world Christian Movement* (241-252). Pasadena: William Carey Libarary.

Bebbington, D. W. (2002). Christianity (Evangelical). In *Dictionary of contemporary religion in the western world* (pp 195-197). Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Benton, T. & Craib, I. (2001). *Philosophy of social science: The philosophical foundations of social thought.* Houndmills: Palgrave.

Berry, H. & Chisholm, L. (1999). *Service-learning in higher education around the world: An initial look.* New York: The International Partnership for Service-Learning.

Boyer, E. L. (1994). *Ready to learn: A mandate for the nation.* Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Boyle-Baise, M. (1998). Community service-learning for multicultural education: An exploratory study with pre-service teachers. *Equity and Excellence In Education. 31(2),* 52–61.

Butin, D. (2005). Service-learning as Postmodern pedagogy. In Butin D. (Eds.), *Service-learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions.* (pp. 89-104). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

116

Campus Compact. (1999). *Presidents' declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education.* Providence, RI: Author.

Campus Compact. (2000). *1999 Service statistics: Highlights and trends of Campus Compact's annual membership survey.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Campus Compact. (2002). *2001 Service statistics: Highlights and trends of Campus Compact's annual membership survey.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Campus Compact. (2007). *2006 Service statistics: Highlights and trends of Campus Compact's annual membership survey.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Campus Compact. (2009). *2008 Service statistics: Highlights and trends of Campus Compact's annual membership survey.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Campus Outreach Opportunity League. *Into the Streets: Organizing Manual, 1993-1994 Edition.* St. Paul: COOL Press, 1993.

Clairborne, S. (2006). *The Irresistible revolution: Living as an ordinary radical.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Coomes, M. D. (2004). Understanding the historical and cultural influences that shape Generations. In M. D. Coomes and R. DeBard (Eds.), *Serving the millennial generation.* (pp. 17-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crabtree, R. D. (2008). *Theoretical foundations for international service-learning.* Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. Fall, 18-36.

Cruz, N. & Giles, D. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. Special Issue,* 28-34.

Dearborn, T. (2003). *Short-term missions workbook: From mission tourists to global citizens.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier Books.

Dougherty, D. (1998). What's Happened to Missions Mobilization? *Evangelical Missions Quaterly. 34(3),* 276-280.

Eby, J. (1998). Why service-learning is bad. Retrieved October 14, 2010, from http://www.messiah.edu/external_programs/agape/servicelearning/articles/wrongsvc.pdf.

Enos, S. & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby & Associates, Building partnerships in service-learning. (pp. 22-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J & Giles, (1994). The Impact of a college community service laboratory of students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence.* Vol. 17, 327-329.

Eyler, J. & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Eyler, J., Giles, D. & Schiemde, A. (1996). *A practioners guide to reflection in service-learning: Student voices and reflection.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University.

Fitch, P. (2005). In their own voices: A mixed methods approach to studying outcomes of Intercultural service-learning with college students. In S. Root, J. Callahan & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Improving service-learning practice: Research models to Enhance impacts* (pp. 187-213). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (1985). *The Politics of education: Culture, power and liberation.* South Hadley: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1993). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world.* South Hadley: Bergin and Garvey.

Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century.* New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Ginwright, S. & Cammarota, J. (2002). New terrain in youth development: The promise of a social justice approach. *Social Justice.* 29(4), 82-95.

Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition.* South Hadley: Bergin & Garvey.

Green, M. & Baer, M. (2001). Global learning in a new age. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* B24.

Guthrie, S. (2000). *Missions in the third millennium: 21 Key trends for the 21st century.* Waynesboro: Paternoster Press.

Hardig, W. (2001). Life Changing Short-Term Missions. In P. Downer (Ed.), *Effective men's ministry: The indispensable toolkit for your church.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Henry, S. E. & Breyfogle, M. L. (2006). Toward a new framework of "server" and "served": De(and Re)constructing reciprocity in service-learning pedagogy. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.* 18 (1), 27-35.

Hofstede, G. (1987). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version (1989). Iowa Falls: World Bible Publishers, Inc.

Honnett, E. P. & Poulson, S. J. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning.* Retrieved October 26, 2008, from http://www.johnsonfdn.org/principles.html

Howard, J. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning.* Spring 1998, 21-29.

Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-Learning in Today's Higher Education. In *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (3-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jick, T. D. (1979). 'Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action'. *Administrative ScienceQuarterly*, 24, 602–11.

Johnson, C. (2006). Deep Learning and the Big Questions: Reflection in Service-Learning. In B. T. Johnson & C. R. O'Grady (Eds.), *The spirit of service: Exploring faith, service, and social justice in higher education* (209-230). Bolton: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Jones, S. R. & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development. 45(2),* 149-166.

Kane, J. H. (1982). *A concise history of the Christian world mission: A panoramic view of missions from Pentecost to the present* (Rev. ed.). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Kingsolver, B. (1998). *The Poisonwood Bible*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Knight-Abowitz, K. (1999). Getting beyond familiar myths: Discourses of service learning and critical pedagogy. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies.* 21(1), 63-77.

Koll, K. A. (2010). Taking wolves among lambs: Some thoughts on training for short-term mission facilitation. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research. 34(2),* 93-96.

Kramer, M. (2006). *Dispossessed: Life in our world's urban slums.* Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Law, E. H. F. (1993). *The wolf shall dwell with the lamb: A spirituality for leadership in multicultural community.* St. Louis: Chalice Press.

Linhart, T. D. (2006). They were so alive!: The spectacle self and youth group short-term mission trips. *Missiology: An International Review. 34(4),* 451-461.

Lisman, C. D. (1998). *Toward a civil society: Civic literacy and service-learning.* Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Livermore, D. A. (2006). *Serving with eyes wide open: Doing short-term missions with cultural intelligence.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

Loobie, S. G. (2000). Short-term missions: Is it worth it? *Latin America Evangelist. 8(1), 6-8.*

Magolda, P. & Gross, K. E. (2009). *It's all about Jesus! Faith as an oppositional collegiate subculture.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing Inc.

McDonough, D. P., & Peterson, R. P. (1999). *Can Short-Term Mission Really Create Long-Term Missionaries?* Minneapolis: Stem Press.

McKnight, J. (1989). *Why "servanthood" is bad.* In B. R. Barber & R. M. Battistoni (Eds.), *Education for democracy* (460-464). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

McLaren, P. (2007). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* (5th Edition). Boston: Pearson,Allyn and Bacon.

Mintz, S. D. & Hesser, G. W. (1996). Principles of Good Practice in Service-Learning. In *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (26-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moely, B. E., Mercer, S. H., Ilustre, V., Miron, D., McFarland, M. (2002). Psychometric properties and correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A measure of students' attitudes related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.* Spring, 15-26.

Moely, B. E., McFarland, M., Miron, D., Mercer, S. H., Ilustre, V. (2002). Changes in college students' attitudes and intentions for civic involvement as a function of service-learning experiences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.* Fall, 18-26.

Mooney, L. A. & Edwards, B. (2001). Experiential learning in sociology: Service-learning and other community based initiatives. *Teaching Sociology,* 29(2), 181-194.

Muriu, O. (2009, July). *Short-term Missions from a Kenyan Pastor's Perspective.* Paper presented at the Being There: Short-term Missions and Human Need conference, Deerfield, IL.

Murray, S. D. (2008). Student Sojourners and Spiritual Formation: Understanding the Intersection of Cross-cultural Adjustment and Spiritual Disorientation. In R. J. Priest (Ed.), *Effective engagement in short-term missions: Doing it right!* (558-589). Pasadena: William Carey Library.

NAFSA, (2003). Securing America's future: Global education for a global age. Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad. NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Peterson, R., Aeschliman, G., & Sneed, R. (2003). *Maximum Impact Short-term Mission: The God-commanded repetitive deployment of swift, temporary, non-professional missionaries.* Minneapolis: Stem Press.

Peterson, R. P., & Peterson, T. D. (1991). *Is short-term mission really worth the time and money? Advancing God's Kingdom through short-term mission (Results of STEM short-term mission research).* Minneapolis: Stem Press.

Pompa, L. (2002). Service-learning as crucible: Reflections on immersion, context, power, and transformation. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.* Fall, 67-76.

