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Abstract

What would happen if some of humanity’s entrepreneurs changed, from a life motivated largely by planning and working for personal autonomy, flexibility and wealth creation, to the business of peace-building and the development of communities of shalom, human flourishing and well-being? This thesis examines the characteristics of people it identifies as peace-builders, involved at a community level, and compares them, their values, worldview and praxis, with the well-documented research into what this thesis calls ‘the entrepreneurial spirit’. The similarities and differences between those groups are explored within the framework of three themes, namely:

- **Theme 1**: In what ways are the worldviews/values of peace-builders similar to or different from those of entrepreneurs?
- **Theme 2**: In what ways do the leadership styles of peace-builders align with those who have succeeded in building an entrepreneurial business?
- **Theme 3**: What reciprocal influences do the peace-builder and their communities have on each other?

Exploring an area where a dearth of literature fails to advance an understanding of the processes that shift the potential entrepreneur’s primary focus from autonomy to the business of peace-building and the community context in which it occurs, this research points to key concepts that assist in that journey.

Through both qualitative and quantitative inquiry in Armenia and Myanmar, each with different histories, cultures, philosophies and economies, the thesis examines the worldviews/values of peace-builders and the societal factors that might lead entrepreneurs being drawn into the business of peace-building. It explores why the worldview/values peace-builders embrace enable them to see an alternative future to that held by most of the people in the communities in which they, as peace-builders, live, and how those values help them lead others to a future of reconciliation and community well-being. By seeking insights into the peace-builders’ motivations, their cultural heroes and mentors, and their views of the issues that spark violence and methodological approaches to peace-building, the thesis aims
to encourage reflection on peace-builder’s leadership styles, and the reciprocal influences between them and their communities. Using the lens of peace-building as a business, it encourages existential and ontological consideration of their work by using a phenomenological framework of radical humanism. Conflating ‘for profit’ and ‘social entrepreneurship’ enterprises, this research analyses peace-builders by pointing to those characteristics identified as seminal by the peace-builders themselves: the value of struggle, kenosis-based servant leadership, and the development of value-based education regarding respect for ‘the other’. The thesis concludes by suggesting a possible path for the structural review of business entities – particularly corporate structures, community activity and educational events to increase the number of peace-builders and outlines further areas of inquiry on peace-building generally.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Area Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>Auckland University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNA</td>
<td>Basic Needs Analysis (Galtung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>Community Shared Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBA</td>
<td>Child Well-being Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS</td>
<td>European Values Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;D</td>
<td>Faith and Development (Department of World Vision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>Internally Displaced People (as opposed to refugees who cross national boundaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLIF&amp;LC</td>
<td>Joint Learning Initiative on Faith and Local Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>Not For Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>Relative Deprivation Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEERS</td>
<td>Social, Environmental, Economic Responsibility and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT</td>
<td>Social Identity Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>Subjective Well Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVS</td>
<td>World Values Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Chapter 1: Research background, key questions and methodology

Research background

They just vanished, like the evidence of breath on a cold morning; they simply dissolved into the air. The 70,000 humans were gone in a single flash, an historic, earth-shattering moment of warring humanity’s inevitable descent into the logic of violence. It is a very still moment in a churn of emotions, to stand and look at an ordinary little grass mound, 2 metres high and 20 metres across, that stoically covers the few mortal remains, the unidentifiable ashes and bone fragments, of 70,000 evaporated, real, living people, and to reflect on the other 70,000 who died slowly over the next days, months and years. The mound lies gently between the trees, a short distance from the point on the ground where, at 8:15, on 6 August 1945, the grotesquely named ‘Little Boy’ exploded 600 metres above a Hiroshima hospital. As the son of a WWII Air Force veteran who was a reluctant fighter against the Japanese in the Pacific, this researcher heard the mound whisper, ‘There has to be a better way.’

In many ways this research project has its genesis in the mind of a child singing a hymn on a Sunday morning in the quiet provincial town of Gisborne, New Zealand.

Figure 1: Thesis flowchart Chapter 1

Introduction:
Asking the key questions
What, Where, When, How, Why & Who

Examining the extant literature.
Defining the terms used.

Positionality:
The background to the factors that affect the researcher and his questions.

Theory:
Building an agreed understanding of how to do the research and how to analyse the results.

Analysis: Qualitative
Does the analysis of the interviews answer the questions in themes 1 and 2? What does that analysis suggest?

Analysis: Quantitative
Does the quantitative analysis answer the question in theme 3? Does the qualitative material support any correlations?

Conclusion: What conclusions does this research support? What does this contribute to our overall knowledge? What else needs exploration?
It’s about as far removed from most global conflict concerns as it’s possible to get, although the New Zealand land wars 160 years previously had left their marks on the community.

The hymn was ‘God of Grace’ and it has a verse that reads:

Cure Thy children’s warring madness;
Bend our pride to Thy control.
Shame our wanton selfish gladness,
Rich in things and poor in soul.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
Lest we miss Thy kingdom’s goal. (Fosdick & Hughes, 1930)

It’s a hymn penned by a man who, following the carnage and destruction of WWI, said:

I renounce war for its consequences, for the lies it lives on and propagates, for the undying hatred it arouses, for the dictatorships it puts in place of democracy, for the starvation that stalks after it. I renounce war, and never again, directly or indirectly, will I sanction or support another. (Fosdick, 1934, p. 98)

To reflect on the words of the hymn is to contemplate why things ‘just are’ and why they seem impossible to change. That raises fundamental questions about the motivations for human behaviour, the ontology of human endeavour, and whether an epistemological picking apart of human aspiration and teleological hopes might promote fundamentally different choices in human comportment.

Peace-builders are people who have made different choices, and in his work with them in post-conflict countries over the past 30 years, this researcher encountered many who were also involved in building or supporting local businesses, seeing this as an important part of their role. This observation led to comparisons between peace-keeping and the entrepreneurial spirit. Using the lens of peace-building as a business, this thesis thus examines some of the characteristics of peace-builders and asks how closely those characteristics align with those of entrepreneurs.
In its investigation into the characteristics of peace-builders, this thesis builds its key questions and themes around Rudyard Kipling’s tried and tested research framework, namely his ‘six honest serving-men’:

I keep six honest serving-men
(They taught me all I knew)
Their names are What and Where and When,
And How and Why and Who. (Kipling, 2014, p. 32)

Chapter 1 outlines the way in which these research questions will be developed throughout the rest of the thesis chapters. Every chapter begins by reflecting on an aspect of this researcher’s Hiroshima experience and tying that to the purposes of the chapter. The facing page at the start of every chapter also has a flow diagram showing how the thesis as a whole is developed and where that particular chapter fits in that process.

Six honest serving-men: Some questions and answers

What?

What are the characteristics of a peace-builder?

This question emerges from three decades of evaluation experiences in several continental contexts. This thesis characterises peace-building as a business and peace-builders as business entrepreneurs in order to compare peace-building values, worldviews, motivations, leadership styles and methodologies with those of people who are deemed entrepreneurial in both the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors. The white-hot core of the research is an exploration of the characteristics of those it defines as peace-builders. During the course of this research and the attempt to answer this crucial question, three areas of inquiry have emerged as useful and illuminating points of focus, clearly delineating the scope of the thesis:

- **Theme 1:** In what ways are the worldviews/values of peace-builders similar to those of entrepreneurs? In what ways do they differ?
- **Theme 2:** In what ways do the leadership styles of peace-builders align with those who have succeeded in building an entrepreneurial business?
- **Theme 3:** What reciprocal influences do the peace-builder and their communities have on each other?
Peace-builders, often the ‘go to’ members of the community, are admired for their wisdom, and are frequently respected for their ability to resolve problems and community conflict by bringing others to the point of recognising their own role in the solution. They also often spawn interesting enterprises in trying to resolve the effect of conflict and to tackle the root causes of the conflict itself.

Communities’ perceptions of peace-builders are, however, more complex. Peace-builders can also be the people seen by others in the community as troublemakers and traitors. There is a long tradition of this in the ‘prophets’ of many religious traditions, those who have courageously spoken and acted, proposing different ways of pursuing peace, who have not been welcomed by their communities: Isaiah from the Jewish tradition, Jesus from the Christian and Islamic traditions, Gandhi from Hinduism, and Imam Muhammad Ashafa from a Muslim context, to name a few (Credo, 2008; Irwin, 1997; Journeyman Films, 2008; Upadhyay & Pandey, 2016). These individuals have found themselves swimming against the tide of general community perceptions about how those ‘others’ should be treated and the expectations of a ‘we win, they lose’ outcome.

In the course of evaluating global aid and development programmes, this researcher has encountered peace-builders, like those interviewed in this research, all over the world, including the red-light districts of Kolkata, the jungles and concentration camps of Myanmar, the impoverished communities of rural Armenia, and the rubbish-tip slums of Manila, Bangkok, Mumbai and Dhaka. In all of these places the similarity between peace-builders and many entrepreneurial business leaders was clear.

While 29 of the 31 peace-builders approached specifically for this thesis were faith leaders of some kind, they were not ‘hyper-spiritual’ or ‘other-worldly’ but present, perceptive and practical, listening to their communities and frequently acting on that. They mentioned occasions when they had presented alternative and less-popular approaches to achieving peace, and the resulting negative responses. They seemed happy to discuss their faults and failings. However, their distinctiveness was that while others around them saw only division, disaster, destruction and despair,
these people looked around them with hope, and saw restoration, reconciliation, reconstruction and revitalisation, a renewed community in the future. This thesis demonstrates that peace-builders, like entrepreneurs, see a different panorama when looking forward.

Figure 2: Where peace-builders fit

Source: Researcher, R. Kilpatrick (Note: The size of the area is not to scale and no attempt has been made to quantify any category)

Working with community and faith leaders, and evaluating social interventions carried out by faith groups, NGOs and governments led this researcher to several realisations. Well before this researcher embarked on this thesis, one strong impression emerging from observation and focus-group discussion was that those involved in peace-building and reconciliation and those involved in establishing local entrepreneurial enterprises aimed at sustainable economic uplift for their communities were largely overlapping sets.

There are many examples of entrepreneurs who are not peace-builders (the green area of Figure 2). How those in the green area might best be shifted to the red
area will be a focus for future research. Not every peace-builder is involved in entrepreneurial enterprise (the black area of Figure 2), and that group is similarly put aside for a future study. There are also some indications that involvement in economics by larger numbers of entrepreneurs may dampen levels of civil disorder (Stinchfield & Silverberg, 2016), making some entrepreneurs peace-builders by default, but this thesis makes no attempt to engage with that subject. This thesis concentrates instead on those who are both people of peace and entrepreneurs (the red area in Figure 2). The hope that this group of peace-builders espouse, and why they have this hope-filled vision of the future with the will and energy to work for it, is at the heart of this inquiry.

This thesis is based on the assumption, in line with multiple studies (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2008d) that genuine reconciliation and lasting peace produces better social outcomes and economic profits than situations of on-going conflict and violence. Because of the relationship of worldview to values, the scientific basis of some metaphysical constructs will be argued, providing a material basis for sacrifice over selfishness, a concept related to kenosis or ‘self-emptying’.

What are humans seeking in business and economic activity?

Hock’s book Birth of the Chaordic Age ‘is written with the conviction that it is far too late and things are far too bad for pessimism. In times such as these, it is no failure to fall short of what we all might dream — the failure is to fall short of all that we might realise. We must try’ (1999, p. 3). So is this thesis. While action research is useful (Punch, 2014, p. 137; Reason & Bradbury, 2004, p. 5), it is not sought as an outcome of this research, although the study itself may have some kind of Hawthorne effect (McCambridge, Witton, & Elbourne, 2014, p. 267) in encouraging peace-builders. This thesis explores what societal factors, worldview/values might lead to entrepreneurs being drawn into peace-building business, because studies show that while financial considerations influence entrepreneurs, they are part of a cohort of motivations better termed the ‘pursuit of autonomy’ (Carsrud & Brannback, 2011; Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003; Wilson, Marlino, & Kickul, 2004). The thesis tests the concept that peace-builders are simply ‘differently focused’ entrepreneurs and that this different focus is a product of their worldview, and it explores the question...
of whether shifting values and worldview from that of personal autonomy to one of communal well-being could produce more peace-builders.

Entrepreneurs’ activities create business. This business can be for profit or for social benefit (often called the generation of ‘social capital’), or for some kind of overlapping hybrid like well-practised Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or Creating Shared Value (CSV) (Driver, 2012) types of business, or even Muhammad Yunus’ social business (Yunus, 2010). Yunus notes that ‘economists have built their whole theory of business on the assumption that human beings do nothing in their economic lives besides pursue selfish interests [. . . so] human beings engaged in business are portrayed as one-dimensional beings whose only mission is to maximize profit. Humans supposedly pursue this economic goal in a single-minded fashion’ (2010, pp. 198, 203). Yunus is not alone; many other extensive studies question the view that we as humans are hard-wired as ‘homo economicus’.

The concept and definition, goals, methods and structures of business are explored in Chapter 2 but, put most simply, business may be regarded as ‘a conceptual embodiment of a very old, very powerful idea called community’ (Hock, 1999, p. 119). If business is about community, then human involvement in business must surpass the simple act of making individuals into machine-like producers and consumers. Instead, it must appreciate the totality of the human situation and human needs.

A UK cabinet paper (Donovan & Halpern, 2002) on ‘Life Satisfaction’ lists numerous studies showing that additional monetary reward, above a certain baseline, contributes little to life satisfaction. While there is a correlation between wealth and satisfaction (or happiness), the curve flattens at higher income levels, and ‘social relationships have a much larger impact on life satisfaction than financial income, at least within the wealthy nations such as the UK’ (Donovan & Halpern, 2002, p. 40). The paper found that regular community activity, such as volunteering, club or church meetings, has ‘the happiness equivalent of a doubling of money income’ (Donovan & Halpern, 2002, p. 3). Indeed, multiple studies indicate that ‘happiness’
is not ineluctably linked to ever greater consumption (P. Mills, 2005, p. 217), while inequality seems to be a major factor in conflict (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010).

If business is to help address community and individual needs, then it must pursue goals other than wealth expressed in GDP per capita. Research shows the need for a different focus. As one example, business that creates useful employment has huge psychic impact on the unemployed person, who suffers from much more than loss of income (Layard, 2003c). Unemployment, which often increases following conflict (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2008a), can breed the violence that impacts negatively on economics too (Cramer, 2010). If the ‘ultimate goal of economic policy ought to be enriching the quality of relationships within society’ (P. Mills, 2005, p. 217), then business needs to reposition itself. This is why the present thesis focuses almost exclusively on the business of peace-building and the ability to redeem and refocus the entrepreneurial spirit to work for reconciliation.

Where?

Two geographical locations were chosen: Armenia and Myanmar (Burma). Separated geographically and linguistically, philosophically and culturally, they provide useful comparison and contrast.

**Armenia**

Armenia was selected because it has had substantial conflict with Azerbaijan in the Nagomo-Karabakh region, starting in 1988 and ending in a shaky ceasefire in 1994, with skirmishes between 2010 and 2014 that killed dozens of troops on each side. Because several aspects of the peace agreement have been abrogated or ignored, this is an area anticipating renewed hostilities and one where peace-makers deal with unrealistic nationalistic emotions and expectations. The dispute goes back to the formation of the USSR and beyond, but this thesis concentrates on more recent events, as these are the presenting issues that peace-builders working in Armenia must confront.

While this researcher is interested in lived realities, multiple interpretations of history feed into the present dispute and are important to the positions occupied by
various stakeholders in the conflict, so some background is useful. Armenia is a landlocked country bordered by Turkey, Georgia, the disputed Nagomo-Karabakh territory, Azerbaijan, Iran and Nakhchivan. In many ways it forms a crossroads between larger regional nations and powers and, when not being invaded by other armies intent on amassing wealth and power, Armenia has often been attacked, sometimes annexed, by others on their way to crush another regional stronghold. It was the first country to declare itself Christian in 301, enjoying regular and murderous conflict since then, through the division of the Byzantine and Sasanian empires, then invasions by various Turkish and Iranian empires, and the Russians (pre- and post-communist versions). Finally, economic invasion by European capitalism has decimated its economy, removing much heavy industry that was subsidised under the USSR economic model. In its most recent history it experienced a genocide by Turks in 1915 that killed about 1.5 million people, a Georgian–Armenian war and an Armenia–Azeri war, both in 1918, and then a war with Turkey ending in an invasion by Russia in 1920. Spared actual invasion by the Germans during WWII, Armenians fought alongside Russia and had one of the highest per capita death tolls of the war. The much more recent war with Azerbaijan over Nagomo-Karabakh presently sits as an unresolved ceasefire. Some further details of the background can be found in *The Economist* (2014).

**Myanmar**

Myanmar (still often called Burma) has had over 60 years of conflict since its independence from Britain in 1948, most of which has been between the majority Burmese and the minority ethnic peoples. The latter were initially guaranteed a referendum on full independence but had that denied after the assassination of Aung San, the leader of Burma during the final independence struggle. These ethnic conflicts were extended in the west of the country, where Buddhist monks led protests and violent clashes with a Muslim minority called Rohingya. At the time of writing, the pseudo-democratic elections of 2015 have made peace discussions more plausible, but there is on-going tension and unresolved justice issues around war crimes and severe human rights abuses. A summary of the very complicated public
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Peace-builders in Myanmar face a good deal of additional community scepticism because of the suspicion caused by so many broken peace accords in the past and the apparent daily abuse of those accords from the beginning of 2015 onwards. Because conflict has never really ceased in some of the ‘black zones’ in states occupied by the Karen, Kachin, Shan, Chin and other ethnic minorities, the ability to establish any kind of settled industry, and to produce economic uplift that would provide health and education and a willingness to consider peace, is extremely difficult. Reconciliation is impossible while rape, killing and the deprivation of the basic necessities of life carried out by the Burmese army is a weekly reality for people whose major misfortune is that they live in and on some of the most wanted natural resources in the country.

When?

The European Values Study (hereafter called the EVS) survey and the semi-structured interviews for this thesis were carried out between December 2013 and May 2015 in both Armenia and Myanmar, but the formulation of the questions of interest and the drive to find an academically robust way of measuring shifting worldview/values occurred in the decade before. The research amongst sex workers in Kolkata, assisting the development of business opportunities and providing alternatives from often violent conflict in their forced roles, and the evaluations done in Fiji, PNG and Bangladesh into the roots of family conflict and violence were completed prior to 2000. Visits to Armenia and Myanmar with accompanying interviews and evaluations began around 2007. All of this previous work provided secondary sources for this thesis.

How?

Multi-method or mixed method?

In her discussion about mixed method and multi-method, Morse defines the difference in terms of the integration (mixed method) and non-integration (multi-method) of quantitative and qualitative approaches (2003). In mixed method, a single
approach (qualitative or quantitative) ‘drives’ the research, and the other approach (quantitative or qualitative) is used to directly support that key approach. Similarly, Creswell regards mixed method as having to contain both quantitative and qualitative results pointing to the same conclusion (2015).

In multi-method approaches, two or more different research methods are independent and capable of supporting a thesis in their own right.

The methods and combination of methods a researcher uses depends on the kind of research being conducted. Helped in part by Cunningham’s suggestions as to how aims might best influence methods (1997, pp. 405–406), this researcher decided on a multi-method approach using semi-structured interviews of the peace-builders themselves, along with the EVS to quantify shifts in worldview, as detailed in Chapter 4. This thesis uses the term ‘multi-method’ as its methodological approach, because the two parts of the research are positioned as ‘stand-alone’.

**The ethical choice of interviewees**

Because of the extensive network of contacts this researcher has in the selected locations, known local staff workers involved in development organisations were asked to do a wider identification of potential interviewees in order to ensure that the research took in those outside the immediate circle of this researcher. This provided an extensive selection of interviewees for the survey on peace-builders’ characteristics. Despite some difficulties, the interviews were conducted by this researcher in a manner previously approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC) to ensure the safety and comfort of those being interviewed (see Appendices i, ii, iii, iv).

**A two-phased approach: Phase 1 (EVS)**

In the first phase this researcher used the EVS (*European Values Study*, 2008) in communities where peace-builders have deliberately attempted to change the worldview and values of local communities through interventions in health, education and civic participation in what has been called ‘post-traumatic’ situations, i.e. either post-war or post-totalitarianism.
The aim of this first phase was to see if there was any apparent difference in the values of two groups: those targeted deliberately for values or worldview change and those in the surrounding community and country. The results of the EVS survey shaped the questions put to the peace-builders being interviewed in Phase 2.

*A two-phased approach: Phase 2 (semi-structured interviews)*

Phase 2 saw peace-builders interviewed and their characteristics explored using semi-structured interviews that had them reflect on their experiences, gifts, motives and community pressures. Initially it was thought that EVS forms filled out on the peace-builders and then compared with the values of those already identified as ‘entrepreneurs’ by numerous previous World Values Survey (WVS) and EVS studies (Alvarez & Knörr, 2013; Beugelsdijk & Smeets, 2008; Giordani, Schlag, & Zwart, 2010; Li-Ming, Chien-Min, & Po-Hsiung, 2011) would be useful. However, the specific contextual nature of each geographically located EVS and the small sample of peace-builders made such an exercise pointless. There are more details on this in Chapter 4.

Originally this researcher had hoped that 10 in-depth interviews might reach data saturation point, but eventually 31 were conducted, recorded and transcribed in order for the expected data saturation point to be achieved. There were multiple other informal interviews with co-workers and some local community people (often through an interpreter), but these were all carried out prior to the 31 formal interviews and were used as background material. The need for interpreters limited the use of some of these interactions. The greater-than-expected number of interviews did, however, enable a better balance to be achieved in terms of the gender, religion, education and experience of the peace-builders.

*Why?*

Violent conflict has hugely negative effects socially, psychologically, economically and spiritually, so why do humans seemingly default to such behaviour? While Fosdick’s hymn was probably seminal to this researcher choosing a career supporting the oppressed — who are often the ‘losers’ in community conflict — that work has also raised ‘why’ questions about the behaviour and characteristics...
of the people who create conflict, as well as those who work as peace-builders. Why do some create conflict while others, despite the many hurdles, hoops and heartaches, work for reconciliation?

Why #1: The people involved as peace-builders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solomon Islands, Fiji</th>
<th>Samoa</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China, Macau, Hong Kong</th>
<th>Bangladesh, NE India</th>
<th>Afghanistan, Pakistan</th>
<th>Papua New Guinea</th>
<th>Indonesia, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Senegal, Swaziland</th>
<th>Nigeria, South Africa, Rwanda, Burundi</th>
<th>Cyprus, Lebanon, Kenya, Albania, Armenia, Georgia, Herzegovina, Bosnia, Armenia, Thailand, Cambodia</th>
<th>Armenia, Myanmar</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1: Approximate timeline of some of the planning, evaluation and research visits
Source: Researcher, R. Kilpatrick

Over three decades this researcher has had the privilege to work / research in some of the more difficult, post-conflict situations in the world: Fiji as a college principal during the coup in 1987, Afghanistan after the American-led invasion between 2001 and 2006 — where he helped establish female staff to educate women. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Rwanda and Burundi between 2007 and 2011, reviewing reconciliation programmes, Kenya after the 2007 riots, Papua New Guinea during the conflict with Bougainville between 2003 and 2007, repatriating staff traumatised by attacks and armed hold-ups, Bangladesh and India (Tripura and West Bengal) between 1998 and 2007, starting sustainable businesses and community micro-enterprise banks, where ethnic tensions often boiled over into violence, and
Lebanon post-2008. This researcher also had the opportunity to do evaluation work on community interventions in post-communist countries like Armenia, Romania and Albania between 2008 and 2013, where previous government action has produced a ‘post-conflict’ kind of mistrust of both government and fellow citizens, and a propensity for conflict and violence.

The peace-builders this researcher has met are not nominees for the Nobel Peace Prize. They are local, unknown, ordinary people generally embedded in their local communities and focused on peace, human flourishing and community well-being. Any large-scale peace plan, which would require some kind of national coherence aimed at stopping conflict, needs hundreds of these kinds of people working quietly away in their smaller communities. It is on these extraordinary, ordinary, quietly world-changing people that this thesis seeks to shed some light.

**Why #2: The costs of conflict**

The reach and power of weaponry is now sufficient to annihilate human life on earth (M. J. Mills, Toon, Lee-Taylor, & Robock, 2014; Starr, 2016; Thakur, 2015). This and the fact that many trigger points for a global struggle exist in more localised and on-going conflicts than ever before, such as those in the Middle East or Eastern Europe (Thakur, 2015, pp. 63–109), makes the need to re-examine the approaches to resolving human conflict ever more urgent. While some of the on-going conflicts in the past have had inter-continental effects, regional conflicts in the 21st century alone have created 26 million internally displaced people (IDPs) (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2013) and 10.4 million ‘official’ refugees (UNHCR, 2013) — although noting how the UNHCR counts, or fails to count, refugees in Southeast Asia, a total of 45.2 million refugees seems more accurate (Sedghi, 2013).
Despite the slight dip in military spending reported by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) as depicted in Figure 3, globally US$3,297,000 per minute was officially spent on arms and military ‘defence’ in 2012 (SIPRI, 2013). Because the illicit trade in small arms occurs in the murk of illegality, total statistics are both difficult to obtain and somewhat unreliable, but estimates suggest US$4 billion is spent on illicit small arms purchase, and it is these weapons that cause between 60 and 90% of conflict deaths, depending on the conflict (United Nations, 2006).

Further, the immediate military costs are not the total cost of a conflict. As the Geneva Declaration points out:

Armed violence destroys lives and livelihoods, breeds insecurity, fear and terror, and has a profoundly negative impact on human development. Whether in situations of conflict or crime, it imposes enormous costs on states, communities and individuals. Armed violence closes schools, empties markets, burdens health services, destroys families, weakens the rule of law, and prevents humanitarian assistance from reaching people in need. (2006)
As Figure 4 and the Geneva Declaration quoted above show, the cost of conflict goes well beyond the borders of the battlefield (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2008b). General Eisenhower said, ‘Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed’ (Eisenhower, 1953). Money that could be spent on the Millennial Development Goals (United Nations, 2013) by reducing the 660,000 malarial deaths per year (WHO, 2013a), or on AIDS medication and research to help reduce 830,000 AIDS deaths per year (WHO, 2013b), or on the 2.5 million people, mostly children, who die every year from diarrhoeal disease (WHO, 2013c) is instead spent on conflict.

The cost of conflict also balloons beyond naïve and grossly underestimated pre-war figures. The Iraq war was forecast, before invasion, to cost US$50–60 billion (with Donald Rumsfeld dismissing the National Economic Council estimates of more like US$200 billion as ‘baloney’), and Natsios, respected head of the Agency for International Development, insisted Iraq would be rebuilt for US$1.7 billion (Geneva
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Declaration Secretariat, 2008c; Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008, kindle loc 340-354). By 2008 the projected cost was US$3 trillion (Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008, location 91), later revised to US$4 trillion (O’Neill, 2013), and likely double that if costs to other nations were included (Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008, location 91).

Part of the reason for these ballooning figures is the hidden cost of war. Improved medical procedures increase combat injury survival (Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008, p. 61), but the estimated longer-term medical cost from the Iraq war alone is US$16 billion (Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008, p. 89). Various scholars have calculated the costs as: Loss of life (US$7.2 million per person); serious injury (US$7.2 million per person); mental health disability (up to US$3.6 million per person). The long-term effects of uranium-enriched ammunition scattered on urban battlefields is potentially medically and socially expensive but presently highly contested (Bleise, Danesi, & Burkart, 2003; Jiang & Aschner, 2006; Sansone et al., 2001; Weir, 2007). Added together with the armed conflict often following war, armed violence generates tremendous economic costs. Using contingent valuation approaches, the global cost of ‘insecurity’ generated by conflict amounts to up to US$70 per person, or a global annual burden of US$400 billion (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2008d, p. 89).

**Why #3: The growing economic and ecological problems that encourage violence**

Global warming contributes to increased violence on the planet through forced migration and increasing despair (Barnett & Adger, 2007; Fritz, Burke, & Wiseman, 2008). As we wobble bravely on into a new millennium, business still mostly strives to achieve the highest returns for investors in the fiscal year, a dangerous approach seemingly ignorant of the repercussions, given that ‘scientists have reached a remarkable consensus regarding the magnitude and origin of this process [of global warming]’ (González Cortés, 2014, p. 43). Displaced people (Maldonado, Shearer, Bronen, Peterson, & Lazrus, 2013) and looming displacements (Farbotko & Lazrus, 2012) create conflict conditions because of large-scale movements of population. Typical of the effect of anthropogenic climate change on population movements are the impacts outlined by Rashid and Paul (2014, pp. 98–
146), who note that, because of historical factors, the costs of correction are likely to fall disproportionately on the poor in industrialised countries (ibid, p. 108). Significantly, the 2007 Nobel committee awarded a prize to Al Gore in recognition that contribution to slowing global warming was a contribution to peace (Biermann & Boas, 2010, p. 61).

Business models based on market-driven consumerism also threaten peace through the growing gap between rich and poor (Baird, 2013, p. 12), and while absolute poverty diminishes (Dewbre, Cervantes-Godoy, & Sorescu, 2011, p. 6), huge youth unemployment with its accompanying social unrest (World Economic Forum, 2013a) threatens to undo what progress has been made and create conditions for violent conflict. The then Head of the United Nations, Ban Ki-Moon,— addressed the UN in April 2013, speaking of the exploitation of nature, often driven by greed, which he felt threatened the very food chain humanity depended on (Ki-Moon, 2013).

Given that climate change and the violent conflict around its effects might cause 100,000,000 deaths between 2012 and 2030 (2012) and predictions of 50-200 million climate ‘refugees’ by 2080 (Williams, 2008, p. 506) with the conflict that implies, the methodology and goals of the business activity that drives climate change must be more closely examined. Thus the need is likewise clear for a business lens to also be applied to peace-building as a comparison to other business activity. McKibben, in pointing out the difficulty of trying to pressure multinational business through stockholder meetings, says,

But in this case there’s not a flaw in the business plan that can be corrected — the flaw is the business plan. Responding to such pressure earlier this year, Exxon — richest company on earth — said it would make no adjustments and thought it was ‘highly unlikely’ that they’d be restrained from using their fuel. That is, they said they’d burn the planet, and they didn’t think anyone could stop them. (2014)

The above explanation evocatively illustrates the critical importance of researching peace-building as a business in contrast to present business foci, but this cartoon may distil it all:
Who?

In research focused around the work of peace-builders there are multiple stakeholders, including this researcher, the entrepreneurs themselves, their close associates and fellow workers, the local community in which the entrepreneurs live and work, and the wider community as a whole. To funnel the scope of inquiry, this thesis examines the peace-building entrepreneurs themselves and what they do. The influence of other stakeholders is considered but only from the peace-builders’ frame of reference.

Who are the peace-builders?

This thesis examines the characteristics of people it calls peace-builders, a subset of a group most regularly grouped under the label ‘social entrepreneurs’. These peace-builders are activists who have forged a place in the life and work of the community they function in by using their limited resources to mould what most others see as worthless or impossible into something of sustainable communal value.
All of them work in situations of conflict or post-conflict and represent a sample of the many fascinating peace-builders this researcher has met over his 29 years of involvement in this field in over 30 nations.

**Peace-builders and their communities**

All of us are products of our families, our communities and our epoch. Our closest circle of friends and family, along with community institutional leaders such as teachers and priests, have the strongest effect on many of us during the period of our values formation. The present thesis explores this important issue by asking, ‘What reciprocal influences do the peace-builder and their community have on each other?’ This thesis uses the EVS to evaluate the potential strength of that effect in Chapter 6.

**This researcher**

Because no research is value-free it is useful for researchers to declare their philosophical standpoint. Each researcher brings their particular bias to theories, research questions, analysis and conclusions. This researcher would typify himself as a progressive evangelical and a committed Christian. The worldview espoused by this researcher as ‘Christian’ is detailed in Chapter 3 through the reflection on positionality.

**Contribution to theory and methodology**

Amongst the many books, journal articles, research papers, etc., on entrepreneurs, there is little that compares peace-building with entrepreneurial characteristics.

This thesis addresses that deficit by answering the questions raised in the three themes outlined on page 18, showing the ways that the values, worldviews and leadership styles of peace-builders are similar to or different from those of entrepreneurs, and showing the reciprocal influences that peace-builders and their communities have on each other. It does this by:
• Identifying the characteristics of peace-builders.
• Examining the kinds of businesses that peace-builders establish to achieve their goals.
• Comparing the commonalities and differences of the characteristics of peace-builders in reference to their leadership styles.
• Investigating how peace-builders perceive that the community has influenced them, checking if they see themselves influencing the community, and using the EVS to shed light on those perceptions.
• Providing a starting point for action research on encouraging the development of peace-building leaders in communities by pointing to the educational experiences that nurture peace-builder behaviours.

This research illuminates the many shared characteristics between peace-builders and entrepreneurs, and develops additional scholarly insights into what those shared characteristics are, how they are developed and how they are implemented for community well-being and development. There has been much debate over the characteristics that separate the ‘for-profit’ and ‘social’ business sectors. This thesis weighs in on the theoretical aspects of that debate by first noting that there is a growing recognition of a continuum between the two, and then suggesting that if the definition of ‘profit’ is altered to include a wider concept of the plan (along with a wider definition of the term ‘business’), then the two sectors can be conflated. This approach has the added advantage of making the theory of how transition between the two occurs a more understandable process.

By making comparisons of the characteristics of peace-building and entrepreneurship, and analysing the self-reported and reflective experiences of peace-builders, the research then demonstrates the practicalities of how transitions are (and could be) made between entrepreneurial business and peace-building. The research further demonstrates how communities can encourage the best of their entrepreneurial talent into the most life-enhancing, community-enriching business pursuits based on the extension of ‘self-important moral identity’ (Aquino & Reed II, 2002; Reimer et al., 2011).

As a subsidiary aim, the thesis research suggests an effective path to achieving the changes needed in how we do business for the good of all, and the policy decisions required to achieve those changes. Suggesting possible legislative
considerations, it points out that human inventions like corporations can be retooled for a different era and that the crises faced globally require such a rethink. Danley places these kinds of radical and revolutionary changes in human behaviour into the realm of divine intervention (Danley, 2010, p. 53), but this thesis adds a theological dimension to the debate by raising the Christian concept of kenosis and suggesting that ‘divine’ kenosis may give human beings the power to co-create. The concept of co-creation means that ‘No longer can God be held to be totally and directly responsible for all that happens’ (Polkinghorne, 2001a, p. 95). Because of the wide global adherence to religious-based worldviews or values, this adds important perspectives to a debate that is often conducted by sections of academia that do not recognise the ability of religious renewal and its accompanying insights to reinforce theoretical constructs around ecology, economics and sociology.

By contributing in the manner outlined in the bullet points on page 36, this researcher hopes to be a part of the answer to those who have called for entrepreneurs to be encouraged to see a greater holism in the enterprises on which they embark (Dana, 2010; Hock, 2005; E. Pio, 2014; Edwina Pio, Kilpatrick, & Pratt, 2017; Wheatley, 1999). To begin that process the next chapter reviews the literature on the key elements of the thesis, looking at the ways in which, business, peace-building, redemption, entrepreneurship and reconciliation have been viewed, analysed and defined.
Chapter 2: Extant literature and its implications

Introduction

Standing near that unassuming mound in Hiroshima brings the realisation that 8:15 am on 6 August 1945 redefined warfare forever. ‘Little Boy’, in instantly evaporating a largely civilian population of 70,000, has led to thousands of pages of research, reflection, rethinking and redefining of warfare. That singular event, previously unimaginable in its horror and consequences, became the new researchable reality. It’s how humans learn, however grizzly the event. The analysis and learning that followed that brief but devastating moment forms a mass of writing from which principles can be distilled, strategies decided, projections enhanced and policy developed from and for multiple contexts.

This chapter seeks to follow through in a similar vein for peace-building. By reviewing and analysing the wealth of relevant extant texts and distilling them into a context from which further research can proceed, definitions can be established for business, peace-builder, peace, redeeming, entrepreneur, faith communities, worldview, kenosis and shalom. Newton observed, ‘If I have seen further, it is by standing upon the shoulders of giants’ (BBC). This chapter examines those shoulders.

Figure 6: Thesis flowchart Chapter 2
A word about definitions

Boaz suggests, ‘one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter’ (2002, p. 123), noting 109 different definitions of the politicised term ‘terrorist’. So it is with peace-building, the antithesis of terrorism. Words carry different meanings for different writers and in different contexts, particularly in post-conflict situations, so by defining them clearly in this thesis, this researcher intends to better advance the contributions.

Defining ‘business’

Some problems with the term ‘business’

As a pervasive global activity, business can span everything from sole trader to mighty corporate, with various ways of measuring its success and multitudinous structures for ownership and control. The peace-builders researched through the business lens in this thesis, for example, were aiming for improved social well-being. For accountants, business has a clear definition from the American Financial Accounting Standards Board: ‘An integrated set of activities and assets that is capable of being conducted and managed for the purpose of providing return in the form of dividends, lower costs or other economic benefits directly to investors or other owners, members or participants’ (Holzmann & Munter, 2014, p. 83). Difficulties arise from this focus on economic benefits, however, because it potentially exacerbates ecological (e.g. pollution and climate change) and social (e.g. institutional mistrust and mental health) problems facing the global community (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010, p. 18). Put more broadly and simply, business may be defined as ‘an idea with people in it’, or ‘a conceptual embodiment of a very old, very powerful idea called community’ (Hock, 1999, p. 119). It makes sense to regard it as a relational activity, given that, as Wheatley states, it can be argued that ‘as in quantum physics, relationship is all there is’ (Wheatley, 1999, p. 34). And because people are not machines, new forms and purpose of business are needed; ‘to do otherwise is suicide’ (Wheatley, 1999, p. 25).

Large-scale corporate business in particular appears to be failing to produce its promised outcomes. The energy business alone is ‘running up an enormous tab
with mother nature’ (Nelder, 2007), suggesting it survives only because of infrastructure, and environmental costs are externalised in a capitalist system. Big business is booming — but not for the many. Instead, the benefits are accruing to the rich (Bentley, 2015) while ‘democracy has become a dysfunctional system serving the interests of mostly corrupt and narrow-minded politicians and ruling elites’ (Ravie, 2013, p. 131), the evidence of which could be seen almost daily in 2016 in the run-up to the American presidential elections on both the Republican and Democratic tickets. There is strong and growing support for some kind of revolution against the elites and the businesses that support them, as the ‘Occupy Wall Street’ campaign has shown in its demand for corporate accountability and care of the planet. The ‘Fair Trade’ movement has also shown that consumers will pay more for a system that is also fair for producers and workers, not just consumers.

Figure 7: The four scenarios of Waddock & McIntosh
Source (Waddock & McIntosh, 2011, p. x) Permission sought.

Waddock and McIntosh note that issues like environmental degradation, global inequality, and resource scarcity, are implicated in corruption and terrorism (2011, Chapter 1), and all contribute to violent conflict. They then suggest four scenarios for the future in diagrammatic form (reproduced in Figure 7). This thesis
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has interest in quadrant D — Sustainable Economic Enterprise (SEE) — because, as shown in Chapter 7, peace-builders share innovative characteristics with the kind of entrepreneurial business people who make the changes that result in SEE. Such peace-builders can at least say the last two sentences of Rabbi Hillel the Elder’s wise observation: ‘If I am not for myself, who will be for me? If I am not for others, what am I? And if not now, when?’ (Quoted in Edwina Pio et al., 2017, p. 54). The insights of peace-builders into the depth of change that is actually needed, and the very different focus required to achieve SEE and reduced conflict, are further explored in the thesis in Chapter 7.

The 21st century opened with examples of corporate business failure caused by a combination of arrogance, ignorance and virulent, corrosive greed: Madof (Markopolos, 2010), Enron (Healy & Krishna, 2003; McLean & Elkind, 2003; Petersen, 2008), Ahold (The Economist, 2003), Satyam (Preston, Durant, & O'Daniel, 2009; Singh, Kumar, & Uzma, 2010), Worldcom (Jeter, 2003b; Scharff, 2005) and multiple others (Oliver & Goodwin, 2010). The banking system nearly collapsed, driven by similar selfish motivations, and the subsequent bailouts (Benediktsdottir, Danielsson, & Zoega, 2011; Gregoriou, 2010; Kaufman, 2000; Tryggvi Thor, 2009; Vallascas & Keasey, 2013) have engendered cynicism and a call for accountability and change. Structure in business and law may actually encourage the deceit that leads to such catastrophes, with research indicating that bankers act more dishonestly when reminded about the ‘aggressive’ shareholder return requirements of their work (Cohn, Fehr, & Marechal, 2014).

The problem is deeper than just the system, however. Monbiot points to the way in which ‘lives are being trashed by klepto-remuneration: theft through excess rewards to rapacious bosses’ (Monbiot, 2015). Expressed more empathetically, it could be said that Van der Hoeven of Ahold, Madof, Lay of Enron, and Ebbers of Worldcom are also the victims of ego, pride and narcissism as well as their own greed (Fool, 2012; Mitchell, 2001; Petersen, 2008; The Economist, 2003). Dooyeweerd’s rather prescient ‘loss of spiritual selfhood’ (1965, p. 29) is now a phenomenon extending far beyond Western culture, as Zhou Zhengyi’s Shanghai shenanigans demonstrate (Oliver & Goodwin, 2010, p. 111). Such loss of values-
based selfhood crosses many socio-economic boundaries too (Shedlock, 2012) and has even made its mark on academic research (Chebotareva, 2011; Edwina Pio et al., 2017). Business in its present arrogant and aggressive form seems troubled.

After listing some of the critiques concerning academic business foci that produce ‘bad theories’ that ‘mislead decision makers’ (2017, p. 37), Waddock et al. note that business activity that is focused only on profitability contributes to the anthropogenic global warming which 97% of scientists say is happening (Antonio & Brulle, 2011; Brander, 2013; Dunlap & Jacques, 2013; Hoegh-Guldberg, 2011; Poortinga, Spence, Whitmarsh, Capstick, & Pidgeon, 2011; Shaftel, 2016), as well as to a host of other problems and ultimately ‘will threaten global food security’ (P. Smith & Gregory, 2013, p. 24). A widespread change in business practice could avoid the inevitable conflict over food insecurity.

Communist ideology, the only serious global alternative to capitalism and ‘business as usual’, dramatically failed late in the second millennium, with Hollander suggesting the failure occurred because communism ‘nourished intermittently small, elite groups, more often than not legitimising their power drives’ (1991, p. 113). This created discontent with the system and eventually mass protest and revolution, leading to its demise. It failed because it failed to spread the wealth it generated, and a more even redistribution of wealth has been shown to be key to human flourishing generally (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010).

The capitalist system, while emerging victor, has created problems of its own, and the global financial crisis of 2008 destroyed the confidence of substantial sections of the population for similar social reasons that had plagued communism. Political economist Ravi Mohamed says this created ‘a good recipe for political instability, radicalism and possibly increased violence’ (2013, p. 125). The GFC accelerated income inequality. In the USA in 1981, the top 1% held 25% of the wealth of that country; by 2010, that 1% were holding 35.4% of the wealth (2013, pp. 110–111). Globally in 2010, the richest 2% owned half of the world’s wealth, while the top 10% owned around 85% of it (2013, pp. 110–111). By October 2015 the top 1% owned half the world’s wealth (Bentley, 2015). Surprisingly, all this does
not appear to have demanded a radical revision of business, its purpose, its methodologies, its philosophical underpinnings or its tenets. The quiet voices suggesting ‘the emperor has no clothes’ have been largely silenced, while the total cost to the taxpayer of the bank failures in the GFC may never be fully determined (Curtis, 2011).

Porter promotes the Masters of Business Administration (MBA) type of training to help overcome these systemic failures, but those same MBA graduates created the Enron debacle (Gladwell, 2002, p. 28) resulting in ‘the sad tale of (at the top) greed, hubris, deception, and incompetence’ (R. A. Miller, 2005) from ‘the smartest guys in the room’ (McLean & Elkind, 2003). Skilling (CEO and Board Chair) and Lay (CEO and COO) both had MBAs from Harvard, where Porter is a Professor and Robert Jaedicke, who was Chair of Enron’s audit committee, was previously Dean of Stanford’s Business School. Enron’s stockholders didn’t complain about ethics prior to the 2004 collapse, despite many public bitter complaints about Enron’s markets manipulation (Healy & Krishna, 2003). Gladwell, looking at this, asks: ‘What if smart people are overrated?’ (2002, p. 29). This is not an intelligence issue, however, but relates to company structures, corporate culture and the values of its employees. Even more important are the values of the stockholders who, in corporate business, drive and/or permit management decisions. It is here that both Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Community Shared Values (CSV) usually fail. Suggested solutions to these problems normally lie within the realm of regulation, intervention and structural reform (H. Davies & Green, 2010; Paulet, 2011) but this ultimately fails to address the root causes. The fundamentals of ‘being human’ require more than regulations that can only superficially manipulate corporate behaviour. To define business as a transformative social activity demands a shift in thinking.

Hock, the founding CEO of VISA, put it this way when he wrote a book about his experiences after walking away from the job without a golden handshake and at the height of his success:
It’s a story of harboring the Four Beasts that inevitably devour their keeper, Ego, Envy, Avarice, and Ambition, and of a great bargain, trading Ego for humility, Envy for equanimity, Avarice for time, and Ambition for liberty; a story of ten years of isolation, anonymity, study, and manual labor, while restoring two hundred acres of ravaged land to health and beauty. (Hock, 1999, p. 3)

Hock recognised that if VISA had started with power, capital, position or influence, they would have undoubtedly used them — badly. This seems to be the human difficulty. Confucius, quoted by Paulet, puts it well: ‘The superior person understands rightness; the inferior person understands profit’ (2011, p. 192).

Peace-builders provide a model for the radical rethink of business because they transcend the quest for personal autonomy and narrowly focused profit to a realm of community well-being. Burrows rightly said that ‘we cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them’ (Burton, 2009, p. 25). Given that both capitalism and communism are ‘mechanistic organizational concepts so wasteful of the human spirit and destructive to the biosphere’ (Hock, 1999, p. 55), we need to rethink business, its purpose, goals and structure in organic terms. In this brave new world of chaos theory, this requires something like a combination of the concepts of the chaordic or ‘new science’ organisation and Yunus’ social business goals (Yunus, 2010) as well as a rethink of human ontology.

The problems with measuring ‘business’

If business is to be defined differently from Holzmann and Munter’s definition (2014), a way of measuring business to talk about it meaningfully must be developed. When discussing the measurement of these subjective but ‘essential to human life’ factors in business, Natsios states that, in development, ‘those programs that are the most precisely and easily measured are the least transformational, and those programs that are the most transformational are the least measureable’ (2010, p. 4). He goes on to point out that ‘measurability should not be confused with development significance’ (Natsios, 2010, p. 13). The same is true for business.