Priest, R. J., Dischinger, T., Rasmussen, S., & Brown, C. M. (2006). Researching the short-term mission movement. *Missiology: An International Review. 34(4),* 431-450.

Priest, R. J. & Priest, J. P. (2008). "They see everything, and understand nothing": Short-Term mission and service learning. *Missiology: An International Review. 36(2),* 53-73

Quantz, R. (2007). *On interpretive discourse.* EDL 775: Miami University.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Richardson, R. (2008). The Impact of Urban Short-Term Projects on the Social Connections of Evangelical College Students. In R. J. Priest (Ed.), *Effective engagement in short-term missions: Doing it right!* (530-556). Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Rickett, D. (2008). Short-term missions for long-term partnership. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly. 44(1*). 42-46.

Roberts, P. (2003). Pedagogy, neoliberalism and postmodernity: Reflections on Freire's Later work. *Educational Philosophy and Theory.* 35(4): 451-465.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa.* Washington: Howard University Press.

Root, A. (2008). The youth ministry mission trip as global tourism: Are we ok with this? *Dialog: A Journal of Theology.* 47(4), 314-319.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage.

Scherer, K. (2002). *Short-term missions: A gateway to church renewal* (Unpublished master's thesis). St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, Crestwood, NY.

Seven Standards of Excellence in Short-term Missions (2003). *United States Standards of Excellence in Short-term Missions.* Retrieved November 8, 2009, from http://www.stmstandards.org/

Short-term Mission Code of Best Practice (2005). *Global Connections: The UK Network for World Mission.* Retrieved November 8, 2009, from http://www.globalconnections.co.uk/

Sigmon, R. L. (1996). The problems of definition in service-learning. In R. Sigmon & S. G. Pelletier (Eds.), *The journey to service-learning: Experiences from independent liberal arts colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Slater, B. A. (2001). *The role of short-term missions in the life of the local church and to make short-term missions more effective through the local church, with special emphasis on Evangelical Presbyterian churches*. (Unpublished DMin thesis). Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, MS.

Stiles, M. & Stiles, L. (2000). *Mack & Leeann's guide to short-term missions.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Stoecker, R., Tryon, E. A., Hilgendorf, A. (2009). *The unheard voices: community organizations and service-learning*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sugirtharajah, R. S. (2005). *The Bible and empire: Postcolonial explorations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tonkin, H. (2004). *Service-learning across cultures: Promise and achievement.* New York: International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership.

Tryon, E., Stoecker, R., Martin, A., Seblonka, K., Hilgendorf, A., Nellis, M. (2008). The challenge of short-term service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.* Spring, 16-26.

UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. (2003). *The spiritual life of college students: A national study of college students' search for meaning and purpose (preliminary report).* Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.

UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. (2005). *The spiritual life of college students: A national study of college students' search for meaning and purpose.* Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.

Ver Beek, K. (2008). Lessons from the Sapling: Review of Quantitative Research on Short-term Missions. In R. J. Priest (Ed.), *Effective engagement in short-term missions: Doing it right!* (474-502). Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Wade, R. C. (1997). *Community service-learning: A guide to including service in the public school curriculum.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wade, R. C. (2001). Social action in the social studies: From the ideal to the real. *Theory Into Practice.* 40, 23-28.

Wallis, J. (2005). *God's politics: Why the right gets it wrong and the left doesn't get it.* New York: Harper.

Wallis, J. (2009). *The great awakening: Seven ways to change the world.* New York: Harper-Collins.

Wuthnow, R., & Offutt, S., (2008). Transnational religious connections. *Sociology of Religion. 69(2)*, 209-232.

Zivi, K. (1997). Examining Pedagogy in the Service-Learning Classroom: Reflections on Integrating Service-Learning into the Curriculum. In R. Battistoni & W. Hudson (Eds.), *Experiencing citizenship: concepts and models for service-learning in political science.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

APPENDIX A

Donovan Weber
Campus Ministry Short-term Mission Trips
Miami University
Department of Educational Leadership

Although every effort will be done to ensure confidentiality of your responses, all Internet-based communication is subject to the remote likelihood of tampering from an outside source. IP addresses will not be investigated and data will be removed from the server.