Although it is both unhelpful and inaccurate to regard people engaged in business as ‘one-dimensional beings whose only mission is to maximize profit’
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(Yunus, 2010, loc 198), economists have insisted on building ‘their whole theory of business on the assumption that human beings do nothing in their economic lives besides pursue selfish interests’ (Yunus, 2010, loc 203). Because studies showing life satisfaction scales and social outcomes are gaining academic credibility (Becchetti & Pelloni, 2013, p. 140), and studies by Frey in Switzerland and Wills –Herrera in Columbia (2011) show the correlation between subjective well-being (SWB) and peace, it is worth considering the effect of business practice on subjective well-being (Boes & Winkelmann, 2010; Brereton, Clinch, & Ferreira, 2008; Cooper, McCausland, & Theodossiou, 2013; Dalziel & Saunders, 2014; Sun & Xiao, 2012). For the purposes of this thesis, ‘subjective well-being’ (SWB), now regarded as the scientific term for happiness and life satisfaction (Diener, 2016), is used interchangeably with ‘happiness’ but should be distinguished from social-well-being, which may be related, but is much more akin to shalom.

The interaction between SWB and conflict is part of Friedman’s ‘Golden Arches theory’ (1999, p. 248), which suggested that no two countries that both had McDonalds would go to war with each other. When this proposition was demolished by the India–Pakistan Kargil war of 1999 and conflicts in Lebanon (2006), Georgia (2008) and Crimea (2014), it became Friedman’s ‘Dell theory’ that ‘no two countries that are part of a major supply chain, like Dell’s, will ever fight a war against each other as long as they are part of the same global supply chain’ (Friedman, 2007, pp. 580–606). Friedman still contends that when people have too much to lose they won’t enter conflict, but this seems to ignore the fact that humans can be very contrary beings, cutting off their noses to spite their faces.

Easterlin (2001) highlights the bias towards measuring economic indicators in human development. Easterlin’s paradox suggests that while within a country people with higher incomes are more likely to be happy, this does not necessarily translate to a higher-GDP country being happier overall than a lower-GDP country. There has been much debate since (Fischer, 2008; Hagerty & Veenhoven, 2003; Powdthavee, 2010; Stevenson & Wolfers, 2008; Veenhoven & Hagerty, 2006), but Layard’s lectures (2013), backed by other scholars (Dolan, Peasgood, & White, 2008), suggest that once the average income is over US$15,000, a country’s average level of
happiness seems largely independent of average income, and variations or contradictions can largely be accounted for in (a) how happiness is measured and (b) how you represent it graphically.

Figure 8: SWB and global per capita income


The regression curve in Figure 8 looks very like the curve in Figure 9, which suggests that similar trends exist both within and between countries. While there is an increase in happiness alongside an increase in income, the effect diminishes with incomes of over US$9,000 internationally and over about US$20,000 in the USA itself. However, by showing the data differently, two seemingly contradictory truths emerge.
Figure 9: Happiness and income for the USA (linear mapping)


Figure 10: Happiness and income for the USA (logarithmic mapping)


If the data is mapped in logarithmic scale, as in Figure 10, then there appears to be a closer and more constant relationship between happiness and income — although to double the happiness requires 10 times the income, and to be 4 times happier requires 100 times the income.
So in one sense both views can be shown to be right. There is an on-going relationship between happiness and income beyond the limits of the US$20,000, but it is clearly a case of the law of diminishing returns, an effect also shown by Delaney (2008) and similarly noted for other countries (Donovan & Halpern, 2002, p. 17; Lora & Chaparro, 2008, pp. 6–10). Given the huge psychic impact of unemployment (Layard, 2003 c), this data suggests that government should do two things for peace and prosperity: Keep incomes more equitable and encourage employment, both of which imply a different focus for business activity.

Underpinning this are two substantive theories as to why conflict and violence develop from perceived inequitable social situations. The relative deprivation theory, developed by researchers like Stouffer, Merton and Runciman (H. Smith, Pettigrew, & Bialosiewicz, 2012, p. 204) is a social psychological concept that posits that it is the comparison with those around them, either as an individual or part of a group, rather than some absolute standard, that produces either contentment or discontent. Smith et al. demonstrate this as a three-stage process: comparison, cognitive appraisal and a justice-related effect (Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, & Welzel, 2008b, p. 205). In contrast, Tajfel and Turner’s approach is from the direction of social identity theory, rejecting the Freudian psychodynamic explanations for Nazi behaviour and looking to group goal behaviour instead (Hogg, 2016, p. 4). Hogg notes Tajfel’s classic definition of social identity as an ‘individual’s knowledge that he belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of this group membership’ (Inglehart et al., 2008b, p. 6), and it is the perception of the group’s disadvantage that leads to comparison and conflict. Both theories can help shed light on the issue of how conflict and violence arise, and both point to the effect of material inequality being an irritant, something that the interviewees in this thesis also note.

An employed person has less time for conflict — as the introduction of the steel axe in Papua New Guinea showed (DeLisi, 1990; Podolefsky, 1984; Resture, 1911). The steel axe cut working times for men dramatically, giving them much more time to create conflict with neighbours. The peace-builders of this study may instinctively recognise that, leading to their interest in community business and
employment of locals. If the ‘ultimate goal of economic policy ought to be enriching the quality of relationships within society’ (P. Mills, 2005, p. 217) then businesses would play their part in that. Mohamed suggests that business needs to ‘create hundreds of millions of jobs for the young and unemployed everywhere and meet the expectations of the poor and the sick and others who lack education and knowledge’ (Ravie, 2013), to which this researcher would add ‘and increase peacefulness’. But unfortunately, for many profit businesses and their entrepreneurial leaders, hiring more people is only a last resort, so ‘calling them job creators isn’t just inaccurate, it’s disingenuous’ (Futrelle, 2012).

All of this points to the need to define business differently and to aim for different goals where ‘the business of peace-building’ might be an important focus. Yunus (2010, p. 212) believes in the innate human desire to serve and he negotiates with companies like Adidas, the Otto group, BASF and others to invest in the kind of social businesses that the Grameen Bank encourages, saying ‘the investment decision made by social business is not based on the potential profit. It is based on the social cause’ (Yunus, 2010, p. xxi). Observations by Hock (2005), Wheatley (1999, 2012) and others have shown how companies might be structured to help better achieve a sense of participation and service for the greater good. If Ellis’ (2001, pp. 109–110) observation that ethical behaviour should be ‘shaped along kenotic lines in order to be consonant with the deep nature of reality’ is added to the mix, a very different purpose, meaning and definition for business could emerge. Put philosophically, if human beings are to find their ontological purpose, then institutions, businesses and lives need to be structured around the principle of self-giving and the confession that we too need love if indeed that is the structure and basis of the universe (Fiddes, 2001). Several scholars have explored the way various faith communities reveal a similar perspective concerning human ontology (Anees, 2005; Bekker, 2010; Lounibos, 2000; Ravindra, 2005) and point to where business at the expense of others invites cosmic disapproval (Rajiv, 2009; Valliere, 2008, p. 181). Business needs to be measured against how it affects human well-being (Layard, 2003 a, p. 3), irrespective of the problems of measuring posited by Hock (2005), Wheatley (2012), Dooyeweerd (1965) and Layard (2003 b). However, the problems of business go
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beyond measuring success to the very heart of business structure itself, which is the focus of the next section.

**Corporate business and the problem of structures, shareholders and stakeholders**

The corporation, love child of capitalism and free markets, demonstrates the difficulties of shifting focus regarding business outcomes and bottom-line accounting. The movie *The Corporation* (Achbar & Abbott, 2003) and Bakan’s accompanying book suggest that corporate social responsibility, if ‘genuine’ and not driven by the ulterior motive of generating profits, is basically illegal (2004, p. 37). His study of several seminal-case-law outcomes led him to believe that corporate law obligates managers to pursue the stockholders’ interests to the exclusion of all other considerations, something he calls ‘psychopathic’. Chomsky has taken this a good deal further in his analysis and shows how corporate capitalism affects government, democracy and peace-building in the widest context (Chomsky, 1999, 2012).

The case of Henry Ford versus the Dodge brothers is instructive. Ford wanted the payout to shareholders cut substantially so that the cost of cars to buyers was reduced and the general population would gain social benefit from a more mobile community. The courts refused to rule. Lee and Nesteruk note: ‘It is sometimes forgotten that in the Dodge v. Ford Motor Co. case itself, the court ultimately refused to interfere with management's plan to expand production and reduce prices because the judges were not certain that the plan would not ultimately result in greater profits’ (Lee & Nesteruk, 2005, p. 72). The court apparently believed that, in law, the aim of a corporation was to make a profit for shareholders, a principle seemingly upheld since. This in turn limits the actions of social entrepreneurs in any public company — as it did Henry Ford.

However, the law only provides the framework in which corporations can act. As Lee and Nesteruk note, ‘if the critics are right that management pursues stockholder profits to the exclusion of all considerations of ethics, decency and social responsibility, it is not so much because corporate law requires it as because it suits the shareholders’ (2005, p. 76). Mitchell points to the expectations of the
beneficiaries of corporations (the stockholders), suggesting the current rights of stockholders are structural traps (Mitchell, 2001, pp. 99–108) that give directors a reason to concentrate on stockholder prosperity while ignoring practically anything else. Robertson and Nickolson (1996, pp. 1096–1097) see corporations working on environmental, employee safety and well-being, discrimination and community relations issues but seemingly only able to do so by genuflecting to the well-being of the priority stakeholder, the shareholder. This is perhaps why the Roddicks wanted to buy back the shares of The Body Shop enterprise they founded when they discovered that shareholders had different profitability expectations from them, noting, ‘The Quakers were enormously wealthy while building schools and helping the community. They never lied or stole. Can you imagine that happening today?’ (Bolton & Thompson, 2004, p. 195). The clear advantage the Quakers had was that every one of their stockholders shared their values for greater social justice and a better deal for the poor.

Mitchell’s solution (2001, pp. 129–131) of self-perpetuating boards removed from shareholder influence, where directors will behave like ‘decent people’, flies in the face of the universally provable human dictum ‘Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.’ Similarly, Porter’s ‘Shared Value’ scenario shows no willingness to discuss issues of power. The authority to make decisions about profit versus social good is in the hands of wealthy shareholders, not the recipients of enhanced social outcomes, nor corporate employees who want to do social good. Schwab’s ‘stakeholder theory’ where ‘companies serve not only shareholders but all the stakeholders of their organization […] including not just shareholders and creditors but also employees, customers, suppliers, the state and the society in which the enterprise is active’ (World Economic Forum, 2013b) resonates with Porter’s concept of CSV (Driver, 2012, p. 424) and has had some successes but also encounters the barrier of stockholder priority. While most of these examples relate to the ‘Christian West’, stockholder priority would also limit a dedicated Muslim trying to act with akhalaq (noble character and ethical conduct) (Syed & Metcalfe, 2015, p. 763) and prevent a Hindu from acting with dharma seva (the service of the community in the righteous path of spiritual perfection and salvation) (Johnson,
2012, p. 577). The priority of the good of the business, gauged by stockholders’ profits, in corporate understanding is a key consideration in this thesis because Porter’s ‘higher form of profit’ (Driver, 2012, p. 426) is not possible without stockholders’ agreement.

While ‘social entrepreneurship’ as a goal of the business leader is a great start, the mind-set and milieu of the shareholders is a vital consideration in determining outcomes in this process. Equally important — and explored in Chapter 6 — is the question of whether the values and worldview of shareholders and leaders can be shifted. Kilduff and Tsai note that ‘the network of relationships within which we are embedded may have important consequences for the success or failure of our projects […] and] affect everything from our health, to our career success, to our very identities’ (2003, p. 2). Balkundi and Kilduff (2006, pp. 942–943) observe how embeddedness in social networks has powerful influence, and Micolaou et al. comment that ‘social networks provide entrepreneurs with useful information about many aspects of running their businesses’ (2009, p. 110).

**Business, the worker and social capital: Towards a definition of business**

The discussion around corporate business has focused on the problem of the corporate owners and a worldview predominately driven by bottom-line profits for those shareholders. However, not only does business exist in many other forms in a capitalist economy (partnerships, sole traders, family-owned, trusts, NFP entities), but there are multiple stakeholders in those business structures who affect the aims and outcomes of the enterprise in much more powerful ways than in corporate enterprises. In these structures a greater alignment between owner vision, worker’s motivation and societal well-being is possible. Such an alignment gives insights into the kinds of enterprises that peace-builders create.

Lanyard (2003 b, p. 14) discusses how maximising social output might be possible and refers to Deci’s experiment in giving puzzles to two different groups of students (Deci & Ryan, 1985, pp. 44–48), paying only one group for each correct solution. After time was up, the unpaid group continued to work, but the paid group
had seemingly lost the internal motivation that would have otherwise existed (Layard, 2003 b, p. 14). Other studies by Pinder, Yoshimura, Anderson, Manoogian and Raznick, and Eden (Deci & Ryan, 1985, p. 48), along with Monbiot’s case study (Monbiot, 2015) of a health worker on less than the minimum wage going beyond the call of duty in helping people, all suggest the same thing: workers are often motivated by things other than financial reward.

A study by Harvard students, also analysed by Layard, examines habituation and rivalry, noting that most Western governments with their profit/cash motivational approaches have made serious errors in their tactics to reform public services and increase productivity. Stressing job importance and adequate pay levels overall would have had better motivational outcomes than rewarding individual performance with increased payment (Layard, 2003 b, p. 15).

The studies above are mentioned to contextualise the definition of business and reinforce the arguments for an alternative. Layard, Wilkerson and Pickett (2003 b, 2003 c; 2010) cite multiple studies pointing to the need to rethink business activity. They conclude that business should be oriented to providing useful employment and reducing the inequality of incomes both within and across countries to produce greater stability, wider community contentment, and greater social well-being for human survival. Many other writers (Dana, 1999, 2010; Dana & Dana, 2005; McFague, 2013; P. Morris, 2015; E. Pio, 2014; Syed, 2010; Waddock & McIntosh, 2011) are likewise calling for business that has benefits for all and works towards the long-term survival of the species.

**Business defined**

Taking a lead from these writers above, seeking business that benefits all, this thesis defines business as ‘A communally integrated set of activities and assets that is capable of being conducted and managed for the purpose of providing a return where both assets and returns can be economic, social or psychological.’
Business and social capital

One way of talking about returns that are economic, social or psychological is to call them ‘social capital’. Taking account of various writers like Coleman (1990, pp. 300–324), Putnam (2000, pp. 18–19), Bartolini (2008, pp. 5–8) and Klein (2013), who clarify concepts of social capital and social cohesion, this thesis deliberately uses the term ‘social capital’ because of its focus on a future return (C. Klein, 2013, p. 293). Bourdieu and Coleman are considered by many scholars to be the founders of social capital theory, with Bourdieu tending to place it alongside cultural and economic capital, where the three can be interchanged, while Coleman uses his ‘rational choice’ concept, where actors, interested in events and resources controlled by others, make rational choices to maximise the utility of those others to them (Galtung, 2005, Chapter 1). Häuberer proceeds to show the development of the theory through Putnam and Lin but concludes that ‘a general social capital theory is still under construction’, although noting that it can be said that social capital is embedded in social relations and mostly applies to hierarchical structured societies (2005, p. 148).

Social capital defined

Given that theory and definitions of social capital are still subject to further academic inquiry, social capital is defined in this thesis as ‘the product of investment by groups and individuals into social relations that is based on trust in others and institutions, social norms of reciprocity, and expectation of return by increase in social, economic or psychological well-being.’

Defining peace-building and the peace-builder

This thesis states that peace-building can be described as a business activity, given the definition of business in earlier sections, which covers businesses ‘for profit’, social business, and CSR or CSV types of business. Peace-builders create business as well — but with a different agenda and outcome in mind.
An early reflector on peace-building, soon after the physical carnage of WWI had receded, mused on the German translation of the famous biblical quote about peace-makers:

which each German child, under a militaristic system of religious education, must commit to memory, perpetuates a misinterpretation of the Beatitude. "Blessed," he repeats, "are the peaceable," or "those who are inclined to peace" ("Selig sind die Friedfertigen"); as though a sentiment were commended rather than a task enjoined; as though the blessing of Jesus might be claimed for pious declarations rather than reserved for creative actions. A leading commentator, himself a German, corrects the translation. "Not the Peace-Lovers," he says, "but the Peace-Builders, inherit the promise" ("Nicht die Friedfertigen, sondern die Friedestifter." Meyer) (Peabody, 1919, p. 531).

A definition of a peace-builder that included only intention or inclination would thus entirely miss the mark. The most insightful hermeneutic of what a person says is what they do. Aligned with this understanding of a peace-builder as a person working for peace is the issue of positive and negative peace, developed by Johan Galtung, a Norwegian mathematician and philosopher. Following early proponents of the idea like Jane Addams and Martin Luther King in the exploration of how to seek peace during a time of nationalist imperialist ambitions, Galtung in the 1960s analysed the contribution to violence that political, economic and social structures make, while not actually or necessarily causing violence themselves (Knight, 2005, p. 395). This led to Galtung defining ‘structural violence’ and ‘direct violence’ as two contrasting parts of the same issue (1969), direct violence being the physical and verbal assaults of war, bar fights and domestic violence, and structural violence being seen in the form of laws that disadvantage social or ethnic groups and provide ‘breaks’ for privileged groups and the like. Negative peace was described as the absence of personal violence while structural violence existed, while positive peace was the absence of structural violence (Galtung, 1969, p. 183).

Galtung later added ‘cultural violence’ to highlight the way in which media, arts, literature, monuments and the like all supported the tacit acceptance of the racism, sexism and nationalism that bedevilled international and national
relationships, with their ‘stars, crosses and crescents, flags, anthems and military parades’ (1990, p. 291). Galtung’s rather too extensive definition of violence as being ‘present when human beings are being influenced so their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations’ (Galtung, 1969, p. 168) highlights more problems than it solves. While not structural injustice, fire, flood and earthquake can also cause conditions that limit somatic and mental potential. By excluding so little from the definition, it might also be possible to dismiss positive non-violent conflict that can lead to positive social change.

Galtung’s Basic Needs Analysis (BNA) (1978) for peace-building goes beyond the ‘one wins the other loses’, the ‘waiting for the next round’ (as between Armenia and Azerbaijan) and the confused outcomes (the Iraq war) to an agreed peace where both sides feel they win (2003). Galtung’s involvement in Charlottesville encouraged the moderates in the desegregation debate there, which allowed the city to move beyond the impasse created by extreme positions (Freire, 1970, p. 94). Galtung has begun to address the imbalance between the substantial body of work that studies conflict and war with his own prodigious output in peace studies, making him the most quoted author on the subject (Galtung & Fischer, 2013, p. 4), and his efforts in the area of peace-building have seen the emergence of hundreds of peace studies and conflict resolution programmes around the world.

One aspect of his work and life that makes him attractive as a theoretician to this thesis (and this researcher) is his hands-on involvement in peace-building work, applying his theory to very real and difficult situations. His future-oriented TRANSCEND.org peace-building approach, that looks for a new reality rather than just re-litigating the historic issues, has a very entrepreneurial aspect to it – seeing peace where others see conflict. The organisation offers everything from university courses, a research institution, a publishing house, mediation training and a media house for peace journalism (Sevincer, Kitayama, & Varnum, 2015), and the organisation produces internationally recognised mediators.

Another scholar who writes extensively in this area of peace-building is John Paul Lederach, a Mennonite and conscientious objector to the Vietnam war. He has
been involved in peace-building efforts in Nicaragua, Tajikistan and Northern Ireland but may also be found helping set up mediation and reconciliation in local parishes or within extended families (Casciani, 2003). Gawere, whose theme of persistence resonates with many interviewees in this research, says ‘Peace-building is a long-term process’, and goes on to quote Lederach, stating that ‘it may take just as long [for conflict parties] to get out of an armed conflict as it took to get in’ (Gawere, 2015, p. 35) — which may or may not be comforting to places like Myanmar with more than 60 years of conflict to overcome. As with Galtung, Lederach’s scholarly output is informed by his personal involvement in reconciliation work.

Lederach’s theory of conflict transformation is a shift from looking to seeing, enabling the participants to move beyond the immediate situation to examine the underlying patterns and context, and then to build a conceptual framework that reveals the content, context and structure of the relationship (Lederach, 2014, location 148). This concept takes a particular episode of violence or conflict and puts it in a wider frame. Lederach gives several examples of this successful peace-building process (Lederach, 2005, Chapter 2) and concludes by saying, ‘I believe it was the serendipitous appearance of the moral imagination in human affairs’ (Lederach, 2005, location 468). His ‘moral imagination’ concept owes its genesis to Mills and the ‘sociological imagination’ (1959) and Brueggermann’s ‘prophetic imagination’ (2001). His call to invoke the artist and the imagination in peace-building and to see other possibilities for a different future remains a challenge to all involved in the processes of peace-building.

Most peace-builders featured in the news operate in national and international spheres and achieve acknowledgement through their diplomatic skills. People like Harri Holkeri, the former Finnish Prime Minister, and Monica McWilliams, founder of the Women’s Coalition of Northern Ireland, two of the early negotiators of the Good Friday Agreement that eventually helped bring peace to Northern Ireland, or Nelson Mandela, who managed to negotiate an end to apartheid and the on-going conflict it sponsored, have achieved great things. Few would dispute the benefits these leaders brought through their efforts and they are already researched. However, their efforts wouldn’t ripen the harvest of peace if it weren’t
for the tillers of the soil of hardened attitudes, the planters of seeds of hope in the compost of destroyed dreams, and those who watered the communal ground of desire for justice for the disempowered. These are the unsung heroes who are the focus of this thesis.

What then does a community-based peace-builder, who is the subject of this research, look like, and how are the outcomes they achieve assessed? Defining them purely in their community context is difficult. Some peace-builders are not admired or acknowledged within their own communities. Sometimes they are viewed as troublemakers, and even traitors, if they suggest that peace may require a compromise that allows an enemy, even a defeated enemy, to claim a ‘win’ in some area. It is the much wider community, not their own community, which sees these people as peace-builders. Locally they are a threat to security because they question the comfortable assumptions of the basis of the existing ‘peace’. As Peter, one of the interviewees in this research, said: ‘I’ve found that there are a lot of people who are ready to work towards peace. They care about peace, but they’re not vocal because they’re seen as traitors. Or they would be seen as traitors if they were vocal.’

Perception in the area of peace-building may be as important as reality (Jamieson, Nock, & Mendes, 2012; Keller et al., 2012), which is why this thesis uses descriptive statistics on worldviews/values, since some peace-building success may be achieved by shifting perceptions before reality also changes. Peace-builders’ activities address the underlying causes of violence, and work at creating justice and equity. Recourse to the ‘justice system’ is often the default reaction (Michael & Paul, 2003), but this legal approach is not the kind of justice that necessarily brings peace. Peace-builders work for shalom, which seeks justice in the well-being of all.