I. Demographic Information

For each question choose only one of the provided options:

1. Gender?

    a. Male
    b. Female

2. Age?

    a. 18-22
    b. 23-30
    c. 31-40
    d. 41-50
    e. 51-60
    f. 60 or older

3. How many years of campus ministry experience have you had?

    a. Less than 2 years
    b. 2-5 years
    c. 6-10 years
    d. 11-15 years
    e. 16-20 years
    f. More than 20 years
    g. None

4. How would you best describe your role in campus ministry?

    a. Lead campus minister for one college/university campus
    b. Associate minister (with multiple staff) for one college/university campus
    c. Lead campus minister for multiple college/university campuses

d. Associate minister (with multiple staff) for multiple college/university
      campuses
c. Regional director overseeing multiple campus ministries and ministers

5. Level of education you have completed?

    a. High school
    b. College Associates Degree
    c. College Bachelors Degree
    d. Master of Arts Degree
    e. Master of Divinity Degree
    f. Doctoral Degree
    g. Other

6. Have you ever served as a missionary in a full-time capacity (ie. Living and working cross-culturally for a year or longer)?

    a. Yes
    b. No

II. Short-term Mission Trip Demographics

For each question choose only one of the provided options:

1. How many short-term mission trips do you organize and lead each year?

    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5 or more

2. Do you organize short-term mission trips yourself, or do you use an outside/third party organization in the United States to organize your trips?

    a. Plan trips myself
    b. Use an outside organization (Box to provide name of organization)

3. How many people participated in your last short-term mission trip including leaders?

    a. 6 or less
    b. 7-15
    c. 16-20
    d. 21-30
    e. 31-40
    f. 41 or more

4. How many non-white (Hispanic, African American, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander), participated in your last short-term mission trip including leaders?

    a. 1-2
    b. 3-5
    c. 5-10
    d. 11-15
    e. 16 or more

5. How long did your most recent short-term mission trip last?

    a. 1-6 days
    b. 7-9 days
    c. 10-14 days
    d. 15-30 days
    e. 31 days or longer

6. How much money did it cost for each individual to participate in your last short-term mission trip?

    a. $500 or less
    b. $501-$1000
    c. $1001-$1500
    d. $1501-$2000
    e. $2001-$3000
    f. $3001 or more

7. If you have led/participated in multiple short-term mission trips, do you return to the same location each time, or do you travel to different locations?

    a. Same location each time
    b. Different locations each time
    c. Varies
    d. I have not led/participated in multiple trips

III. Short-term mission trip planning

1. Do you have an explicit formalized curriculum (defined as specific learning objectives with activities to meet those objectives) that is tied to your short-term mission trips? Is this a general curriculum for all short-term mission trips or is it created specifically for each individual trip?

    a. Yes, it is a general curriculum applicable to all trips
    b. Yes, it is a curriculum created specifically for each individual trip
    c. Yes, it varies

d. No, there is no explicit formalized curriculum

2. What was the most important factor in deciding the objectives of the last short-term mission trip that you led?

    a. Abilities, talents and interests of those participating on the trip
    b. Needs communicated by members of the host culture you visited
    c. Objectives were defined by an outside organization that planned the trip
    d. A combination of participant's interests and needs communicated by the host culture

3. How would you describe the level of contact you had with members of the host national culture during the planning of the trip?

    a. Significant contact, multiple contacts through phone or email discussing the logistics of the trip as well as the meaning and purpose that you and the host nationals placed on the trip
    b. Moderate contact, one or two contacts through phone or email to discuss the logistics of the trip
    c. No contact, all communication was done by third party organization

4. How much time did you spend preparing your students for the last short-term mission trip you led through group meetings, assigned readings and research on the location/culture you were visiting, and prayer/meditation, etc?

    a. 1-5 hours
    b. 6-10 hours
    c. 11-15 hours
    d. 16-20 hours
    e. 21 hours or more
    f. None

5. During your preparation time for your last short-term mission trip how much of your time was spent doing the following activities? (Fill in a percentage next to each item, the total of percentages should add up to 100).

    a. Logistics (discussing packing lists, visas, passports, etc.)
    _____
    b. Team building activities
    _____
    c. Discussing cultural norms of host national culture you will be visiting
    _____
    d. Learning about historical, social and political issues of host national culture
    _____
    e. Prayer and meditation
    _____

f. Fundraising

_____

g. Other – Please describe: _____

_____

6. In the space provided below list your stated goal/s for the last short-term mission trip you participated in or led.

_____ (space provided for text) _____

IV. Activities on short-term mission trips

1. During an average week on your last short-term mission trip how much of your time was spent doing the following activities? (Fill in a percentage next to each item, the total of percentages should add up to 100. The 100% reflects the time that you are awake during a 24 hour period).

       a. Logistics (preparing meals, travel time, group communication, etc.)