In the words of Goodhand, ‘Peace-builders attempt to address the underlying causes of conflict and to prevent future outbreaks of violence, and post-conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction of societies’ (Goodhand, 2004, p. 71), including issues like envy (Donovan & Halpern, 2002, pp. 19, 23; Tepvenhart, 2013), the ‘hedonic treadmill’ (Layard, 2003 b, pp. 3, 4) and the addiction to wanting more (Layard, 2003 b, p. 6). One characteristic of entrepreneurs is ‘being able to
develop trust quickly’ as a way to grow business (Nguyen & Rose, 2009). This would seem to be a prerequisite for peace-building too, and kenosis may be the tool peace-builders use to establish that trust. Whether this aspect of trust is an entrepreneurial characteristic or a trait modified by a worldview will be investigated in this thesis (Marcati, Guido, & Peluso, 2008; Muller & Gappisch, 2005; Talley, 2004).

**Peace-builder defined**

In this thesis a peace-builder is acknowledged by the wider community as a person who, by working for justice, has brought increased personal and communal well-being (shalom) into a tension-filled setting of past or present violence, or who is widely acknowledged to have prevented violent conflict where it seemed inevitable. They create the conditions for a lasting peace, something more extensive than the absence of conflict.

**Excursus: Shalom, an ancient idea needed today**

A stable and harmonious lifestyle has the ancient term shalom associated with it, which conjures up a picture of total community well-being and human thriving achieved by structural justice. This is Galtung’s ‘positive’ peace. This thesis uses the concept of ‘peace-building’ as a ‘search for shalom’ where shalom is more specifically ‘[...] wholeness, health, peace, welfare, safety, tranquillity, prosperity, harmony, the absence of agitation or discord’ (Strong, 2010). This shalom has a great deal to do with life satisfaction and it explicitly rejects peace achieved by warfare or subjugation, since this is neither lasting or, indeed, peaceful.

Such a state of human well-being is often called ‘prosperity’ or ‘flourishing’ and is much more than economic in its scope. Substantial amounts have been written concerning flourishing and positive organisational behaviour (H. Smith et al., 2012, pp. 147–150) and such organisational behaviour does provide a well-earthed alternative to the kind of positive psychology approach that could probably only be written from a rich, settled background (Compton & Hoffman, 2013). This flourishing of humanity is what Pope Paul IV called ‘peace’ when he said, ‘If you want peace, work for justice’ (1972). This understanding of peace may also explain...
why so many peace-builders are active in developing business activity that encourages the production and fair distribution of wealth.

**Defining redeeming**

Redeeming, generally reserved for religious settings, seems unusual in a title such as ‘redeeming the entrepreneurial spirit’ where redeeming can mean ‘to buy back’, ‘to free from captivity by payment of ransom’, ‘to change for the better: reform’, ‘to make good: fulfil’ (United Nations, 2017)

**Why talk of redemption?**

Our greedy over-exploitation of nature threatens ‘the very food chain humanity depends on’ (Ban Ki-Moon, Ki-Moon, 2013). Further, the inexorably growing gap between rich and poor (Baird, 2013, p. 12) is a looming crisis. Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Dewbre et al., 2011, p. 6) hides deep unrest (World Economic Forum, 2013a). These are not small problems solved with a minor tweak. They demand a complete paradigm shift, a change in methodology and a major revision of economic goals. Such changes cost money, and sometimes lives. Environmental activists have been killed in South America for opposing logging, mining and hydro schemes (Sherkat, 2014b). The costs to environmental groups in court action can be up to £100,000 per day (Sherkat, 2014a) just to stop the ‘business as usual’ approach to offshore drilling or use of pesticides that kill bees.

Redeeming can be a costly and painful business. Re-orienting the purpose of business and the talents of those that drive business to address these issues will require a huge psychological and economic shift. Perhaps there are shades of Schumpeter’s cycles of destruction here (Andersen, 2012, pp. 634–635), not so much with the material objects but with the investments of hearts and minds in philosophies and activities that have passed their use-by date.

To give the impression this process is easy, painless or of low cost would not represent the sacrifice required. That is why this researcher deliberately chose the
term ‘redeemed’ —because it has a sense of cost In that sense, redemption is inexorably linked to the concept of kenosis.

**Redeeming defined**

In this thesis ‘redeeming’ refers to the price that must be paid (economic, social and psychological) in order to shift the thinking and practice of business — and the thinking and practice of the entrepreneurs who create business — towards sustainable goals that create shalom.

**Defining entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial spirit**

Scott states: ‘Neither capitalism nor democracy is easily understood and, indeed, there is no standard definition of either’ (B. R. Scott, 2009, p. 2), so defining entrepreneurs operating largely in capitalistic democracies is equally difficult. Scott’s three tiers in his sports governance analogy shown in Figure 11 illustrate how a differently understood capitalism might survive the post-GFC period and still serve the socially focused entrepreneur (B. R. Scott, 2009, p. 12). This view largely aligns with Porter’s expanded view of capitalism. Capitalism itself has taken on many forms over its lifespan, becoming more pervasive in each iteration, moving from merchant to industrial to financial to welfare to state and finally to global capitalism (Ahmad, 2004, p. 181). Likewise, entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs take many forms too. Chomsky notes that the non-consumer-driven state is often the progenitor of the entrepreneurial products (Chomsky, 2013). The state sector, or government, cannot be dismissed from the entrepreneurial process.
According to Schurenberg, ‘Entrepreneurship is the pursuit of opportunity without regard to resources currently controlled’ (Schurenberg, 2012, p. 1). Isenberg expresses it differently: ‘Entrepreneurs see and realize value where others think there is none, and act in ways that are contrary to what almost everyone else thinks is worthwhile [...]. [An entrepreneur] must see or sense value in things that many other people see as worthless, impossible, or stupid’ (Isenberg, 2013, p. 3). Mennonite John Stahl-Wert, suggests that ‘God is an entrepreneur, a risk taker.’ When God looks at the world, he doesn't see it as ‘bankrupt and suffering under a lousy provisional administration.’ Instead, like an entrepreneur, ‘God sees what it can be, and makes an investment in it’ (Mennonite_Canada, 2004, p. 24). The neo-liberal understanding of the entrepreneurial and enterprising God taken by the Thatcher government, which alienated the Church of England (P. Morris, 1992, p. 276), is not the one shared by the Mennonites when talking of that concept and coherent critiques around ideas of egalitarianism, quality of life, and wealth creation. Neither is entrepreneurship totally about money for many successful entrepreneurs — the money simply helps create the autonomy mentioned as a key goal of entrepreneurs on page 21. Even Branson of Virgin fame writes: ‘If you get into entrepreneurship..."
driven by profit you are more likely to fail. The entrepreneurs who succeed usually
want to make a difference to people’s lives’ (Branson, 2013).

However, entrepreneurship (and ‘the entrepreneur’) is still notoriously
difficult to quantify, described by Schumpeter as the ‘modern-day philosopher’s
stone, a mysterious something that supposedly holds the secret to boosting growth
and creating jobs’ (Schumpeter (nom de plume), 2013). ‘Almost all modern theories
of entrepreneurship take their origin from Schumpeter’ because he has placed
entrepreneurs at the ‘vortex of his theory on economic development’ (Hébert &
Link, 2009, p. 67) and has searched extensively for the human qualities that make
successful entrepreneurs, and for the social and economic conditions needed to
promote the emergence of successful entrepreneurship (Kirzner, 2009, p. 145). As
Isenberg notes, however, entrepreneurs are, in many senses, just ‘ordinary people’
(2013, p. 102), perhaps many of whom are ‘lifestylers, and expect either no or only
limited medium-term growth potential as measured by job creation expectations’
(Frederick, O’Connor, & Kuratko, 2013, p. 17). Schumpeter himself backed away
from his early ‘man of action’ typifiers (Knudsen, Becker, & Swedberg, 2011).

In an early review of the literature around entrepreneurial characteristics,
Cunningham and Lischeron name six different schools in the history of identifying
entrepreneurship, listed in Table 2.

The Cunningham-Lischeron table is only one way of thinking about
entrepreneurs. Frederick et al. look not at the entrepreneurs themselves but rather at
what motivates them, and suggest these principles ‘predict entrepreneurial activity’
(Frederick et al., 2013, p. 12) suggesting seven groupings, a group of four in the
‘macro’ segment, and a group of three in the ‘micro’ segment.
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Entrepreneurial model | Central focus | Behaviour and skills
--- | --- | ---
‘Great Person’ School | The entrepreneur has an intuitive ability — a sixth sense — and traits and instincts he/she is born with | Intuition, vigour, energy, persistence and self-esteem
Psychological Characteristics School | Entrepreneurs have unique values, attitudes and needs which drive them | Personal values, risk taking, need for achievement
Classical School | The central characteristic of entrepreneurial behavior is innovation | Innovation, creativity and discovery
Management School | Entrepreneurs are organizers of an economic venture; they are people who organize, own, manage and assume risk | Production, planning, people organizing, capitalization and budgeting
Leadership School | Entrepreneurs are leaders of people; they have the ability to adapt their style to the needs of people | Motivating, directing and leading
Intrapreneurship School | Entrepreneurial skills can be useful in complex organization, intrapreneurship is the development of independent units to create, market and expand services | Alertness to opportunities, maximizing decisions

Table 2: Models of entrepreneurship

Source: (Adapted from Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991, p. 47) Used with permission.

Frederick et al. suggest the four macro-motivators are those factors largely outside the control of the entrepreneur themselves and consist of the social and cultural, the financial/capital, the displacement, and the ecological schools of thought:

a) Social mores and community values are embedded in institutions as the main value shapers for the entrepreneur.

b) Funding sources and investors are the most influential shapers of the values and final focus of the entrepreneurial enterprise.

c) Entrepreneurs are ‘displaced’ by political, cultural or economic events so they move to new enterprises.
d) Ecological factors drive entrepreneurs to new understandings of human relationship to our island globe and the need for sustainable development.

The second group looks at the entrepreneur’s internal, or micro, controls, and comprises the entrepreneurial trait, the venture opportunity and the strategic planning schools:

(a) The entrepreneurial trait school examines certain personal characteristics such as innovativeness, tenacity and flexibility.
(b) The venture opportunity school analyses the opportunity options and the ‘right idea at the right time’ for the entrepreneur. This is sometimes associated with ‘the pathways principle’.
(c) The strategic planning school attributes success to planning and strategies around markets, people, products and resources.

Schumpeter also looked at individual motivational factors and soon abandoned attempted categorisation. This thesis will do likewise, as control, planning and ‘right idea right time’ aren’t possible for peace-builders in conflict situations. There is some validity in the personal characteristic approaches, as is shown in the research, but they point more to why and how peace-builders can continue, not how they got into peace-building in the first place. However, one aspect of personal characteristics that commends itself to this study is that of servant leadership, where both kenosis and entrepreneurial activity occur. Greenleaf’s seminal work on servant leadership (1977, 2008) is supported in many fields (Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010; Doraiswamy, 2013; Ebener & O’Connell, 2010; Hunt, 2002; M. E. O’Brien, 2011; Pekerti & Sendjaya, 2010; M. Scott, 2012), mainstreamed (Covey, 2006) and theorised (Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010). A servant leader ‘must empty or set aside those qualities which are detrimental to good leadership behavior’ (Ryken, 1984, pp. 18–19), a process similar to that of kenosis.

While recognising that there will be micro theory applicable to individual situations, the macro-school theorists offer a better theoretical base for this thesis in terms of addressing theme 3, which examines the reciprocal influences that the peace-builder and their community have on each other.
Another reason for pursuing a macro view of the entrepreneurial spirit is research that points to cultural factors influencing entrepreneurship. Some note the negative effect of Confucian thinking on entrepreneurship (Cheung & Yeo-chi king, 2004, p. 246; Young & Corzine, 2004, p. 80), even claiming that ‘Confucianism is hostile to entrepreneurship’ (Lam, Paltiel, & Shannon, 1994, p. 207). However, this blanket equating of dominant cultural concepts to behaviour needs caution because, as Lam et al. point out, these Confucian restrictions have also created a strong underground counter culture (1994, p. 208), which is where challenge and innovation are often found. Hofstede and later Lee and Peterson developed the idea of six cultural factors that could affect individual entrepreneurs (enumerated in Frederick et al., 2013, p. 19), but this is a Eurocentric and individualistic view on how entrepreneurial success is achieved and, as Morris, Davis and Allen point out, the ‘role of individuals versus groups or collectives in facilitating entrepreneurship in organizations may also be culture-bound’ (1994, p. 66).

This important theoretical concept for this thesis serves to shift from motivation focused on autonomy and financial gain to one focused on social capital is simply a movement along the well-researched and documented individualistic–collectivist continuum (M. H. Morris et al., 1994, p. 67). In other words, there is no distinct boundary between for-profit (individualistic) and social (collective) businesses, which reiterates the definition of business given above on page 53. This thesis therefore focuses on macro factors in the interviews of the peace-builders themselves but notes micro factors when they are expressed.

Frederick, O’Connor and Kuratko contend that business and social entrepreneurs are fundamentally different (2013, p. 5) because only one has profit as a motive. Contrary to that stance, this thesis takes the line that there is no difference in entrepreneurial spirit between for-profit and social entrepreneurs — even when accepting the validity of Dees, Mort and Marshall’s concept that social entrepreneurship has a fourfold aspect of ‘the virtuousness of their mission to create better social value, the unity of purpose in the face of complexity, an ability to recognise opportunities to create better social value for their clients and their
propensity for risk-taking, pro-activeness and innovativeness in decision-making’.

Following the definition for business, where both assets and returns can be
economic, social or psychological (mirroring somewhat Porter’s idea of the evolution
of capitalism into a ‘higher form of profit’ (Driver, 2012, p. 426), there is merely a
difference in the goals targeted and outputs sought and, certainly, a blurred boundary
between the two. The boundary is blurred not only by the continuum from ‘for-
profit’ to ‘social’ business. At the ‘for-profit’ end of the spectrum, well-practised
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or Creating Shared Value (CSV) (Driver,
2012) both seek to do social good. CSR creates profit that it donates to social
institutions to help build community infrastructure and social capital. Businesses that
give to allow parents to stay in hospital with their children, or entrepreneurs who
donate eponymous business school buildings to universities fit this characterisation.
Porter’s CSV model combines making a profit with seeking to do communal good.
Some community-run health centres and possibly even businesses that develop
renewable energy sources would fit this category.

Porter also notes the continuum between ‘a social organization doing social
good without a business model, without market principles’ through to the other end
of the spectrum, Corporate Social Responsibility, a for-profit business concentrating
on profit that does philanthropy — which he would call ‘pure giving’ (Driver, 2012,
p. 424). Faith communities are often at the social organisation end of this spectrum,
but peace-builders, many of whom are from faith communities, can’t easily be placed
at the social organisation end, as they have both a business model and a focus on
social good.

This thesis hereafter uses the term ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ to express those
entrepreneurial motivations that result in entrepreneurial action. The characteristics
of entrepreneurial spirit may be enhanced by trauma (Barendsen & Gardner, 2004)
and adapt to their social context (Valliere, 2008, p. 173). In motivational terms,
influences like the virtuousness of an entrepreneur’s mission may be important (R. S.
Marshall, 2011, p. 184), or the importance of being able to juggle multiple
accountabilities — including ecology (Thomas Lawrence, Phillips, & Tracy, 2012, pp. 320-321). To be successful, however, entrepreneurs need to influence the behaviour of others to achieve leadership and/or organisation goals (Danley, 2010, p. 2; Gladwell, 2002, 2008). Part of the skill set to be investigated therefore — in terms of peace-builders and their similarities with entrepreneurials — is the ability to influence or leverage others but not control them (White, 2012, p. 2), an aspect that informs Themes 2 and 3 in this thesis.

The place of women as entrepreneurs and peace-builders receives special attention, although not all women social entrepreneurs are peace-loving (Gaudiani & Burnett, 2011, p. 21). Women generally outnumber men post-conflict, they ‘bear the greater burdens of post-war recovery’ (Pankhurst, 2008, p. 32), and the focus on women and conflict in the UN setting has led to the orthodoxy that women ‘are “natural” peace-makers and peace-builders’ (Kouvo & Levine, 2008, p. 364). Given the historically early (and often counter-cultural) female entrepreneurship (Calpino, 2012; B. Koehler, 2011, p. 96) and the future need for peacemakers noted in writing like ‘The Clash of Civilizations’ (Huntington, 2010), a deliberate inclusion of women is necessary in the present study. This is particularly so if those women have helped maintain a view of the world in which people are more than simply mechanistic neuronal beings (Staune, 2005; Verstraeten, 2002). Therefore, one third of the interviewees in this research are women.

**Entrepreneurs and faith-based motivation**

The reciprocal influence between the faith community and the social entrepreneur clearly has some efficacy in integrating new and challenging personal experiences (Peres, Moreira-Almeida, Nasello, & Koenig, 2007), and somewhere between 87% and 93% of social entrepreneurs have a form of religious adherence (J. O'Brien & Palmer, 2007, p. 17) in a world where religiosity is increasing (see the World Bank statistics in Figure 12, page 81). Adding to this discourse on faith and entrepreneurship is clearly both relevant and important.

Williams notes the differences between those driven by profit motives and those more motivated by social goals, and joins the growing chorus of those
questioning the hegemony of profit-driven capitalism (C. C. Williams, 2007). Strangely, Williams ignores the religious aspect, saying, ‘For the first time since the Reformation, there are no longer any significant oppositions — that is, systematic rival outlooks — within the thought-world of the West; and scarcely any on a world scale either, if we discount religious doctrines as largely inoperative archaisms’ (C. C. Williams, 2007, p. 28). Western scholars often seem to overlook religion and faith as a powerful motivational force, despite evidence to the contrary.

Business schools (with their main focus seemingly preparing people for corporate environments) and other training institutions began to show interest in social entrepreneurship from the mid-1980s (Brock, Kim, & Davis, 2008, p. 111). While responding to what they perceive as a rising tide of increased focus on social issues in business, and a desire for a more meaningful engagement with the sector (T. L. Miller, Wesley, & Williams, 2012, p. 349), few give faith and faith communities’ considerations space in their curricula. Personal competencies seem more important for study — perhaps spurred on in that by the social entrepreneurs themselves (2012, pp. 361–366). These institutions apparently consider ethics and philosophy to be sufficient coverage (Cornelius, Wallace, & Tassabehji, 2007).

Bandura notes that ‘most human behavior is learned observationally through modelling’ (Bingham & Conner, 2010, p. 10). Bingham and Connor also show how virtual learning can put people into ‘real’ situations by providing ‘immersive environments’ (Bingham & Conner, 2010, p. 225) in order to achieve that modelling. A number of faith communities model the kind of social involvement they expect from adherents through ‘making disciples’ (followers) where teaching on ‘this is how I should act’ supersedes ‘this is what I need to believe’. Lived example and mentoring are the key tools for developing social transformation skills. Involvement with care of the poor, advocacy for the oppressed and disadvantaged, and the search for mechanisms to achieve social justice are being reintegrated into seminary curricula and college-level programmes as the process of what Cox typifies as moving back from ‘belief’ to ‘faith’ accelerates in the 21st century (2009).
Ideas may produce effects in economic systems. Exposure to the effects of poverty and marginalisation often provide the motivational drive of those rising to leadership roles in social entrepreneurship. Bolton and Thompson discuss William and Catherine Booth and the work of the Salvation Army, noting that ‘their trigger had been the poverty and social deprivation they had witnessed’ (2004, p. 191). Anita Roddick of the The Body Shop had her pursuit of social and environmental change enhanced by visiting ‘third-world’ countries and ‘living native’ (Bolton & Thompson, 2004, p. 193). Bolton and Thomson (2004, pp. 189–208), while listing categories of social entrepreneurs and noting the religious nature of many of the characters, do not examine or even speculate on the influence that immersion in faith communities might have had on the entrepreneurial activity.

Bolton notes that the two founders of Aspire, an organisation dedicated to finding work for homeless people, were both raised by parents living in a Methodist Theological College (2004), but he does little to explore what specific factors might have inspired that choice — the beliefs themselves or the believing community. Plaskoff does a little better, linking Sarah Harris’ mission trips with her interest in social entrepreneurship (Plaskoff, 2012, p. 433). Harris, the CEO of Incite, a US$7.5 million firm she pioneered, says: ‘During these trips, we created relationships with local people, overcame language and cultural barriers, and worked together to improve conditions’ (Plaskoff, 2012, p. 434). She points to this as being seminal in developing her entrepreneurial enterprise.

This researcher applauds that the links entrepreneurs have with religion, faith and faith communities are explored in considerable depth in works like that edited by Dana (2010), and hopes this thesis adds to such research. Dana observes that to investigate entrepreneurship ‘as if it were an isolated phenomenon — derived from the self’ risks missing the environmental factors (like religion) that cause the kind of differences that see 1.8% of Filipino immigrants and 12.4% of Greek immigrants in Canada being self-employed (2010, p. 2). In the introduction, Dana further develops the theme that it is not just the religious beliefs of a faith community but the social/psychological support that faith community exudes which affects entrepreneurial endeavor, and in the penultimate chapter, with Godfrey Baldacchino,
points out how enduring and pervasive these religious effects can be (Dana, 2010, pp. 401–417).

Lawrence (2012, p. 420) notes that social entrepreneurs need to manage two challenges: the risk of losing their dual focus and becoming either purely social or purely commercial, and the risk of becoming mired in the conflict between those representing the commercial and social sides of the operation. In this latter regard, Smith and Woodworth (2012) point to the desirability of skills in accepting, differentiating, and integrating competing demands. In a corporate business this involves convincing a group of shareholders, with possibly very divergent priorities, to change direction.

The advantage of the social entrepreneur having their community of faith as their shareholding group becomes clear when reflecting on these two challenges and the skills needed to navigate them. When entrepreneurial leaders and most shareholders share the same social values, the inevitable discussion about the relative importance of the commercial and social sides of the enterprise sees all participants approaching from a similar standpoint, and consensus outcomes are more likely.

**The faith community around an entrepreneur**

There are a number of reasons for looking at faith leaders and their communities in terms of social entrepreneurship, one of which being that organised religion could be typified as a social business and, in some prosperity-gospel settings, even a ‘for-profit’ enterprise. Three further reasons are enumerated below.

Firstly, Christian religion has been using business as a means to support social change for at least 2000 years. With what has been called ‘tent-making’ mission, the Christian Apostle Paul used his tent-making business to support his religious/social activism (Metzger B. et al, 1989). And despite disagreement over the processes involved, Islam was spread to Indonesia and other nations by entrepreneurial traders (Damais, 1968; Ricklefs, 1991). While Paul’s tent-making could be classified as CSR, it should be noted that the tents themselves provided shelter for persecuted minorities forced to migrate, and so solved a pressing social
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problem of the time — a first-century emergency housing crisis. Contemporary secular interest in social entrepreneurs was preceded by a revival in more holistic tent-making mission activity (J. Cox, 1997), largely brought about because of political impediments to mission movements (Yamamori, 1987). It appears that a substantial part of social entrepreneurial innovation has been driven by those with a passionate interest in sharing their religious insights in nations restricting political and religious freedom and generally lagging in human rights legislation.

Secondly, the religious sector has methodically critiqued the consumptive capitalist system over many years, presenting philosophical and practical alternatives. All four of the following examples express religious doubt about the benefits of consumptive capitalism:

- Pope Benedict’s *Caritas in Veritate*, which paints a vision of ethical capitalism and a middle way between capitalism and socialism (2009).
- Ahmad’s *Islamic Perspective on Global Capitalism* (2004), which is particularly wary of capitalism’s hegemony and its tendency for the ‘exploitation of the weak by the powerful’ (2004).
- Donahue’s unpacking of the Buddhist critique of ‘value’ in her article ‘Suffering free markets’, where she observes its many similarities to Marx’s observations on the inference of value through representative forms that prove to be largely ephemeral (2014).
- Schultet and Ashcroft’s Protestant Evangelical work, *Jubilee manifesto*, on the importance of relationship rather than material as the basis for an equitable and contented society (2005).

Belk quotes the Bhagavad-Gita as one of the most poetic critics, saying: ‘Pondering on objects of the senses gives rise to attraction; from attraction grows desire, desire flames to passion, passion breeds recklessness; and then betrayed memory lets noble purpose go, and saps the mind till purpose, mind and man are all undone’ (Belk, 1983, p. 514). This sounds very like the build-up to violent conflict. It is faith communities that have envisioned and implemented, usually in small scale, the most coherent alternatives to capitalism in its several forms, subverting aspects of it through refusing to charge interest, giving the means of production to the workers and deliberately running some businesses at a loss because of the huge social benefits perceived. Exploring the reciprocal effect on the social entrepreneurs of people from
faith communities helps understand the soil from which the flower of these critiques emerges.

Thirdly, social entrepreneurs manipulate parts or all of the pervading capitalistic economic system to achieve social goals outside the purview of normal capitalism. Vasakaria notes that the definition of social entrepreneurship has evolved in meaning from ‘being an act of philanthropy to [an] innovative business model’ (2008, p. 34). She defines social entrepreneurs as people who ‘identify the problems in society, trace the root causes of the problems and endeavour to solve them […] applying their entrepreneurial abilities to bring about social change’ (2008, p. 32). This definition could be applied to most faith communities.

**Entrepreneur defined**

Taking into account the discussion above, this thesis defines an entrepreneur as ‘One who takes an opportunity with the resources they have to mould what most others fail to see, or see as worthless or impossible, into something of sustainable value where both assets and returns generated can be economic, social or psychological.’ This definition deliberately conflates for-profit and social entrepreneurship, seeing the only difference in the two as being the form of profit generated.

**Defining reconciliation**

Reconciliation is often defined as something like the Oxford dictionary’s ‘restoration of friendly relations’ (Wallace, Chaib, Harris, & Mayhew, 2017), which says little about the process required. Galtung notes that it often requires a third party, and is ‘a process aimed at putting an end to conflict between two parties. It includes a closure of hostile acts, a process of healing and rehabilitation of both perpetrators and victims’ (Galtung, 2005, p. 222). Such reconciliation will ultimately lead to *shalom* in the community. Galtung continues in the article to give some strategies for achieving reconciliation, and while several seek justice in a judicial way, what he stresses is the kind of justice that leads to restoration, whether through being able to lay responsibility on ‘circumstances’, seeking restitution with apology, or outright forgiveness. Galtung notes that judicial processes usually involve those
committing the violence, like dropping bombs or shelling civilians, but seldom those who ordered the crime in the first place. Such processes have little effect on reconciliation being achieved.

Lederach and Appleby also pick up on the theme of justice as part of reconciliation, noting that reconciliation is synonymous with ‘truth commissions’ in many countries, while talking about peace-building on a macro level. Taking the best of reconciliation traditions from religions like Islam, Judaism, and Christianity, they suggest weaving these ancient models into modern concepts like human rights, democracy and law. They propose that reconciliation is the restoration of right relationships, and reference shalom in this (Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, & Welzel, 2008a), although tending to focus this on political processes.

**Reconciliation defined**

This thesis takes these proposals and others concerning reconciliation and defines reconciliation as ‘the process that ends violence, creates a healing environment and works towards a state of shalom.’

**Defining kenosis**

If for-profit and social entrepreneurs are pursuing a return on investment, albeit somewhat different returns, what is it that makes them different and, in particular, what is it that makes peace-builders so different from entrepreneurs generally? To answer this question, attention in the thesis now turns to kenosis.

*Kenosis*, which appears in the verbal *eskenōsen*, where the writer of Philippians 2:5–11 (who is probably quoting one of the first hymns of the Christian church) refers to Jesus Christ’s ‘self-emptying’ (*kenosis*) of power, rights and possessions as God. *Kenosis* has been described as a joyous, kind and loving attitude that is willing to give up selfish desires and to make sacrifices on behalf of others for the common good and the glory of God (Ellis, 2001, p. 108). This has profound implications not only for Christians’ ethical behaviour but also for the construction of a Christian worldview, because at the very core of God is a self-sacrificing love seeking to draw in creation as a partner.
Kenosis takes us into the realm of metaphysics because it relates to a basic understanding of the meaning and purpose of existence, the possible ‘first cause’ of the universe, but it does revolve around ‘provable’ evidence. Somewhere between 87% and 93% of the world perceive reality based on religious adherence (J. O'Brien & Palmer, 2007, p. 15) and many of the people interviewed for this thesis are people of faith or faith leaders. Metaphysics also begins to answer the questions about humanity’s teleological trajectory, which emerges as an important motivational component in the peace-builders interviewed. Schramm says that there is ‘no way to escape “metaphysics”’ (2013, p. 827) and that those who talk of post-metaphysics simply use the word in a different way. Even Kant, who proposed a ‘purposeless purpose’ at a purely metaphysical level as he sought to provide a non-religious basis for ethics, holds to a teleological purpose at a biological level (Quarfood, 2006, p. 372).

A physical world built on kenosis is not a straightforward concept. The same raw data concerning evolutionary change produces divergent interpretations and contrary worldviews (Dawkins, 2006; Polkinghorne, 2001a; Stove, 1995; Templeton & Harper, 2005). Dawkins’ view of the selfish gene seems to espouse a world of competition and conquest, while Polkinghorne’s understanding of that same genetic behaviour develops a concept of a universe built on sacrificial love. Sacrificial love and kenosis support Yunus’ theory that ‘Real human beings that all of us know will be delighted to create businesses for selfless purposes’ (Yunus, 2010, p. 237). Clearly, if Dawkins is right, then the hope of being able to identify, then persuade, entrepreneurial capitalists that holistic development based on using their skills to peace-build is largely pointless. If Polkinghorne is right though, there is a valid scientific perspective for moving forward with the research, tentatively adopting ‘the understanding of evolutionary process as corresponding to creation being allowed to make itself, [and acknowledging it as] clearly kenotic in its character’ (Polkinghorne, 2001a, p. 95). The chaos we observe in sub-atomic particles still produces particles ‘relating’ to each other (Polkinghorne, 2001a, p. 99). This is a relational world, not a mechanistic one, and if human beings are indeed ‘made in the image of God’ then we, too, are made for kenosis. To act self-sacrificially is thus to be divine.
This thesis suggests that an effective path to achieving the changes needed in how we do business for the good of all is by developing an attitude in harmony with the created order, that of *kenosis*. Danley puts such achievement of change in the realm of divine intervention (Danley, 2010, p. 53), but this thesis suggests that ‘divine’ *kenosis* gives us the power to co-create. In that sense redemption is in our own hands. The theological implication that ‘No longer can God be held to be totally and directly responsible for all that happens’ (Polkinghorne, 2001a, p. 95) has important implications in terms of how capable entrepreneurial people are encouraged in the business of peace-building, and in terms of the fatalism of some faith-based worldview structures.

Cox suggests that, along with a resurgence in religion and the ‘death of fundamentalism’ (being seen now in the decline of many fundamentalist denominations in the USA and also in the reaction in the Islamic world to groups like ISIS), the third and most important change in religious profile this century is ‘a profound change in the elemental nature of religiousness’ (H. Cox, 2009, p. 1). This new trend in the understanding of the nature of the divine, combined with the growth in religiosity, marks a seismic shift in the discussion around worldview, and may be related, in part, to a growing understanding of the implications of chaos theory. Taking worldview and faith to be closely related, this thesis contends that the worldview, or faith, of the entrepreneur determines the direction in which entrepreneurs take their considerable talents. Further, if worldview is malleable, then some ideas may emerge from researching those entrepreneurs that would contribute to rethinking the focus of business for a more sustainable future that builds on social capital.

There are multiple real-life positive, sacrificial and even self-emptying models that point to *kenosis*. Missionaries, aiming to do good in more remote parts of the world, packed their belongings in coffins as they sailed overseas, facing an average lifespan of just two years in malaria-infected West Africa (Diara, Diara, & Nche, 2013, p. 91). Islam has a similar early affirmation of self-sacrifice for peace and a better future in the *hijrah*, or migration, from Makkah to Madinah, demonstrating ‘early evidence that Islam commanded neither passive martyrdom nor
suicidal resistance’ (Casewit, 1998, p. 110), with the intent being an expression of faith (Casewit, 1998, p. 114). Pierre points to the difference between martyrdom and suicide (2015), but acts of suicide that could also be called martyrdom, like self-immolation to protest Chinese occupation (Wong & Yardley, 2013), are noted. Renunciation is still very much part of the Indic traditions, even today. ‘Hindu sannyasins and sadhus, Buddhist monks and nuns, Jain sadhus and sadhvis are those who stand apart from, although in relation to, householder society’ (Eck, 2013, p. 364), having emptied themselves of possessions and seeking a path empty of desire. These also might be typified as a form of kenosis.

The context in which this self-sacrificing now occurs, however, is the change in science since Weber. After 400 years of Newtonian mechanistic universes of wheels and levers of certainty, chaos theory has bulldozed the sterile landscape of hierarchy and the tyranny of linear processes, allowing the fauna of uncertainty and the flora of poetic imagination to emerge. Adam Smith’s seminal works (Adam Smith, 1952, 2009), first published in 1759 and 1776, represent some of the first applications of Newton’s ideas to business (Diemer & Guillemin, 2011). This modern change in scientific understanding, while taking its time to have a significant impact in business process as well as theology, has profoundly affected the purpose and nature of entrepreneurial enterprise and our understanding of how the world operates. Those at the forefront of change in business purpose have signalled this already (Hock, 1999, 2005; Katz, 1997; Ki-Moon, 2013; McCarter & White, 2013; Putnik & van Eijnatten, 2004; Senge, 2006; Wheatley, 1999; Yunus, 2010). Some prefer to maintain the more ‘structured’ path to a sustainable future, maintaining that CST (Chaordic Systems Thinking) fails every scientific validity test (Emery, 2011, p. 401) or inadequately addresses the issues of asymmetric power (Caldwell, 2012). However, this thesis shows that peace-builders tend to give power away, and seek reconciliation by encouraging truth-telling and forgiveness.

**Kenosis defined**

Kenosis, as a key focus in this thesis, is defined as ‘the willingness to sacrifice rights and power for the good of others, winning community shalom by sacrificial love.’
Defining worldview


Postmodernity has rejected scientific claims to objectivity and rationality, and this researcher likewise centres much of the concept of worldview on that of the social and existential factors affecting perceptions of reality. Variations in spiritual (and possibly ‘ideological’) structures, as well as culturally shaping historical events, seem good explanations of why people and ‘peoples’ (social/cultural groups) apprehend reality with such diversity.

Worldview defined

This thesis holds that worldview, in its broadest terms, is ‘a collection of beliefs about life and the universe held by a person or group’. This is why worldview might be a critical factor in how the characteristics and motivations of peace-builders are formed and expressed in action. It also explains why this word is used in this thesis as worldview/values. A person’s values give them a worldview. Their worldview shapes their values.
Worldview and faith

*Figure 12* shows that the global impact of faith is not going to diminish in the foreseeable future. Much more research needs to be pursued on the positive and negative effects faith has in important areas of life like business. Weber’s writing (2008) highlighted the intersection of faith (as an expression of worldview) and business as key to explaining economic difference, although today these beliefs are seen as mediated, producing pluralistic outcomes (Schramm, 2013, p. 836) and his ideas of social science inquiry being value-free are now largely disputed (Lekka-Kowalik, 2010). Haar and Wolfensohn (2011) have pushed the integration of faith into mainstream social and economic development understanding and Cao (2007, p. 51), Minami et al. (2011, p. 52) and others (Li & Bond, 2010; Madsen, 1998) show economic action emerging from faith. Marx’s ‘opiate’ factor (Marx, 1844) shows faith as a worldview can also be blinding. Parris (2008), a convinced atheist, says ‘I truly believe Africa needs God,’ acknowledging that faith transforms worldview and impacts community life and economics. Therefore, attention must be paid to the effect of worldview on all of life — herein particularly focused on business and peace-building.

In this thesis the concepts of worldview and faith are not used synonymously as some authors do (Glanzer & Talbert, 2005; Utter & Storey, 2007), although they are clearly related. Scientific worldview can also be ‘an implicit dogma […] approach[ing] the level of religious belief’ (Øyen, Vaage, & Lund-Olsen, 2012, p. 18). Sometimes this occurs because of the error noted by Whitehead as ‘the fallacy of misplaced concreteness’ (Rohrer, 2013; Whitehead, 1938, p. 51). This thesis assumes faith impacts worldview for at least 87% of the population generally (J. O’Brien & Palmer, 2007, p. 15), so the faith aspect is addressed in this thesis.

Kits firstly notes that ‘literature dealing directly with the influence of faith/worldview on approaches to development is surprisingly modest in scope’ (2006, p. 6). Partly true in 2006, the literature on the subject since 2000 has continued to expand, as demonstrated in the bibliographies of some recent books, theses and journal articles (Baltutis, 2012; Berger, 2009; Rees, 2011), although Vander Zaag demonstrates that the research lacks an even geographical spread.
Berger (2009, p. 69) notes that Marx, Freud, Durkheim and Weber and the ‘death of God’ thinking so prevalent in the 1950s and 60s were all proved wrong by the empirical evidence, and this was not restricted to the West. Fauzia (2013, p. 215) records growing interest in zakat (the giving of alms) in Indonesia, also noting that the faith/worldview it produces is not ‘in vacuo’ but is shaped by the political, economic and historical forces around it, meaning that worldview, therefore, cannot be regarded as static. Luetge’s (2013) 1581-page book has only one chapter directly on faith (Sørensen & Spoelstra, 2013), but it includes many contributions using worldviews and philosophies that arise from faith-based understandings.

Kits states that interpretations of the effect of faith, and its associated worldviews, on development range from adding to, being alternative to, or permeating all aspects of the development business (2006, pp. 6–18). The World Bank, too, takes the effect of faith on economic development seriously. It initiated, under Wolfensohn’s leadership, the World Faiths Development Dialogue (WFDD), which continues in Georgetown University’s Berkley Center for Peace, Religion and World Affairs (WFDD, 2013 b) with multiple publications (WFDD, 2013 a), and also in the World Bank’s own Development Dialogue on Values and Ethics (DDVE), providing many reports and findings (World Bank, 2013).

*Figure 12* from Quentin Wodon (2016) is plotted using data ‘from the World Values Surveys, ‘with different start/end year depending on the country, based on longest stretch available for each country. The longer blue line is the 45° line that would represent no change between years The data were an index of religiosity measured in both years’ (Wodon, 2016). The data reflects what Berger (2009), Cox (2009) and many others are saying. What the WVS data shows is that, despite the sometimes rapid decline of religion and faith in the West, religiosity, as a measure of commitment to a faith and organised faith community, has globally actually increased slightly — shown by the regression line diverging upwards from 45 degrees. This is particularly pertinent to the economic effect of peace-building, where most actors seem to be working from a faith perspective, and the basis of many conflicts is often ascribed to religion.
Management plans relying solely on secular technical business models often come up short on achieving sustainable and transformational futures for the target community (K. Marshall, 2005). Bradley (2009) examines the desire of certain faith communities to convert people, without seeming to recognise that conversion or ‘repentance’ (whose roots are actually the Greek word *metanoia* — a change of heart and mind) is fundamental to the business of genuine development and genuine peace-building too. Social and economic lift is associated with some conversion (McGavran, 1988), and has several sociological explanations (Shah R. and T., 2008).
Studies on prior beliefs and economic outcome support Weber’s basic thesis of the importance of belief to the entrepreneurial spirit and its effect on economic outcomes (Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2006a) and peace-building too. Others, like Adely (2007), are considering how the education of women — as part of the development process — impacts their faith and the construct of their worldview. The need to include women as a particular group in this study is compelling because women are often the ones working hardest for peace (Butler, 2013; Freedman, 2002; Mubarak, 2002).

Summary

This thesis defined business as ‘A communally integrated set of activities and assets that is capable of being conducted and managed for the purpose of providing a return where both assets and returns can be economic, social or psychological’. Combining that definition of business with that of an entrepreneur as ‘One who takes an opportunity with the resources they have to mould what most others fail to see or see as worthless or impossible, into something of sustainable value where both assets and returns generated can be economic, social or psychological’ makes clear the intent of this thesis. Peace-builders are part of a group of entrepreneurs who are in business with a particular focus. Given the definitions and the background on the terms in the thesis title, this researcher seeks to determine how closely aligned the peace-builders interviewed are with entrepreneurs and their general characteristics, leadership styles and reciprocal communal influences. This is achieved, firstly through some self-reflection on the researcher’s positionality, and then through examining the social theories on which this research stands.
Chapter 3: Positionality

Introduction

How someone judged the success or otherwise of ‘Little Boy’ on that August morning in 1945 depended very much on where they were at the time. For the scientists back in the USA who had worked for years at turning theory into practice, it was vindication and elation; for the crew of Enola Gay, the aircraft dropping the bomb, it was an awesome sight; for those on the ground who survived the blast, it was unimaginable horror. Perception depends very much on the vantage point, the positionality of the observer.

Reflexivity and positionality

Reflexivity enables positionality. Reflexivity has been described in many ways, and Pillow’s list (2015, p. 419) of some of the terms used is helpful, including ‘ethical mindfulness’, a ‘knee-jerk reaction’, a ‘picturing of ourselves’, ‘embodied engagement’, an ‘act of labor’, or ‘dialogic performance’. Postmodernity and the death of the metanarrative makes the understanding of a researcher’s standpoint more important than it has been traditionally. The dispassionate and distanced researcher is a thing of the social sciences past, and the special edition of Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies devoted to exploring the issue of ‘narrating one’s self in ethnography’ shows just some of the ways
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in which reflexivity can be played out in ethnographic research. ‘Reflexivity has emerged as an omnipresent theoretical concept and methodological strategy diverse in meaning and practice’ (Berry & Clair, 2011, p. 95) and ‘the starting point for gaining new perspectives’ (Lundgren & Poel, 2016, p. 3). Reflexivity gives researchers insights as to their own standpoint, the position from which they view the field of endeavour.

Like St Joan of Arc, this researcher has debated at length with his internal voices (and with his supervisors) about whether this thesis should be written in the first-person or the third. Ultimately a third-person voice was chosen to slow the narrative and to preserve a more analytical and dispassionate stance, to counter the closeness this researcher had to the topic and some of the people involved.

Pio and Singh (2015) note that some areas of research (like that of interviewing the survivors of acid attacks) might result in issues of researcher harm, and that researcher resilience in this area is largely unexplored. This researcher is aware that seeing piles of bones, viewing exhumed bodies, examining fresh machete wounds and talking with people like Frida (Gushumba, 2007), along with interviewing the peace-builders in this thesis, sometimes brings a sense of impotent rage that humans could treat each other with such disrespect, dismissiveness, callousness and inhumanity. This researcher knows from experience that what he has done in work on the field, advocacy and support for peace-builders is but the proverbial ‘drop in a bucket’ in terms of changing the circumstances for the victims of violence and oppression or making the task any easier for those who work tirelessly on in this area, and this also increases the frustrations.

Just writing this paragraph brings back to this researcher’s mind the act of walking around a school building in Rwanda with a peace-builder while looking at over 200 bodies. They’d been exhumed from the grounds of the school, where 50,000 people died over the course of 3 days, hacked to death by ‘neighbours and friends’. The world watched in silence. Writing it down brings back the smells associated with that day. The flashes of memory of babies still in their mothers’ arms, heads with spear holes in them and bodies with limbs obviously hacked from
them click in the head like a rapidly moving, silent black-and-white movie. These memories sit uncomfortably in the mind of this researcher, who fears that adults and kids he has laughed with and shared food with in another part of the world, where concentration camps, government-approved violence, displacement and trafficking go ‘unseen’ by the rest of the world, may suffer the same grisly fate as those in Rwanda.

There in the steaming heat of Myanmar’s city of Sitwee, where he interviews more peace-builders who share his fears and work for a very different outcome, these thoughts hang like a dark cloud. They resurface in occasional flashes of anger with inanimate objects and the desire to smash something out of sheer frustration and helplessness. As Pio and Singh have noted:

> Although organisations and ethics committees make copious efforts to perform due diligence on the ethics applications they receive, there often tends to be greater emphasis on participant safety, with intricacies of the actual research context often left to the ‘good judgment’ of the researcher. However, the ‘duty of care’ extends not only to participants but also to researchers. This becomes even more pertinent for qualitative research contexts, which involve personal interactions with participants and constantly balancing the needs of those affected by the research (E. Pio & Singh, 2015, p. 228)

Although dealing with such painful stories and impossible situations was addressed in debriefs and spiritual direction in the years before the research for this thesis began, the question of his own resilience in this area remains with this researcher. He had thought that as ‘time heals all wounds’ and that as the years went by these things would fade. The mere act of writing about them, however, has seen them resurface freshly with quite negative thoughts and emotions. He now accepts that this will be how it is until he dies and he must, and can, live with it.

**Four lessons on positionality learnt from reflexivity**

Firstly, what you see depends almost entirely on where you stand and from where you look. Every researcher brings their unique combination of genetic inheritance, communal history and individual experience, which gives the researcher
inherent bias. Recognising that you have bias as a researcher is one thing; effectively ameliorating that bias is a completely different problem.

Secondly, research occurs in the context of shared space and experience. While the researcher may not be involved in the actual experiences, they absorb something of the events while recording the reflections on that experience. Sharing coffee and listening to a young woman describe in amazingly dispassionate terms being rounded up with her family, being led from her home to a ditch outside of the village, seeing her mother, father and siblings beaten and hacked to death, being macheted herself and thrown into the pit as dead with her dead or dying relatives, and being buried alive (Gushumba, 2007, p. 14) did not leave this researcher unmoved or unchanged.

Thirdly, learning is not unidirectional. Several of the interviewees in this research asked for transcripts after completion of the thesis in order to further their own insights as to why they thought and acted as they did. A researcher has the opportunity to be midwife to new insights and even actions of those they research. Statements such as ‘As a poet I like to tell you they were very comprehensive questions’ and Jim’s comment ‘Thank you, thank you also for helping, I mean, people don’t ask you these questions, and that’s helped me also think about some things in a new and different way. I appreciate that, it’s actually [. . .] it’s not a one-sided value thing, is it, when you’re asked in a safe environment, to open into some areas.’ Another interviewee put it this way: ‘I don’t think about this kind of thing in my everyday life [. . .]. That’s why, now when you are talking about that, my experience is answering you automatically, because I learn in action.’ Sharing space and making inquiries sparked that reflection.

Fourthly, there will be unfinished business. Interviewees want to continue to contemplate their motivations, practices and hopes for outcomes as part of their ongoing learning. While interviewing, this researcher can attest to several serendipitous moments of theoretical understandings being made alive by the stories of the interviewees, and the process of transcribing and then coding those reflections furthered that process. Even when the thesis is finished, this researcher’s thinking on
peace-builders and on the characteristics, practices and worldviews of the researched and this researcher, will not be static. Positionality is not a fixed perspective. Instead, it is more like a movable feast where morsels of insight and meals of understanding affect the palate, making tasting in the future an enhanced experience.