       _____

       b. Team building with short-term mission trips participants (group time, devotions, prayer time, etc.)

       _____

       c. Relationship building with members of host culture (sharing meals, activities, purposeful social events, etc.)

       _____

       d. Service (preaching, teaching, evangelism, vacation bible school, etc.)

       _____

       e. Service (manual labor, construction, painting, cleaning, etc.)

       _____

       f. Sightseeing and tourism

       _____

       g. Other - Please describe: _____

       _____

2. Do you provide opportunities on the trip for students to reflect on their experience? If so, how much time do you provide during the average week?
       a. No
       b. Yes, 1-5 hours
       c. Yes, 6-10 hours
       d. Yes, 11 hours or more

3. Are students encouraged to share things they have learned through their experience? If so, in what ways are they encouraged to do this? Check all that apply.

       a. No, they are not encouraged to share their reflections
       b. Yes, through journaling

c. Yes, through sharing with others in a group setting

d. Yes, through further service activities

c. Yes, other – Please describe: _____

4. Besides spiritual issues, are students encouraged to reflect on social and political issues as well?

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Unsure

5. Does the curriculum or you as a leader/participant on the trip make an effort to connect social and political issues experienced in the host culture with social and political issues in the student's home culture?

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Unsure

V. Post-trip activities

1. Did you provide opportunities for students to reflect on their experience on the trip after they returned home?

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Unsure

2. Do you collect feedback from the short-term mission trip participants to assist in planning future trips?

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Unsure

3. Do you collect feedback from the host nationals you worked with on the trip to assist in future planning?

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Unsure

4. Do you have tools (ways of assessing or measuring) to ensure you have met the stated objectives of the trip? If the answer is yes, briefly describe the tools that you use to ensure you have met your objectives?

a. Yes
b. No
c. Unsure

_____(Brief description of tools)_____

Thank you for your participation in this survey. If you are willing to participate in a more in-depth interview concerning your role in planning and executing short-term mission trips, please provide contact information below.

APPENDIX B

Informed consent for the online survey – in the form of an email introduction:

Hello, thank you for taking the time to consider participating in this survey. The survey will not take longer than 15 minutes, and your participation will be greatly appreciated!

Title of the study:

Evangelical University Students in a Cross-Cultural Context: An Examination of Short-term Missions Through the Lens of Service Learning

Researcher:

Donovan Weber
Dept. of Educational Leadership
Miami University, Oxford Ohio

Purpose, Risks & Benefits:

The purpose of this survey is to determine how short-term mission trips are planned and implemented by campus ministers in the United States. These responses will be analyzed to determine whether they are congruent with perceptions of good practice in service learning literature. There is the possibility that current practices in campus ministry organized short-term mission trips are not congruent with perceived best-practices in service learning literature. The benefits are that this survey will provide valuable information about the phenomenon of short-term mission trips that does not yet exist, and it will also produce research that will provide information about trends and issues in short-term mission trips to assist the profession of campus ministry.

Process & Duration:

Click the link below and you will be taken to an online survey hosted by Surveymonkey, and then follow the instructions. The survey should not take longer than 15 minutes.

Confidentiality:

All responses to this survey will be kept confidential. The responses will be stored on a secure computer in my office, and will be erased at the end of the study.

Right to refuse or to withdraw:

Your participation in this survey is voluntary, and you can refuse to participate, or you can choose to discontinue participation at any time.

Individuals to contact:

If you have questions about the research please contact Donovan Weber at 513-529-6825 or at weberdm@muohio.edu or Dr. Knight-Abowitz at 513-529-6825 or at knightk2@muohio.edu

For questions about your rights as a participant please contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship, Miami University at 513-529-3600 or at humansubject@muohio.edu.