**The stages of life for this researcher**

This researcher has what would generally be termed a ‘Christian’ worldview but, given that this worldview embraces Christians as disparate as George Bush and Mother Teresa, some narrowing of that concept needs to be completed before then integrating that idea with an established academic philosophical approach. For this researcher, a Christian worldview takes seriously the words of Jesus and their implications, which suggest that God is on the side of the poor and that the justice God expects is not retributive but reconciliatory, leading to *shalom* and peaceful well-being. The Nazareth manifesto of Luke 4: 16–21, in the Bible, is therefore for this researcher the guiding light of attitudes to others and how life is to be apprehended, understood and lived.

While this researcher believes there is an external singular reality, he believes that singular reality is inaccessible to the limited apprehension of the human mind and therefore that his apprehensions of reality have been shaped by the experiences in his background. The next part of the thesis details those experiences and reflects on how they affect his worldview.

**In the beginning: Carpentry, engineering and science**

This researcher began his working life helping his father, a self-employed builder, while still at school. It was a very small-scale business employing only two other people at its peak. A job ‘well done’ and completed by ‘the sweat of the brow’ was called ‘honest toil’ and often affirmed. Both parents had been children during ‘the depression’, so the oft-taught values of frugality and justice for working people were foundational. The ill-feeling generated by the loss of the family farm through corporate foreclosure well before his birth has probably shaped the kind of ‘presumed guilty’ attitude this researcher has when interpreting particular corporate actions. The church he attended during his school years instilled in its young people a
worldview built around frugality and a Protestant work ethic. Independence and self-reliance under the care of a largely benign and just God who rewarded effort and frowned on idleness was the order of the day.

It was also during those school years that this researcher thought deeply about teleological issues (although not knowing that was what they were) and, rejecting the teaching of his early childhood, decided that life was largely purposeless, that the heavens were basically ‘brass’ and so, philosophically at least, wavered between following a life of hedonistic pleasure and ending it all with some sure-fire action that guaranteed death. This was largely brought about by a crisis of faith around the nature of God. The God of his church’s Christian cultural belief who, with his divine puppeteering strings of control, blessed those who loved him and brought sorrow and travail on the atheist and unmindful sinner, was not an evidentially supportable concept. His received notions of God as belief in inherent justice were swept away by his observation of the success of greed, selfishness and oppression displayed by the rich and powerful, and he became an atheist to such a God. It was an existential crisis probably typical of many faith-immersed teenagers.

However, one morning during his mid-teens, in the early morning mists, as he sat on a mountain contemplating those two simple options of hedonism or death, an intense spiritual experience resulted in a profound shift of perspective — a shift to become ‘other oriented’. To say that everything changed as a result of that decision scarcely covers the profound shift in worldview and values that resulted. Nature sparkled for the first time in years, people’s stories and perspectives became fascinating, and life made sense since it had a purpose. The overwhelming feeling that the universe was actually designed in love and that, in the end, love, grace and forgiveness would win over greed, hatred and violence was palpable. Experience has taught this researcher that, for him and millions of others, numinous encounter transforms values and worldview and re-orients actions for end results that others may not see as possible. In Christian circles this transformation is called conversion or ‘being born again’; in other religions it might be called ‘enlightenment’ — *moksha* in Hinduism, *bodhi* in Buddhism and, perhaps the nearest equivalent in non-Sufi Islam, the *Hadj*. 
This numinous experience was followed by three years of a largely wasted university education, but they resulted in this researcher becoming a teacher of physics and maths at a Roman Catholic boys’ high school in the 1970s. Notions of time, space and energy, and the largely unsurprising physical laws governing them, were interesting and beginning to be challenged at this time. The impact of Lorenz’s paper (1963) about the inability of mathematical equations to accurately predict weather was still in nascent mode. And while Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle was well documented, the impact of chaos theory was still in the butterfly-flapping stage, the cyclonic storms of the scientific paradigmatic revolution accompanying its exploration being as yet unrealised. This began the research of chaos theory and its Christian theological counterpart, kenosis, outlined in Chapter 2.

The experience of teaching science also opened up a much more interesting field of study: the pupils themselves. What made these young men, who could be incredibly thoughtful and even self-sacrificing one moment, so thoughtless, selfish and greedy the next? The most obvious path of exploration into the perplexities of human existence was, for a committed Protestant working in a Catholic school, the field of theology. Over time this developed into what some in religious circles would describe as a ‘call’ or vocation. This process was the growing awareness and certainty that genuine fulfilment in life is best achieved by pursuing a particular path which, while not tightly ordained or predestined, has certain parameters to it. However, the early and brief flirtation with the ‘hard’ or ‘physical’ sciences left its mark in this researcher’s desire to see qualitative research supported, where possible, by data gathered in a quantitative manner.

**Through theology**

Theology asks all the big questions of life about the meaning of existence. This researcher’s five years of theological study meant not only covering those fields of ontology, teleology, epistemology and hermeneutics but also psychology (particularly in relation to counselling), philosophy, sociology and comparative religion. This was in addition to the standard areas of biblical studies, church history and Greek and Hebrew. The pastoral leadership course entailed reflection on one’s own life and examination of the inhibitors of ‘personal growth’ — a process called
spiritual formation. Spiritual formation has the habit of confronting some of the neophyte’s most deeply held convictions and the events and influencers that have shaped them. The emergent spiritual maturity allows the developed soul to better cope with contradiction and paradox, evolution and diversity, complexity and mystery in one’s own, and others’, lives. These various phases of faith that circle around spiritual maturity are well described by McLaren (2011).

Theology may be regarded as a course of study that encourages the exploration of all that is wonderful, awesome and mysterious in the world and in our relational interactions with it and others, but in scientific ways. Anselm, an Archbishop of Canterbury in the 11th century, put it succinctly and well when he said that theology was ‘faith seeking understanding’ or ‘an active love of God seeking deeper knowledge of God’ (T. Williams, 2007). That kind of knowledge, however, is obtained only through commitment. Sex, in the Bible, is described as ‘knowing’ a spouse, suggesting there are some forms of knowledge that cannot be fully understood or adequately explained without commitment to ‘the other’. It might be possible to describe love from the outside of a relationship, but to really come to terms with the concept, one must commit to love another person and personally experience the ecstasies and agonies of that relationship. Although some approximations can be achieved by excellence in description, these are ersatz for the real deal.

Older social science inquiry supposed dispassionate academic neutrality. Engaging with the topic ‘from the inside’ was discouraged as biased, but that notion changed because it was recognised as obscuring the inherent bias and positionality of the researcher. No research offers the possibility of multiple valid understandings from various viewpoints. As noted above, it is positionality that affects how evolutionary data is interpreted, for example (Dawkins, 2006; Polkinghorne, 2001b).

Similar comments could be made about the many wonderful explorations and insights that have emerged in relation to altruism. Is altruism simply a result of a bias that comes from the naïve analysis of action predicated on the concept of self-esteem maintenance as explored by Miller and Ross (1975), or does it come from
neurobiological, psychological, sociological, evolutionary or religious impulses (Haidt, 2007; Haski-Leventhal, 2009)? All have some evidential basis, but the conclusions reached are often determined by the starting point of the researcher. The view of the data that is embraced depends very much on the prior commitment to a worldview. This researcher has made such a prior commitment, a determination to know God by attempting relationship with God, by assuming there is a God, that God can be known, that God is interested in a relationship with human beings and that that relationship can be acknowledged, experienced and developed. Additionally, there is the possibility that God has purposes to achieve in partnership with those who were created in kenosis-based love.

With theological study completed, this researcher started working as a Baptist minister. Listening to the stories of people who come for counsel, comfort and sometimes advice informs a listener’s view of humanity. This researcher’s positionality was shaped by holding the hand of a dying person, giving courage to a teenager facing a potentially terminal disease, listening to the anguished outpourings of someone betrayed in what they thought was a secure and happy relationship, hearing a woman explain her complete opposition to alcohol by describing the terror of nightly drunken steps down the hallway to her bedroom and the repeated rape of her as a girl.

... and social anthropology

From being a Baptist minister in New Zealand, this researcher then moved with his family to Fiji to be Principal of the Christian Leadership School, arriving in Fiji on the day of the 1987 elections that significantly changed Fiji’s political landscape and led to the first of several military coups one month later. His boss, who was the college board chairperson,
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was a key player in the coup process, leading this researcher to further reflect on the relative influences of cultural norms and personal theological commitment. If theology views relationships from the ‘God–Me’ and ‘God–People’ perspective, social anthropology and sociology do so more from a People–God and People–Me standpoint, then psychology is more focused on the Me–God and Me–People relationships. The interplay of those relationships led this researcher, on his return to NZ, to do study in the field of social anthropology, specifically looking at the way in which development interventions impacted various cultural norms and expectations, and how they impacted worldview in ordinary Fijian village life.

One event that influenced this researcher’s positionality from that time in Fiji stands out. He had also started doing some aid and development research. It was an evening kava/yaqona session with the men of the village in preparation for an investigation into the impact of development in the area. The men were describing the effectiveness of the assistance of an NGO on various developments in the village. Disconcertingly, nothing had apparently been done despite the documentation showing a spend of NZ$500,000. This was potentially a major relief and development scandal, although a quick observation on a twilight arrival indicated the presence of concrete water tanks, a concrete sewer system and smokeless stoves.

Next day, however, the women could not praise the NGO enough. They had provided all the materials and know-how for smokeless stoves, flushing toilets, solar-heated showers and drainage systems — but villagers had been required to do the work. Previous encounters with NGOs had led the men (as leaders!) to believe that the only real assistance was cash hand-outs; anything other than that was not assistance. Yet androcentric researchers still exist, in an apparently approving nod to Lévi Strauss, who made the famed statement ‘The entire village left the next day in about thirty canoes, leaving us alone with the women and children in the abandoned houses’ (Brown, 2001, p. 185).

Another area of wariness for this researcher was people’s willingness to play into his own religious bias. Years later, high in the Ecuadorian Andes he was asking some standard ‘most significant change’ (MSC) questions for a development project.
‘This village used to be known for drunk men, abused women and neglected children – and then the word of the Lord came’ was the response from one woman in the area. This could have been discarded as manipulative (people seeking funding), but further questions led to the understanding that religious instruction had given these marginalised Indian men the first taste of being valued for who they were in 500 years of oppressive colonial history. Such a divinely backed imprimatur of their value transformed how they viewed themselves, their place in the world and what they could achieve. A faith perspective on this particular process was therefore appropriate — a lesson for a somewhat cynical person of faith.

However, years of evaluating aid and development projects led to the conclusion that sustainable transformation enabling people to enjoy free and full lives depends not only on shifting worldview — a quasi-religious task — but also on redistributed economic outputs. Based on an understanding of business as a great form of community cooperation to achieve economic uplift, and of law in conjunction with business as enabling some measure of community control over wealth production resulting in better outcomes for all (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010), this researcher decided to move into the area of business management.

... to business, economics and law

The definition of business outlined in Chapter 2 — a ‘communally integrated set of activities and assets that is capable of being conducted and managed for the purpose of providing a return where both assets and returns can be economic, social or psychological’ — shows clearly the bias this researcher has in terms of how he wants to frame business. In this thesis, business that does not produce sustainable and communal good (social capital) is not successful business. This is based on the following beliefs:

a. There is a higher purpose for business than just monetary profit.

b. Every human has an inbuilt desire to find a greater meaning in life than just a mundane survival and existence.

c. There are within us, both as individuals and as communities, forces that distract us from that greater purpose.
d. Humans can change both their individual and communal worldview/values and thus the trajectories of their lives.

e. Interventions, both communal and individual, can bring about change in human values and worldview.

This non-exhaustive list gives shape to the research in this thesis. It points to a critique of corporate business in particular that has, in this researcher’s opinion, lost its way as it has increasingly moved from ideas of community enhancement and social good to the ascendancy of concepts of profit and wealth accumulation. Climate science alone says this is much too small a picture of the totality of human existence. We are on the edge of catastrophic climate change while at the same time having powerful, moneyed corporations preventing meaningful lifestyle changes (Greenpeace, 2011; N. Klein, 2011, p. 21). Sole traders, small family businesses, most business trusts and NFP businesses present little problem, but the sociopathic nature of some corporate business enterprises does pose real risk that could be ameliorated by some legal reframing. Those who frame business law and those in business need wit and wisdom to actually implement the changes essential to preserve life on the planet. How that might be achieved is examined in Chapter 7.

This researcher also seeks make community well-being an issue to consider. In New Zealand, the primary responsibility of the directors of any corporate business is the good of the company: ‘Subject to this section, a director of a company, when exercising powers or performing duties, must act in good faith and in what the director believes to be the best interests of the company’ presumably to (rightly) protect the shareholders of the business ("Companies Act Section 131(4): amended, on 30 June 1997, by section 11 of the Companies Act 1993 Amendment Act 1997 (1997 No 27).", 1993). This seems often to mean that directors can exclude the bigger picture, the long-term sustainability, communal health — in the widest sense — and peaceful co-existence of the communities in which the corporate operates. Good business has helped the bottom billion out of abject and absolute poverty over the last 15 years of the MDGs, but this seems also to have accumulated great wealth in the hands of a very few (Bentley, 2015). Corporate business is no longer Hock’s
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‘conceptual embodiment of a very old, very powerful idea called community’ (1999, p. 119).

**The effects of positionality**

Recognising that all of these factors listed above influence perceptions and interpretations, the next sections look at the three research phases identified by Pio and Singh (2015) as areas where positionality has an impact: pre-fieldwork (‘stepping into opaque pools’); fieldwork (ploughing ‘through hell and high water’); and after fieldwork (‘diving deeper’). This researcher set their three phases to music that feeds the soul:

- The theory and literature search — ‘tell me the old, old story’ (Katherine Hankey)
- The fieldwork and data collection — ‘getting to know you, getting to know all about you’ (Rodgers and Hammerstein)
- The analysis — ‘many rivers to cross’ (Jimmy Cliff, sung by Joe Cocker)

**On the theory and literature search: Tell me the old, old story**

A song from this researcher’s Sunday School background has a line in the chorus invoking the idea of remembering what you have learnt from the past:

Tell me the old, old story
Tell me the old, old story
Tell me the old, old story
Of Jesus and his love. (Hankey, 1886)

A literature search can remind you of things forgotten or buried, of ancient truths exposed and tested, and can also challenge the researcher’s preconditioned notions by shining a different light on some closely held concepts.

This researcher has filtered a wide range of potential definitions around business and entrepreneurial activity through social- and community-focused filters, including the thoughts of God as an entrepreneur, reflecting this researcher’s bias and belief in the way in which the world should be structurally understood. His research into the literature also looked for business that focused on social capital as much as
wealth creation. This does not mean that this researcher is unaware of other definitions, theories, focii or arguments but rather that he does not embrace them as being the best fit for the available evidence.

There are good and substantive arguments for a universe based on *kenosis* and sacrificial love rather than natural selection aimed at the mere survival of a species. Selecting that theoretical base as one of the key choices to help explain the motivation and work of peace-builders can be seen as an inherent bias, but it is also a defensible theoretical choice in that it fits what the peace-builders said of themselves. While a wide range of theoretical bases were explored in the literature — from neo-conservative to left-leaning — it is not possible to escape environmental shaping completely, even in researching literature.

**On data collection: Getting to know you**

It's a very ancient saying,
But a true and honest thought,
That if you become a teacher,
By your pupils you'll be taught.
[...]
Getting to know you,
Getting to know all about you. (Rodgers & Hammerstein, 1951)

Bias shaped by experience can be affirmed here. Having worked 35 years in the sector, this researcher selected his interviewees through people he knew. Nearly all of that work experience was with faith-based organisations, and this naturally skewed the pool of potential interviewees somewhat. Inquiries within the group of interviewees yielded little fruit in terms of people they knew who were not attached to a religious organisation active in their area. This is not surprising, since between 87% and 93% of the world operate on some kind of religious faith basis (J. O'Brien & Palmer, 2007, p. 17). It was thus to be expected that a large percentage of the interviewees would be related to some form of religious practice.

The data was further moved in the direction of faith and religion by the questions that were asked, which were specifically about a person’s faith journey and the worldview they had in relation to a deity. If there was no deity, as is the case in
several expressions of Buddhism, further questions were asked about enlightenment, unity with the universe and transcendence. While some might see this as ‘skewing’ the data, the same could be said about the great number of social science inquiries that fail to ask faith questions, given the huge percentage of the population operating from that worldview and how important it is in areas such as commerce and social capital. While preparing for project evaluations in areas of Africa, this researcher reviewed reports on health work in a place where more than 50% of the health infrastructure is run by religious institutions — and he did not find a single reference to religion. This is a small example of the bias that seems to exist when researchers are unable to see the impact that faith structures have on worldview and actions. In the present thesis, wherever data could be collected without any religious or faith considerations, that was done, for example with areas or people chosen for the quantitative survey, where randomisation was carried out under strict guidelines.

Three further observations about the data collection are necessary:

Firstly, where there was a struggle to connect because the interview was conducted through a translator, the questions became less complex, less inquiring at some levels, and not engaging in as much direct conversation. Follow-up questions are more difficult because of the intricacies and speed of translation. Given the philosophical and even spiritual nature of some of the questions, translation both ways must have been difficult, so bias against pressing harder for answers has little to do with positionality and more to do with practicalities.

Secondly, where discussion traversed areas of major interest for both interviewer and interviewee, the questions and answers became both more animated and extensive, and this was not related to similarities of belief structures. In fact, some of the most engaging conversations were with people whose views on a range of topics outside the central questions were quite divergent. The exchanges point much more to a thirst for knowledge than a desire to reinforce one’s closely held beliefs.

A third observation is that years of listening to people and their stories, their triumphs and tribulations, enables not only empathy but a self-trust about pursuing
‘between the lines’ implications. One of the interviewees said early on in the interview, ‘I read somewhere that if you take away all the bugs in the world, nature would stop functioning in less than 50 years, but if you took out all the humans in the world, nature would fix itself within 50 years’. Follow-up questions probed more deeply into the interviewee’s reflection, revealing the source and nature of violence she had seen and heard. Her faith in a benevolent universe and the basic goodness of people had been deeply shaken by what she witnessed. It was the previous pastoral experience of listening to ‘the story behind the story’ that provided this researcher with the confidence of knowing there was tragedy and profound inner turmoil behind the simple statement that sounded like a recitation of facts. This led to a connection between interviewer and interviewee that wouldn’t otherwise have happened.

This researcher’s earlier pastoral cross-cultural experience as a college principal, evaluator and supervisor was also useful in determining the veracity of the stories being told. For example, lowered eyes and head are often mistakenly perceived as lying (‘A person telling the truth will always look you in the eye and if they won’t look you in the eye they are lying’). And in some cultures, particularly ones where ‘face’ is important, one must be able to frame the question in the form of ‘What are people saying about this initiative / that action / my questions’, thus enabling people to tell a researcher what they are really thinking while attributing it to ‘other people.’ It is cultural device used in other circumstances for ‘speaking truth to power’ without appearing to.

Previous experience in teaching and pastoral work in Asia and the Pacific as well as a sound knowledge of theological and existential faith issues served well in this research. Being aware of most of the religious sensibilities (positioning of feet for Buddhists, times of regular prayer / fasting for Muslims) and being able to talk theological language from the ‘inside’ were clear advantages, and this researcher didn’t feel he was being either put on a pedestal or dismissed as ignorant at any point in the data-collection process. Prior experience also ensured ‘blind’ approaches were made to former colleagues and employees; they didn’t know who was doing the research before agreeing to the interview — and no one withdrew on finding out who was doing the interviews.
On analysis: Many rivers to cross

Many rivers to cross
But I can’t seem to find my way over
Wandering I’m lost
As I travel along the white cliffs of Dover. (Cliff, 1969)

Choosing and interpreting data that only supports a researcher’s thesis and side-lines or ignores contrary evidence is like getting to an isolated spot using only highways — it can’t be done. When wandering alone through the data, there is an inherent desire to find the easy way home, but with Joe Cocker singing in the ear, this researcher is reminded that the shortest and easiest way through the data may not actually be the way home. As this researcher waded through the data multiple times, not just for the coding but for the understanding of what was behind the words spoken, he was aware of the temptation to leave some contrary material out. But the struggle with that material resulted in a breakthrough in terms of understanding that he was actually dealing with two separate categories of peace-builders, something he was not expecting.

Paying attention to the outlier data was important. Researchers will usually gravitate more to those whose position they agree with, because they better understand what those with similar opinions are thinking, but with some reflexivity this can be largely avoided. Listening carefully and objectively to those who defined themselves as being on the edge of faith, on their way out of faith, or agnostic, was one way to ensure data was handled with as little bias as possible.

A final reflection

This researcher has used both his reflective self-disclosure and the literature review to attempt to hear the peace-builders effectively, but the problem remains of successfully incorporating the voice of the oppressed that “continues to be unspeakable and invisible” (Banerjee, 2000, p. 4). Post-colonialism’s ability to control economies and to make subjugated countries dependant on the coloniser (A. Prasad, 2003, pp. 4-5) through super-ordination, habituation, adaptation, dialogue...
and the like (Mir, Mir, & Upadhyaya, 2003), is often achieved through business, and brings the effect of past oppressions into today’s debates.

A number of writers listed in Prasad and Prasad (1997, p. 288) point to the enduring legacy of colonialism, its (often) vilification of the other (1997, p. 291) and its expectation of superiority, which impacts on local conflicts and while they credit “Said’s authoritative study Orientalism” (1997, p. 288) with baring this post-colonial lens, Wolf’s “Europe and the people without a history” is an earlier example showing how various iterations of capitalism (1964) penetrated and subjugated previous cultural and economic structures. The colonial roots of conflict and its enduring presence were noted by interviewees and flow directly from question m/b of the semi structured interview questions (page 263), but are not specifically explored here. This researcher notes, and agrees, that ‘The process of “accommodating” Aboriginal interests into a capitalist, colonial framework is simply an imposition of an alien knowledge system and a subjugation of local knowledges’ (Banerjee, 2000, p. 21) but the thesis is focused on exploring solutions to present communal power tensions.

As this chapter has established, this researcher has theological and sociological roots that give priority to the poor, the oppressed, the marginalised and the displaced. In his view, the universe is constructed in such a way that it is the responsibility of every human in their situation to ‘do as God does’, so that in the end ‘love wins’. Furthermore, this is not a belief in ‘crumbs from the table’ kind of charity but a deeply held conviction that when justice that leads to shalom is put into practice, then everything must change.

This worldview has implications for how the domain of entrepreneurship, business and peace-building might be defined and practised. It has extensive philosophical and theological implications that have created a worldview shared by many — but not many of those who hold positions of power. This worldview has a vantage point that anticipates and works for deep social change. It is the background that has pushed this researcher to a theoretical understanding of how to interpret human behaviour in the light of these sociological, theological and philosophical underpinnings.
Chapter 4: Research theory and methodology

Introduction

At the memorial, there is a plaque that is much smaller than the ones that dot the site itself. It’s harder to find, a few hundred metres from that gentle mound in Hiroshima. Technically it marks the very centre of the blast on that August day in 1945. It stands where the hospital once stood, directly under the bomb blast point 580 metres above it. As a marker in the annals of warfare, defining a new era, it represents in stone the drawing together of years of research, experimentation and technological advance. This next chapter draws on the theoretical constructs that mark the advance of theory and methodology into the realm of peace-building.

Figure 16: The plaque in Hiroshima, directly under the bomb blast point
Source: R. Kilpatrick personal photo

Introduction: Asking the Key Questions

Examining the extant literature.
Defining the terms used.