I have read this entire form and I understand it completely. All of my questions regarding this form or this study have been answered to complete satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research.

By clicking this link you are confirming that you are over the age of 18 and that you consent to participate in this online survey.

SURVEY LINK

Thank you for your time.

The responses you provide today are being collected with online survey software that is designed to secure your data and provide you with confidentiality. Nevertheless, despite these safeguards, there is always a remote possibility of hacking or other security breaches that could compromise the confidentiality of the information you provide. Thus, you should remember that you are free to decline to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable for any reason.

APPENDIX C

Script for follow-up telephone interviews:

Hello,

You are being contacted because you expressed interest in sharing more information about your experiences in organizing and implementing short-term mission trips for university students. Are you still interested in participating in a telephone interview? This interview should not take a half hour to 45 minutes to complete, and there will not be any follow-up interviews.

As a reminder, the purpose of this interview is to determine how you plan and implement short-term mission trips as a campus minister in the United States. Your response will be analyzed to determine how it is congruent with perceptions of good practice in service learning literature. The possible risks for participation in this interview is the possibility that current practices in campus ministry organized short-term mission trips are not congruent with perceived best-practices in service learning literature. The benefits are that this survey will provide valuable information about the phenomenon of short-term mission trips that does not yet exist, and it will also produce research that will provide information about trends and issues in short-term mission trips to assist the profession of campus ministry.

If you have questions about the research please contact Donovan Weber at 513-529-6825 or at weberdm@muohio.edu or Dr. Knight-Abowitz at 513-529-6825 or at knightk2@muohio.edu

For questions about your rights as a participant please contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship, Miami University at 513-529-3600 or at humansubject@muohio.edu.

During the interview you can choose to skip any question that you are not comfortable with, and you can discontinue the interview at any time with no penalty. Have all of your questions been answered concerning this interview, and are you willing to proceed?

Can you confirm for me that you are over the age of 18? Your verbal confirmation will serve as your consent to participate in this survey.

Thank you.

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions:

Q1: Tell me a story about your last STM that embodies the intent or goals that you had for the trip? Follow up questions: location, activity, length of trip, size of group?

Q2: What did a typical day look like during your trip?

Q3: How would you describe the people you went to work with?

Q4: What do you feel like you accomplished through this STM?

Q5: How would you describe your relationship with the people you visited? What does that relationship look like today?

Q6: Tell me about the goals you had for this trip? Was there an explicit mission statement? What was it?

Q7: What do you hope student participants got out of this trip?

Q8: Tell me about your curriculum for this trip? Was it explicit or implicit? What did it look like?

Q9: Describe the community or country that you visited? Were there any interesting social, cultural or political similarities or differences to the United States that you noticed?

Q10: Did you focus on issues of justice or social justice with your students? How did you do this? How do you define justice?

Q11: Have you ever been a long term missionary (1 year or more in the field)? If so, how did you transition into campus ministry?

Q12: Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your STM?

Survey Data Graphs

Demographic Data

Table 4.1.1: Age

Age	18-22	23-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61 or older
n	3	43	19	16	14	6
percent	3%	42.6%	18.8%	15.8%	13.9%	5.9%

Table 4.1.2: Years of Campus Ministry Experience

Years	Less than 2	2-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	18-20 yrs	More than 20
n	3	43	19	16	14	6
percent	3%	42.6%	18.8%	15.8%	13.9%	5.9%

Table 4.1.3: Campus Ministry Role

	Lead campus minister for one college/university campus	Associate minister (with multiple staff) for one college/university campus	Lead campus minister for multiple college/university campuses	Associate minister (with multiple staff) for multiple college/university campuses	Regional director overseeing multiple campus ministries and ministers
n	36	24	15	15	11
percent	35.6%	23.8%	14.9%	14.9%	10.9%

Table 4.1.4: Level of Education

	High School	College Associates Degree	College Bachelors Degree	Master of Arts Degree	Master of Divinity Degree	Doctoral Degree	Other
n	3	3	66	15	9	4	1
percent	3.00%	3.00%	65.30%	14.90%	8.90%	4.00%	1.00%

Chi-Square Tests

Table 4.2.1: Comparisons of Men and Women

	Men	Women	n	Chi-Square	p
Trip Length					
Less than 15 days	42%	17%			
16 days or more	58%	83%	105	7.39	0.007
Trip Location					
Same location	10%	12%			
Different location/varies	90%	88%	95	0.15	0.697
Trip Curriculum					
Yes	33%	27%			
No	67%	73%	81	0.38	0.562
Preparation Time					
0-10 hours	37%	36%			
11 hours or more	63%	64%	77	0.002	0.97
Reflect Int. Issues					
Yes	86%	70%			
No/Unsure	14%	30%	94	3.8	0.051
Reflect Local Issues					
Yes	71%	53%			
No/Unsure	29%	47%	94	2.919	0.088

Table 4.2.2: Comparisons of Campus Ministry Experience

	5 years or less	6 years or more	n	Chi-Square	p
Trip Length					
Less than 15 days	28%	30%			
16 days or more	72%	70%	97	0.07	0.791
Trip Location					
Same location	8%	14%			
Different location/varies	92%	86%	87	0.697	0.404
Trip Curriculum					
Yes	28%	41%			
No	72%	59%	74	1.537	0.215
Preparation Time					
0-10 hours	40%	35%			
11 hours or more	60%	65%	74	0.173	0.677
Reflect Int. Issues					
Yes	73%	85%			
No/Unsure	27%	15%	87	1.725	0.189
Reflect Local Issues					
Yes	60%	62%			
No/Unsure	40%	38%	87	0.011	0.915

Table 4.2.3: Comparisons of Missionary Experience

	Missionary experience	No Missionary experience	n	Chi-Square	p
Trip Length					
Less than 15 days	19%	40%			
16 days or more	81%	60%	105	5.246	0.022
Trip Location					
Same location	6%	14%			
Different location/varies	94%	86%	95	1.521	0.218
Trip Curriculum					
Yes	36%	27%			
No	64%	73%	81	0.789	0.374
Preparation Time					
0-10 hours	29%	44%			
11 hours or more	71%	56%	77	1.783	0.182
Reflect Int. Issues					
Yes	79%	78%			
No/Unsure	21%	22%	94	0.006	0.94
Reflect Local Issues					
Yes	63%	63%			
No/Unsure	37%	37%	94	0	0.996

Table 4.2.4: Comparisons of Curriculum Use

	Curriculum	No Curriculum	n	Chi-Square	p
Preparation Time					
0-10 hours	19%	49%			
11 hours or more	81%	51%	60	5.083	0.24
Reflect Int. Issues					
Yes	83%	80%			
No/Unsure	17%	20%	74	0.051	0.822
Reflect Local Issues					
Yes	70%	65%			
No/Unsure	30%	35%	74	0.167	0.683

Highlighted Survey Questions

Table 4.3.1: Survey Question 2.2 - Trip Organization

Do you organize your own trips or use an outside organization?

Plan trips myself	Use an outside organization	n
79%	21%	126%

Table 4.3.2: Survey Question 2.7 - Trip Location

Do you travel to the same location or to different locations?

Same location	Different location	Varies	No multiple trips	n
25%	8%	61%	3%	124

Table 4.3.3: Survey Question 3.1 - Trip Curriculum

Does your trip have an explicit curriculum? Is it specific to the trip or generalized?

General trip curriculum	Specific trip curriculum	Varies	No explicit curriculum	n
20%	25%	25%	30%	101

Table 4.3.4: Survey Question 3.2 - Determining Trip Objectives

What was the most important factor in deciding the objectives of your trip?

Interests of the STM group	Needs of the host community	Combination	Outside organization	n
3%	34%	54%	10%	101

141

Table 4.3.5: Survey Question 4.4 - Reflection on Social & Political Issues

Do you encourage students to reflect on social and political issues?

Yes	No	Unsure	n
79%	10%	12%	94

Table 4.3.6: Survey Question 4.5 - Reflection & Student's Home Context

Do you make an effort to connect social & political issues to the student's home culture?

Yes	No	Unsure	n
63%	20%	17%	94