Positionality:
The background to the factors that effect the researcher and his questions.

Theory:
Building an agreed understanding of how to do the research and how to analyse the results.

Analysis: Qualitative
Does the analysis of the interviews answer the questions in themes 1 and 2?
What does that analysis suggest?

Analysis: Quantitative
Does the quantitative analysis answer the question in theme 3? Does the qualitative material support any correlations?

Conclusion: What conclusions does this research support? What does this contribute to our overall knowledge? What else needs exploration?

Figure 15: Thesis flowchart Chapter 4
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Theoretical constructs structure the research data into a coherent explanation of what we see occurring amongst peace-builders. If the entrepreneurial spirit is to have a different focus, to be ‘redeemed’, then a philosophical framework is required to order and explain what interviewees are saying about themselves and their work. The theory of change discussed below can be applied to entrepreneurial thinking, which will provide paths for entrepreneurial leaders of business to move from the pursuit of autonomy (Carsrud & Brannback, 2011; Shane et al., 2003; Wilson et al., 2004) to a focus on community shalom and well-being. This chapter explores the philosophical basis for understanding how peace-builders see themselves and how it might be possible to measure their effect. The chapter then sets out the methodology used to gather data.

**Establishing a philosophical position**

Given the propensity of humans to form groups and cultures, and the ability those groups display to generate conflict, this thesis uses an anthropological stance, proposing that cultural values filter how most of the individuals within a community perceive and react to events around them. The cultural values of the community thus shape what is reality for them. Hiebert (2008, pp. 925–984), who has spent a lifetime studying worldview transformations as a missional anthropologist, outlines an epistemology of worldview, which accounts firstly for tensions within a group, and then how the change that occurs actually happens. This thesis brings kenosis and chaos theory as added insights to those theories of cultural change.

Anomalies in the experience of people within a culture require ‘normal’ transformation — the way that changing technology has shifted the population’s view of transport infrastructure, for instance, where technology has substituted the horse and cart with the car as the ‘normal’ form of transport. ‘New science’, on the other hand, requires a paradigm shift in the nature of reality and will ultimately transform the way in which we order and understand large parts of human activity and relationship, much in the same way that Galileo revolutionised how the universe was apprehended. It is like horse and cart being superseded by teleportation. A total paradigm shift of life without transport infrastructure like roads is required. This
thesis is proposing a Galileo-type paradigm shift in understanding the task of business. A shift requires looking at, and listening to, the world in a new way.

As discussed in Chapter 3, this researcher has a Christian worldview based on *kenosis*, which suggests that God is on the side of the poor and that the justice God expects is not retributive but reconciliatory. This also implies that there is an external singular reality, but this researcher does not believe that singular reality is accessible to the limited apprehension of the human mind, a conclusion supported by what can be multitudinous interpretations through history and culture of repeatedly observable phenomena.

If there is such a single, separate, reality that is accessible, then a researcher determines that structural reality by seeking to eliminate their own innate biases and then describe that reality. This is the objectivist approach. If, however, reality as we know it is not a single, separate entity but a perception of the image created by the ontological assumptions that shape our epistemology, then a very different task ensues as the researcher seeks to determine how their own values, beliefs and emotions (often called their subjectives) are involved in shaping that ‘reality’. This second, subjectivist, approach has been foundational in areas like feminist theory (Campbell & Wasco, 2000) and is seminal to most social constructivist approaches, such as conversational and discourse analysis, critical theory and the like (Barker, Pistrang, & Elliot, 2002, pp. 86–89). It is the essence of a post-modern approach to apprehending structures and events. This puts this researcher’s Christian worldview firmly in the subjectivist category.

**Classifying social theories: Objectivist and subjectivist**

Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) classic schema on sociological paradigms and organisational analysis seems enduring, although critique based on multi-paradigm perspectives and paradigm interplay (phenomenological pragmatism) has also recently achieved academic respectability (Goles & Hirschheim, 2000, pp. 258–260). The four emerging paradigms of radical structuralist, radical humanist, functionalist and interpretive are based around two axes, as seen in *Figure 19*. The horizontal axis shows the continuum from objective to subjective, as per *Figure 17* while the vertical
axis contains the continuum from regulation to radical change, as set out below in Figure 18.

Around the horizontal axis in Figure 17 swirl the debates on ontology, epistemology, the nature of human ‘being’ and the issues of methodology. At the objective end of the scale, realist ontology assumes a factual, concrete reality existing independently from the observer. Nominalist ontology, at the other end of the spectrum, maintains that individuals use tags or labels to express their understanding of the event/object, so that joint understanding can be negotiated through commensurability. It is described not as communal understanding but rather ‘a network of assumptions and intersubjectively shared meanings’ (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, pp. 29–31).

When the same objective–subjective spectrum is applied to epistemology, the objective end of the scale gives rise to positivism and representational epistemology, where the study of human experience looks for the commonalities and methodologies that harmonise the ways in which individuals apprehend the universe. In contrast, at the subjective extremes, anti-positivism leads to examining the idiosyncratic and fragmented interpretations of experience. There is no metanarrative, no overarching story or applicable hegemony, and no hope of harmonising the individual perceptions.

The postulations around human nature and the relationship between the individual and the society in which they reside can be subjected to the same scale. At the objective end of the spectrum, determinists take the view that individuals and their thoughts and actions are not only constrained but fundamentally determined by environmental circumstance. By contrast, the voluntarist hypothesises that every human is an entirely free agent, an autonomous individual.

All of this has impacts on the methodology of this thesis. The objective or nomothetic approach seeks to apply scientific rigour through quantitative methodology using standardised tools, surveys and other ‘scientific’ tests that have set rules for application. The subjective, ideographic researcher begins the inquiry by
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attempting to get insider knowledge from the subjects being studied, and builds a social understanding from that viewpoint.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 17:** The objectivist–subjectivist axis of social theory

Source: (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, adapted from p. 11–19). Permission sought.

The vertical dimension in *Figure 18* represents the theoretical position the researcher takes regarding the nature of society. Burrell and Morgan name one end of the scale as the ‘sociology of regulation’, where the focus of attention is the glue of society, the factors that stop descent into anarchy and preserve the status quo, and where concepts like harmony, social stability, unity, social amalgamation, team spirit and authentic community reign supreme. The other end of the scale is the ‘sociology of radical change’, which looks to the factors affecting social transformation, hegemony, opposition, liberation, revolution, and the inherent capacity for development within society (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, pp. 16–19).
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Burrell and Morgan then integrate these two dimensions and suggest that research could be typified in the four main ways shown in Figure 19.

Figure 18: The vertical axis of social theory

Source: (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, adapted from p. 11–19). Permission sought
The radical humanist paradigm

The philosophical positioning of this thesis is radical humanist. In 1979, Burrell and Morgan suggested that the most common paradigm for academics was functionalist (as cited in Goles & Hirschheim, 2000, p. 254), but grounded theory, which emerged in the same year as Burrell and Morgan’s seminal analysis (Strauss, 1967), accelerated the move away from functionalist methodology by showing there were valid alternatives (Goles & Hirschheim, 2000, p. 254). The research in this thesis is aimed at understanding how a radical social shift, based on a re-orientation of values/worldviews, can be understood from the point of view of the peace-builders themselves, and their actions and the experiences that have led them into the difficult area of reconciliation. Details of the other three perspectives are explored in Burrell and Morgan (1979) and are not elucidated at length here.
Radical humanism has its roots in the German idealist tradition of Kant and Hegel, growing through the Frankfurt School, then through the writings of Habermas and Marcuse and the existentialist philosophy of Sartre, and on through the work of social theorists like Illich, Castaneda and Laing. This progression is outlined by Burrell and Morgan (1979, p. 33), who state that the link is the ‘common concern for the release of consciousness and experience from domination by various aspects of the ideological superstructure of the social world within which men live out their lives.’ This model assumes that individual consciousness is framed and constricted by ideological structures that constantly find the individual ‘wedged’ between those ideologies and their own consciousness. The over-throwing or transcending of the limitations of existing social arrangements (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 32) is aimed at liberating humans for development beyond the bonds that perpetuate the status quo, allowing development of the fully conscious human being.

The radical humanist model was chosen by this researcher because it aligns with many years observing peace-builders struggling to produce necessary social change while they work on community development. However, this researcher thinks it unlikely that any person can free themselves from such ideological shackles, and that the best humans can do is constantly search for a more ‘freeing’ ideological scaffold, probably exchanging one dominating ideology for another. Such searching is vital, and should not be underplayed. To cease searching is to assume the mantle of surety, which inevitably leads to the attempted subjugation of others who disagree. History is littered with examples in religion, philosophy and political economy that attest to that process.

**Phenomenology**

Phenomenological symbolic interactionism is how radical humanist theory was applied in this research. Phenomenology, from the Greek concept of the study of ‘that which appears to be’, undertakes the difficult task of trying to ‘constitute an objective meaning-context out of subjective meaning-contexts’ (Kim & Berard, 2009, p. 273), where subjective meaning is socialised by acculturation (Kim & Berard, 2009, p. 270). Phenomenology, like radical humanism, has its roots in German philosophy, beginning with Husserl’s concept of getting ‘back to the things
themselves’, developed by Heidegger into the idea of ‘being’ and expanded by Gadamer, who sought to show how all understanding is ultimately interpretive (Palmer, 1969, pp. 162–181). Gadamer was not alone in this quest. Ludwig Binswanger had already applied comparative insights to psychology (Frie, 2010). However, it was Gadamer who made clear that ‘Understanding occurs in interpreting’ and is credited with the concept of hermeneutical phenomenology (Laverty, 2003, p. 25). Put most broadly, the goal of phenomenology is ‘to understand the social world rather than predict or control it’ (Gallant & Kleinman, 1983, p. 13), and this involves being able to uncover and grasp the meanings of the subject’s experiences.

Husserl believed that this was possible by ‘bracketing out’ (a mathematical concept) what one already knows. Heidegger thought this impossible because interpreting requires the researcher to bring what they already know to that task. This researcher follows Heidegger, believing that reality is a slippery concept because total objectivity is impossible. This researcher agrees with Gadamer that it is in the dialectic, the conversation with the matter at hand, that understanding is achieved (Palmer, 1969, p. 165), although that understanding is always incomplete. Schulz suggests that ‘what we already know’ is both a phenomenon that everyday actors undertake and an important point of academic study, which he called typification (Kim & Berard, 2009). Typification allows humans to proceed with daily living and a largely coherent assimilation of ordinary events into their idealised structure of reality (their typifications) in much the same way we drive through the city without thinking much about the street layout, the buildings we pass or even that we stop and start at traffic lights. It’s as if we were on autopilot. Only by having ubiquitous typifications can the novel be understood and also named (Kim & Berard, 2009, p. 268), because we have to have something to class the new — and freshly experienced — against. Typification is embedded in common language so that an event can be taken for granted ‘not only by me but by us, by “everyone”’ (meaning everyone who belongs to us) (Kim & Berard, 2009, p. 270). Consequently, the issue of hermeneutics also needs inclusion in methodological theory.
However, there are different approaches to phenomenology itself, where some division between ethnomethodology and phenomenological symbolic interactionism has occurred. While both approaches are concerned with meaning, they differ as to what meaning is and the most useful way to investigate it (Gallant & Kleinman, 1983). Earlier writers like Schutz have made contributions to both approaches to the discipline as well as to other related sociologies (Kim & Berard, 2009, p. 264) but later writers may be more closely aligned with one group than another (Gallant & Kleinman, 1983, p. 2).

Gallant and Kleinman show the subjective nature of knowledge by pointing out that ethnomethodology and phenomenological symbolic interactionism arise on opposite sides of the Atlantic (Gallant & Kleinman, 1983, p. 2). Powell talks of the intellectual lineage of symbolic interactionism as being Mead, Park and Thomas followed by Blumer and Hughes (Powell, 2013, p. 4). Flecha et al. believe that 'Interactionism gives priority to processes of interaction. Action does not only consist of achieving ends that are pre-established by each individual, but it is also the result of the interaction between agents’ (Flecha, Gómez, & Puigvert, 2003, p. 57). This led to Mead’s postulation that ‘the self is the inter-relationship between the I and the me. The I is formed by our body's responses to the actions of others. The me is the whole of the attitudes of others that the I assumes. The I and the me are phases of the self. The self is the self, which can be both subject and object at the same time’ (Flecha et al., 2003, pp. 58–59). The inability to separate subject and object is offered by Kruger as a symptom of mental illness (Kruger, 1999).

Blumer (1969, p. 2) puts Mead’s ideas into ‘three simple premises’ which form the basis of the theory of phenomenological symbolic interactionism. These are:

(a) Humans’ reactions to events and objects are based on what meaning those things have for them.

(b) The meaning that is given to those events and objects depends on the social discourse with others concerning them, i.e. meaning is constructive in a culture.
(a) The meanings are adjusted, amended and integrated through the interpretive processes of the individual.

In phenomenological symbolic interactionism, people don’t just respond to ideas and events but use those ideas and events as a kind of scaffold to build their own idea of the culture they inhabit (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). This doesn’t suggest symbolic interactionism means that people are free to explain ideas and events as they please because, being in community, they need to interact with others and so are limited not only in how they can express ideas but in how they can act and still be a part of that community. It does, however, see ‘the individual as “making sense” of obdurate reality within the interactive matrix which constrains the whole gamut of experience’ (Gallant & Kleinman, 1983, p. 8).

Conversely, ethnomethodology seeks to explore the process of interpretation and integration into worldview (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Because ethnomethodology treats the interpretation process itself as the focus of the investigation, this research is not an ethnomethodological exercise, focusing instead on numinous moments rather than on the unremarkable and mundane acts of life that produce reflexivity and automatic response (Flick, 2009, p. 60). It seeks to analyse the outcome of these ‘ah ha’ moments rather than the process (Gallant & Kleinman, 1983, p. 5). Instead of applying already established theories about how peace-builders construct the realities they live by and how they create order in the shifting sands of community conflict, this thesis therefore looks to unpack their subjective perspective and interpret their constructed reality in terms of their expressed experience. It also seeks to find commonalities in those experiences.

Phenomenological symbolic interactionists apply a range of methodological approaches to do their research. Denzin and Lincoln list multiple approaches in the ‘Methods of collecting and analysing empirical materials’ and ‘Strategies of inquiry’ sections of the handbook they edited (2011a, 2011b), including case studies, mixed-method approaches, performance ethnography, participatory action research, arts-based inquiry, focus groups and grounded theory. This researcher uses several case
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studies from two very different cultural and geographical areas and a multi-method approach in examining the issues.

In a similar way that reflexivity can be used to analyze the viewpoint of the researcher it can also consider the positionality of the interviewee. Flecha et. al. (2003, p. 47) suggest that Husserl’s ‘life world’ concept, with its multitude of unquestioned assumptions, is the backdrop to Schütz’s approach, and that ‘Schutz's work helps us to understand the life world, but by focusing on consciousness, it poses limitations and complicates our analysis of social relationships’, and that he ‘remained a prisoner of the categories of consciousness’ (Flecha et al., 2003, p. 57). This researcher disagrees. Schütz aimed to interpret an individual’s actions in the light of the meaning they had given to their actions. His basic thesis posits that it’s never the event itself that gives meaning but rather that an individual interprets the event, and that this interpretation is moulded by reflection within the ‘life world’ of that person, so interpretation occurs not only within their own experience, but within that of the community in which they live. The seeds of interactionism are thus already present in Schütz, for whom the conscious attention given to events produces meaning in a way that would not be possible if one were simply a participant in those same events (Schütz, 1967, pp. 6, 69, 92–93). This understanding of reflection or the ‘reflective attitude’ resonates with Plato’s concept that the ‘unexamined life is not worth living’ because it does not advance an understanding of meaning.

This researcher takes the philosophical position of phenomenological symbolic interactionism, regarding it as the most useful theory of how society is both cohesive and yet open to change. Assuming that thoughts are also experienced events, the interviewed peace-builders give sense to their experiences according to how they have ascribed meaning to those experiences. In this way, understanding may be gained about the activity of peace-building in the experience of those entrepreneurs who attempt it.

Phenomenological symbolic interactionism may explain some of the process of change as people re-interpret the meaning of events, but to answer the question of
what it is that actually changes, this thesis must also address the issue of changing worldview and the values associated with it — terms that are defined in Chapter 2.

**Measuring worldview by quantifying values**

Organisations and businesses want to be cost-effective, and to do that they need to measure what they produce versus the inputs. For businesses, outputting product measurement is relatively straightforward. Being able to measure community changes effectively and correlate them to various programmes that have been used in the community is much more esoteric but also the holy grail of any NGO wanting to impress donors and evaluation agencies. Increased accountability and transparency requirements, donor community misapprehensions about aid spending levels and fear of money laundering make the pressures to measure effective communal change even greater. ‘Terms like impact assessment, objectives, log frames, objective verifiable indicators […] have become part of the language [for NGOs]’ (Woolnough, 2008, p. 134), but the most effective way of measuring these is not straightforward. *Figure 20* shows the potential divide that is not only cultural but also methodological at core.

*Figure 20: Two types of measuring*

Given that holistic transformation, including human spirituality, is notoriously difficult to measure and analyse (Woolnough, 2008, p. 136), understanding what has transformed peace-builders and moved them to act in the ways they do is fraught with problems. For example, one economic insight ‘that, on average, a doubling of trade between two countries leads to a 20% diminution of hostility between them’ (Polachek, 1980, p. 56) might encourage peace-builders to work on the basis that to lift measurable economic activity is to decrease violent conflict (Polachek, 1980; Polachek, Robst, & Chang, 1999). On a larger scale is Friedman’s ‘Golden Arches theory’ (1999, p. 248) that no two countries boasting McDonalds had gone to war with each other (1999, p. 248). As noted on page 45, this was rather overrun by events, and his updated ‘Dell theory’ substitution (Friedman, 2007) may fail too. However, despite failures, the data implies generally that the link between increased productivity and diminished conflict might be strong enough to declare the work of the peace-builder useful, primarily by measuring economic output.

This thesis tends to negate that idea, based on the research discussed in Chapter 2 that shows GDP as a very blunt and somewhat unreliable instrument by which to measure how the mass of people apprehend their situation. Using other measures of SWB can be interesting (Donovan & Halpern, 2002, p. 40) but also subjective, relativistic and difficult. Natsios’ statement, quoted in full above on page 44 is key here: ‘[Those development programmes] that are the most transformational are the least measureable’ (2010, p. 4). Given that peace-building is central to much community development, the problem of measurement that this thesis faces is clear. Qualitative or quantitative reporting may depend on the audience. Peace-builders reporting on domestic violence in the community might want to report statistics to local health clinics, but a story that includes a quote from a child and pictures of beaming classes of safe-looking children might get more money from donors. It’s the same for making sense of the work of the peace-builders studied in this thesis; a number of angles of insight need to be covered.

Marx’s ‘opiate’ factor must be considered (1844) and reasonable attempts made to check self-perceptions of a ‘better and more hopeful life’ (qualitative
responses) against harder data like mother and child mortality rates, educational levels, nutritional statistics and incidents of reported violence. Peace-building interventions are complex events and many community workers tend to believe their own public relations when it comes to community impact, which can markedly affect the perceptions of the recipients in the community. (Recipients generally want to encourage the on-going participation of their free helpers.) The additional problem is that, when it comes to statistics on violence, whether domestic, communal, internecine or international, it is hard to show what hasn’t happened because of the work of the peace-builders. A case built on silence is problematic. Additionally, as noted in the work of researchers like Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales (2006b) the effects of culture can last for centuries, so the longer-term impact of the work of these peace-builders will probably never be known.

**So, what should we measure and can we measure it?**

Data is the outcome of research, but how it is collected, analysed and reported is important. Some business data such as profit and loss, profit margins, etc., are required at least on a monthly basis for management, although the bigger the organisation and the more complex the tools, the harder it is to actually figure out what they mean — if businesses like Enron, Worldcom and Satyam, which used very complex financial tools, are anything to go by (Reinstein & Weirich, 2002). Other data such as the factors affecting staff morale and retention, the motivating factors behind stockholder decisions to buy or sell, or rationales behind consumer purchases are not so readily reduced to easily comprehended figures, nor are they necessarily always easily open to rational explanation. To get a more fully rounded picture of certain aspects of a business, two or more basic methods of obtaining and analysing information may be needed. Quantitative research can reduce large data sets with numerical values to useful information. Where the data set is smaller and understanding the thoughts, feelings and actions of those being researched is important, and idiosyncratic patterns might be a feature, then qualitative approaches might seem more appropriate.

This researcher responded to a request from the Faith and Development team of the World Vision Middle East and Eastern Europe area (MEER), lead by Danut
Manastireanu and Ekaterina Papadhopuli, in April 2013, to evaluate their work. Evaluation was by document review, semi-structured interview and focus groups — very much a phenomenological symbolic interactionism approach. However, Manastireanu and Papadhopuli were dissatisfied with the traditional measures being used and thought that these techniques did not adequately reflect values and worldview transformations. This researcher was tasked with developing a tool to determine if observed changes in behaviour had actually been precipitated by changed values and attitudes that had impacted ‘worldview’. This led to the application of the European Values Study, which has a lengthy historical application and is widely accepted in academic literature. Started in 1981 and conducted every 9 years, it now interviews 70,000 people in 47 countries and has over 1300 known scholarly articles associated with its research. The methodology is explained in detail in Chapter 6, but the key to its use is its ability to reasonably assign values to certain qualitative statements and thus quantitatively assess changes in values and worldviews. Set alongside the qualitative studies, in this thesis it provides a more complete picture of the impact of interventions on the target populations within various regions called Area Development Projects (ADPs), and is a complementary method to run parallel with the phenomenological symbolic interactionism approach. This mixing of methods without direct correlation is the multi-method approach discussed below.

**Design of the study: Moving on with multi-method**

When referring to qualitative and quantitative approaches to research methodology, some researchers have declared peace in the ‘paradigm wars’ (Bryman, 2006b), which, while somewhat pre-emptive in the view of this researcher, seems prescient of the trend. They suggest that overall analytical quality will improve if indeed ‘the cleavages between them [qualitative and quantitative philosophies and methodologies] have been bridged’ (2006a, p. 112). Certainly, ‘quantitative and qualitative methods provide differing perspectives on a subject and this is why the use of both may be viewed as complementary rather than validatory (Woolley, 2008, p. 8). A mixed-method approach to social research is considered to occur when both qualitative and quantitative approaches are integrated, meaning that ‘these components are explicitly related to each other within a single study and in
such a way as to be mutually illuminating, thereby producing findings that are
greater than the sum of parts’ (Woolley, 2008, p. 7).

While this thesis uses both qualitative and quantitative methods, they are to
investigate two separate aspects of the thesis proposal. The quantitative approach
examines the evidence for values changed by deliberate and targeted intervention,
while the qualitative methodology investigates the perceptions peace-builders have
of their worldview, motivation and actions — in their own words and sometimes in
the words of those around them. Thus, in Figure 21 below, this thesis is not looking
at the integrated ‘mixed method’ area that is coloured grey. Rather it is concerned
with the two red areas, because it uses both quantitative and qualitative approaches
but not in any way to cross-validate or provide supportive evidence for the alternate
approach. This methodology is multi-method and referred to as such throughout this
thesis as the more generally accepted terminology, but ‘bi-polar’ seems a better
expression in many ways, since it effectively excludes any ideas of cross-validation,
a point explicitly and effectively illustrated in the red areas shown in Figure 21.

Figure 21: The qualitative / quantitative paradigm divide
Source: R. Kilpatrick
### Case studies and multi-method

Case study methodology is a readily accepted approach in many fields (Yin, 2009, location 366) and has been applied extensively to business and management areas (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). Both the quantitative and qualitative research in this thesis can be treated as case study material. As Eisenhardt and Graebner point out, ‘A major reason for the popularity and relevance of theory building from case studies is that it is one of the best (if not the best) of the bridges from rich qualitative evidence to mainstream deductive research’ (2007, p. 25). Further, ‘Case studies as tools for generating and testing theory have provided the strategic management field with ground-breaking insights’ (Gibbert, Ruigrok, & Wicki, 2008), and while even multiple case studies don’t allow statistical extrapolation, they can still be generalised effectively, and this is how the statistics material has been treated in this thesis. The qualitative study is surrounded by background material that puts the statistics into a case study environment, giving them context and meaning.

Case studies have good academic credentials (Crowe et al., 2011; Cunningham, 1997; Dart & Davies, 2003; Edwards, 1998) and allow for mixed-method, which helps with the triangulation of results that is desirable (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). This researcher’s prior work in this field using Most Significant Change (MSC) methodology (R. Davies & Dart, 2005), and the reports that the research produced, have suggested worldview/values do shape the actions of peace-building entrepreneurs. These values, characteristics and worldviews are explored in this research, and the prior reports themselves, which have helped inform the direction of this investigation, can come in useful for background material (Kilpatrick & Goode, 2009a, 2009b, 2010).

There are two reasons this researcher used multi-method case studies where qualitative interview and reflection is combined with descriptive statistics.

Firstly, case studies are, by their nature, qualitative, and the issues in this thesis are qualitative. Cameron’s statement that ‘Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted’ (Cameron, 1963) echoes Natsios’ point, quoted above on page 44.
Secondly, a case-study framework intimates two things: (a) the researcher acknowledges bias before starting work, tries to effectively name it, attempts to ameliorate it, and strives to remove it while recognising its presence, all of which is made more possible because case studies use the words and thoughts of the interviewees (Creswell, 2015, p. 43) and (b) humans, like the weather, may be generally predictable but specifically apparently random. Case studies and multi-method allow for the researcher to make a case based on qualitative interviews and then test that case for generality using quantitative approaches (Creswell, 2015, p. 15).

Had the target sample of peace-builders been larger, this thesis could have used mixed-method approaches with inferential statistical methods, but a project of that scope is beyond this PhD thesis. However, justification for descriptive statistics based on a small sample is supported by Hamilton (2012, pp. 67–77) and in an extended mathematical discussion by Dochtermann and Jenkins (2011).

**Multi-method and symbolic interactionism theory**

Social theory provides the epistemological foundations, and the methodology allows us to construct the building on those foundations. Case studies based on semi-structured interviews with the peace-builders who are the focus of this research, along with informal discussions with the wider community to build a context for the interviews, allow this researcher to make well-founded generalisations about the characteristics, leadership styles and impacts of the peace-builders without being predictive. By taking the subjectivist stance within the sociology of radical change that connects the research theory to the methodology through phenomenological symbolic interactionism, which allows the interviewees to give meaning to their experience and this researcher to interact with and codify those meanings, it is possible to draw robust conclusions, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
Making choices: Country selection

Twenty-nine years of involvement in international development and visits to over 70 countries, with work in around 30 of them, has provided this researcher with a global network of contacts, meaning there were multiple conflict or post-conflict situations to choose from. To make the task manageable, Armenia and Myanmar were selected as countries in two continents, with two different histories, cultures, philosophies and economies, and some background of their history is outlined in the ‘Where’ question in Chapter 1.

Armenia, as noted in Chapter 1, is a country that has seen multiple and enduring conflicts. In a country so prone to externally inflicted conflict, it is not surprising that internal tensions blossom into confrontations too. The country’s economy was devastated by the dissolution of the USSR, and casual observation when driving through the countryside notes shuttered and pillaged factories in towns and cities whose infrastructure is crumbling through lack of investment and whose symbols of civic society — schools, hospitals and town halls — are, at best, dilapidated. Poverty that comes after prosperity seems to engender greater potential for mental illness and civic conflict between the ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ than in communities that have never known any different (Donovan & Halpern, 2002, p. 31). Armenia represents the former, and the anger and bitterness that bubbles beneath the façade of Armenian society is understandable if one considers the limited options the poor have to express their frustrations at their diminishing economic wealth.

The nation of Myanmar/Burma, which stands at the crossroads between China and India, has a long history of settlement and is thought to have been one of the first civilizations to have domesticated pigs and chickens. From Ptolemy referring to some of the early residents as cannibals through multiple dynasties, alliances and empires Myanmar has been a conflict zone of civilizations with the last great external incursion being that of the British in three Anglo–Burmese wars in 1885 (D. G. E. Hall, 1960). Burma, as it was then, became a state of British India and huge cultural and economic changes followed although the constant suppression of rebellion seems
to have been a hallmark of the next 50 years. This led to much internal conflict when Japan invaded and various leaders opted for support of, or resistance to the Japanese. Since the Panglong conference in 1947, the granting of independence in 1948 and the subsequent assassination of several who led that independence process Myanmar has been in the state of unending ethnic conflict, if not outright civil war, for much of subsequent 69 years. There have been multiple reports of the civil rights abuses and even possibly war crimes over this time (Lowenstein, 2015). It is a country rich in natural resources, having gems, jade, oil and natural gas under its fertile soil, and during the years of British colonialism was known as ‘the rice bowl of Asia’ (Rogers, 2010, p. ii). The installation of a new elected democratic government in 2015/2016 has yet to demonstrate that the abuses perpetrated by the various armies (the majority by the official Burmese army) can be halted and some accountability for actions against civilians pursued.

These two different countries are used for the qualitative study, but only Armenia is used for the quantitative research because there is no prior WVS or EVS data available for Myanmar with which to make any valid comparisons.

**The qualitative methodology**

This thesis uses phenomenological symbolic interactionism to analyse the way events and ideas in a person’s life have constructed their idea of how the culture in which they live and work actually functions. How they understand that culture is determined by listening to them explain what has shaped the foundations and superstructure of their thinking, and by observing and analysing their actions. Words and actions aren’t always coherent. In a post-modern world, researchers have become more aware of the paradoxes that both researched and researcher hold in their minds and have learned to account for actions as the interplay between various paradoxes. Consider five dimensions of potential paradoxical behaviour in management: (1) combining self-centeredness with other-centeredness; (2) maintaining both distance and closeness; (3) treating subordinates uniformly, while allowing individualisation; (4) enforcing work requirements, while allowing flexibility; and (5) maintaining decision control, while allowing autonomy (Yan, Waldman, Yu-Lan, & Xiao-Bei,
Both poles of these values should be part of a peace-builder’s skill set in seeking community reconciliations. The ability to hold a paradox is essential. Extending tolerance to the intolerant, giving voice to those whose voices make the task harder, seeking security through a negotiated peace while paying, and encouraging others to pay, taxes that support an oversized military budget all speak of an ability to juggle paradoxes, what Foucault called *parrhesia* or truth-telling (Pearson, 1983). Providing some sort of theoretical ‘distance’ in the research doesn’t mean the researcher needs to shed their humanity. Kuntz’s discussion on extraction and the idea that such research ‘offers the illusion of full or complete knowledge’ (Kuntz, 2015, pp. 44–46) suggests any methodological approach has limitations, particularly in conflict situations.

Having self-effacing peace-builders embedded in conflict situations ‘tell the truth’ about their work, can be difficult. A survey with a combination of questions that help categorise thinking was possible but rejected because of the immediate constraints that taxonomies tend to put on thought processes. A focus-group session with several of the peace-builders in the room together has the advantage of ‘iron sharpening iron’, where ideas flow in an interactive fashion that is useful in unpacking some key concepts. This was necessarily rejected; some of the peace-builders could not be identified because of danger to themselves, and some of them were unable to travel any distance because they were under surveillance.

Case studies as a stand-alone methodology were considered and would have been useful in some ‘compare and contrast’ approaches, but several of the proposed settings were too dangerous for extensive observation, and the extended presence of this researcher might have placed a wider cohort of informants in danger. For similar reasons, observation and action research as a variation of case study was considered and rejected.

Eventually, the semi-structured interview emerged as the most practical method of accessing the information in a way that was consistent with the theoretical and philosophical approaches that had been adopted, and that satisfied AUT’s Ethics Council (AUTEC).
The interviews

The 31 interviews were conducted over a period of five months from 1 July to 30 November 2014 as detailed in Table 3 and Table 4. These were people who had been acknowledged by either this researcher (by virtue of his presence in communities doing evaluations or consulting with various local NGO groups) or others (working with partner NGOs in these communities) as peace-builders.

The interviewees from Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Open/Closed</th>
<th>Translator involved</th>
<th>Organisation/Individual</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Years involved in peace-building</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ophelia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The interviewees from Myanmar with characteristics
Source: R. Kilpatrick

Two of the interviewees from Armenia were working in Georgia at the time of interview. While many interviewees were happy to be identified, those whose comments being identified in public would put them at risk, or those who have fled...
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the country of conflict but whose families remain, were guaranteed anonymity. All interviewees’ names have thus been changed and some localities disguised to protect the interviewees and their families and associates.

**The interviewees from Armenia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Open/Closed</th>
<th>Translator involved</th>
<th>Organisation/Individual</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Years involved in peace-building</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: The interviewees from Armenia with characteristics*

Source: R. Kilpatrick

Armenia interviewees and the two interviewees from Georgia were considered together in Armenia because they have similar issues, have spent considerable time there, share a border and worked together. In Armenia there is some current tension and open conflict with at least two neighbouring states is likely in the future, however much of the difficulty is historic and there was no active conflict at the time this research was completed. An indication of how the unresolved conflict between Armenia and Turkey, particularly in relation to Turkey being
unwilling to accept responsibility for the deaths of over a million Armenians as a genocide, can so quickly drag others into the conflict was demonstrated in April 2015. Pope Francis, using words of his predecessor, referred to ‘the first genocide of the 20th century’. This resulted in open condemnation from the Turkish president and the withdrawal of the Turkish ambassador from the Vatican for ‘talks’ in Ankara, as well as a renewing of rhetoric against the EU (for its stance in calling for the recognition of the genocide) and the USA (for its use of the term the previous year) (Peker & Pop, 2015; Rocca, 2015). This demonstrates how volatile and sensitive the whole issue remains and how carefully peace-builders must go about their business.

The second region is Burma/Myanmar where the conflict has continued almost unabated from independence in 1948 beyond the time of the newly elected government of Aung San Suu Kyi in early 2016. In 2014–15 peace processes were begun in most states although the treatment of one particular group, the Rohingya, is of concern and has elements of both war crimes and potential genocide associated with it (Lowenstein, 2015). There is also conflict in Kachin state in 2014–2016 where a peace accord signed in February 1994 broke down on June 9th 2011 over self determination and the distribution of asset generation in the state (Khaung, Ko Ko, & Vrieze, 2014). The military regime that ruled Myanmar until 2016 tended to successfully typify the Kachin conflict as a struggle to protect Chinese business investment (Mirante, 2011).

Unfortunately, past experience of peace treaty breaches has taught most ethnic minorities in Myanmar to be very wary of regime promises and the associated army movements. As the Maje Project report states ‘There has always been an imbalance in negotiations between the KIO, which is very willing to compromise, and the regime, which relentlessly plays a zero sum game. This time a ceasefire might possibly bring the KIO some major concession — perhaps abandonment of the BGF demand or even cancellation of the Myitsone dam — but based on historical evidence, the regime is highly unlikely to follow through on any promises it makes to the KIO’ (Mirante, 2011). This would be the experience of most ethnic minority groups in Myanmar.
Just a few days prior to the newly elected and somewhat democratic government of Aung San Suu Kyi being sworn in, the military regime passed a law, NCPO Order 13/2016, in clear breach of human rights legislation, that gave wide ranging power to ‘Prevention and Suppression Officers’ with regard to 27 types of crime. The law grants form immunity to all officers, makes their actions not subject to judicial review, and gives very ambiguous powers to the those officers (Amy Smith, 2016). Interviewing peace-building activists under such circumstances could be hazardous, but every effort was made to secure their safety and abide by AUTEC’s guidance and approval. The typical interview lasted between about 50 and 90 minutes. Three of the interviews were divided across multiple time slots: two of these had about four hours between Part 1 and 2, and the third was completed by phone about three weeks after the first part had been concluded. This was because of interviewees’ very tight time schedules rather than for any clandestine reasons.

Originally the open/closed category was envisaged around high/low security concerns. However sometimes cultural and practical concerns overrode the category of security – for instance, when a male interviewer was talking with a female interviewee, so this category became blurred rendering analysis void. Several early interviews were in a public space and background noise made transcription difficult so more ‘closed’ interviews were undertaken thereafter. Four of the interviews were conducted in clandestine/private settings to avoid potential police and military interference, and security concerns dictated no direct prior contact between researcher and interviewees who arrived and departed separately.

Because fear of the military was very real in the Myanmar setting (M. Smith, 2015) and the interviewees were unable to obtain permission to leave the concentration camp, on one occasion the interviewer’s driver was sent away while contact was made and the interview completed, and on another both driver and translator were sent away. Those two interviews were conducted under relatively tense circumstances because both interviewees had previously been arrested and jailed for outspoken comments on the actions of the government/police/military — or had simply requested that the rule of law be followed. These interviews were somewhat disguised as potential business transactions so that authorities could
present plausible deniability explanations if challenged by higher authorities. This researcher’s involvement in several business start-ups in places like Bangladesh, India, PNG and China meant that credentials could be supplied as validation.

As can be seen from Table 3 and Table 4, as much diversity as possible was sought amongst interviewees and a spread of values established across all fields: ethnicity (European, American, Australian, New Zealanders, Shan, Karen, Burman, Armenian, Georgian, Canadian, Chin), gender, age (from 26 to 73 years old), experience (from just a few years to 35 years as peace-builders) and religion (agnostic, four types of Christian (Evangelical, Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox), Buddhist and Muslim). One field needs special comment — that of gender. A third of the interviewees were women, and, given the cultural and religious backgrounds of the two main geographical areas researched, this is perhaps an over-representation of the proportion of women involved in the leadership of peace-building movements. However, this was a deliberate choice because, as noted above on page 68, it has often been women who are the loudest voices for pacifism and peace. As an example, the only person to vote against the USA declaring war in both WWI and WWII was Congressman Jeannette Rankin, a committed pacifist, who effectively sacrificed her political career in doing so (Fenton, 1997). She wrote: ‘The work of educating the world to peace is the woman’s job, because men have a natural fear of being classed as cowards if they oppose war’ (Rankin, 1914). In 1941, when being pressured to make the vote unanimous for going to war with Japan, she said, ‘As a woman I can’t go to war and I refuse to send anybody else’ (McFadden, 1973), a stance that saw her seeking refuge from an angry mob in a phone booth. However, her comment that ‘You can no more win a war than you can win an earthquake’ has stood the test of time.

Each interviewee was asked the semi-structured questions based on the theoretical framework developed in later in this Chapter and also on some of the tentative insights gained through this researcher’s prior experience in helping establish businesses in various local communities where there was conflict and tension. The question ‘Tell me the story of how you became involved in the work you do? What do you think are the main influencing people, ideas and events that
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have led you to this point?’ was very much shaped by previous experience. Some of the questions were also gleaned from the insights of evaluation teams that this researcher led into post-conflict situations where the work of religious leaders and groups towards a more peaceful and prosperous future was being assessed. It was in similar post-conflict settings that this researcher first noted the connection of faith leaders to small-scale entrepreneurial business, and wondered if there was a way to assess what the link might be between peace-building and the entrepreneurial spirit.

The business settings that sparked interest in local peace-builders ranged from supporting staff in establishing kindergartens in China through to giving skill training to local rascal gangs in Papua New Guinea and giving sex workers in red light districts in South Asia an alternative kind of employment. While not particularly obvious, the tension in China where the kindergartens were being established was between the various classes in that ‘classless’ society. The kindergartens were giving ordinary workers the chance for their children to participate successfully in a very competitive education environment.

More obvious tension existed around the rascal gangs of PNG, who are well-known for the violence and destruction they bring. This is mostly fuelled by lack of opportunity to take part in the economy, when young men have drifted from remote village life into the cities where their agricultural skills are of little value. Having marketable skills reduced their willingness to be involved in anti-community activity.

The negative impact of life in a red light district is probably most obvious. Women involved in the sex industry are often seen as a breed apart, they expect violence as a matter of course, and because of their social status and the perceived threat they bring to family (and thus community) life, they do not have advocates in wider society who will speak out against the violence perpetrated against them. Some further background about the stigma of social isolation of the sex workers and how the new business reversed that stigma can be found in the paper ‘I want to touch the sky’ (Kilpatrick & Pio, 2013).

Each of the businesses mentioned above sought to understand the context in which people lived and worked, and to understand their worldview and what they
wanted for themselves and their families. From assessing those desires, the businesses worked to help the people move towards the hopes they had articulated for their own lives. Understanding at least some of the aspirations of the poor and oppressed, the stigmatised for whom violence in the workplace is a fact of life, the internally displaced people (IDPs) and the refugee, helped shape the questions directed at others who were involved in the same work, having them reflect on what they did and why. Many of the people whom this researcher encountered in peace-building roles were there because of some major event in their lives that had impacted them significantly. They had an experience where they saw the effect of conflict or on-going oppression on a group of people and decided to try to do something about it. The research was aimed at finding out if there was some commonality in that experience and aftermath, and if it was pity, compassion, a sense of justice or some other motivating factor that was dominant in their thinking.

The semi-structured interview takes into account the perils of asking people to relive the painful or traumatic experience that may have tipped them into action (Corbin & Morse, 2003). If responses revealed anything that might be too sensitive a topic for the interviewee — for any number of reasons — this researcher could move on to the next question, or skip a question, without the interviewee having to dwell on the experience. Some of the interviewees had seen family members imprisoned, hurt or even killed, so care was needed with some questions, although little emerged in the interviews that seemed to make interviewees uncomfortable, nervous or stressed.

The ‘semi-structured interview questions’ form is set down in Appendix iv and was generally followed consecutively. The questions’ intent is explained here:

a) The first question is clearly a philosophical question and indicates that the research was interested in much more than the mechanics of peace-building. Designed to add to the understanding of the worldview of the interviewee, it is open-ended and seeks expansive answers to what might be considered the most important questions about life values, ontology and teleology.
b) The second question is designed to seek the interviewee’s view on relationship and community by asking directly about views on how humans ought to relate. In one sense, this is a question directly related to their views of shalom and what the ideal community might look like. While philosophically exploring the interviewee’s teleology, it has the additional advantage of allowing them to expand on what they might be working towards and how that related to question (g) about their giftings.

c) The third question allows insights into how the peace-builders see not only the people who seemed to create difficulty but also the context of the community in which this arises. This is important because it allows the interviewee to reflect not just on individual characteristics but on the community ethos and the events that shape that ethos. It is intended to give an impression of their view of the history of the area and to identify underlying causes of conflict, not just the causes that a surface analysis by a one-day media visit might portray.

d) This question is a direct follow-on from the previous one. It simply encourages a more in-depth analysis by the peace-builder as to what the community and national conflicts are really all about. Again, it offers the chance for the interviewee to provide a hermeneutic on their view of life and humanity because it asks for interpretation of events.

e) The question about peaceful community is again asking for an interpretation of what the interviewee sees as being ideal. The first questions around this theme, namely (a) and (b), will have sparked some additional reflection, so this question presents opportunity to expand on previous thinking.

f) Asking about what influenced them into peace-building is clearly a hermeneutical question right at the heart of phenomenological symbolic interactionism, asking interviewees to give sense to their experiences according to how they have ascribed meaning to those experiences.

g) The next question is an extension of (f) above: and asks about the ‘ideal peace-builder’. This invites further reflection in the area of phenomenological symbolic interactionism on the part of the interviewee.
h) The question about being identified as a peace-builder invites insights gleaned from the community alongside and reflection on how the community might view the interviewee. As noted, there are some surprises in the answers to this question that this researcher had not anticipated.

i) Religion is the source of many people’s hermeneutic of life and the material world in which they find themselves so questions about religion are very pertinent. The questions around faith and its effects on interviewees are designed to explore their spiritual background. As stated elsewhere, many of the interviewed peace-builders operate from a religious perspective and a very high percentage of those with whom they work have adherence to a faith viewpoint. The whole interest in the topic of the thesis has been ignited by faith leaders who were involved in reconciliation in post-conflict communities and also in local business building.

j) The research was interested in what experiences the interviewees have as models for their work, with several cultures seeing only winners and losers in conflict situations. The models that workers can then call on to apply are limited by their experience so this question is to gauge what the peace-builders have in the way of lived experience to draw on, and if they saw aspects in local cultural phenomena that they could use in reconciliation processes. One classic in this field is Richardson’s Peace Child, where he draws on an ancient cultural ritual of the ‘idealization of treachery’ (2005, p. 10) and its reconciling counterpart, the giving of a peace child as an analogy of a wider reconciliation between people and God. This is another way of connecting the interviewee’s worldview with their actions using phenomenological symbolic interactionism.

k) The next question about informal justice systems is a more specific question relating to (j) above, but it pushes for additional reflection on the difference between various forms of justice and which kind of justice interviewees thought might make for the best conditions under which reconciliation would occur. Galtung’s theoretical divide around positive and negative peace (1996), where negative peace pays no attention to structural issues while positive peace allows for movement forward and resolution to the issues
creating the conflict in the first place. One group often excluded from the positive peace process is the mining industry (Bond, 2014), which has been a cause of community conflict in both Armenia and Myanmar. It is therefore interesting to see how interviewees view the best way of dealing with the causes of considerable community conflict and what justice looks like to them.

l) The question about cultural heroes in word and song is to see if interviewees can harmonise what this researcher conjectures would be obvious dissonance between the heroes of the community, who are frequently leading generals and renowned fighters, and their own heroes, where it is expected that figures like Martin Luther King, Gandhi and Jesus might be more often given an exalted status. This also gives further insights into the peace-builder’s ability to hold paradox and tolerate others having bi-polar views on issues around peace.

m) The next set of questions is designed to give an understanding of the connections that the peace-builders make with situations, often outside their own context, that also produce conflict: The movement of climate change refugees, land confiscation and pollution in accessing resources for exploitation results in conflicts at local level. Some of the peace-builders are dealing with exactly those kinds of issues, although economic change rather than climate change has devastated the Armenian countryside. The military budgets that take services like health care and education away from their local communities and spend it in ways that are less productive, as far as the local population is concerned, are other ways in which conflict might be produced and are common to both Armenia and Myanmar. This researcher was interested to see how many locally focused peace-builders see those issues in terms of how they contribute to their community’s tensions — and how they interpret those processes as well. While parts of the question could be considered ‘political’ (such as military spending and corporations), the questions on ‘othering’ and HIV/AIDS are designed to extract the interviewee’s interpretation on community processes and to determine what part their religious background might play in that. Until the early 2000s, the
religious community created an almost wholly negative response to HIV/AIDS based on their moral codes. This researcher wants to ascertain if peace-builders with a religious background might have a very different response from that of the typical church-, mosque- or temple-goer.

n) The question about restoring peace is asking what they are doing in response and maps priorities of the interviewees’ peace-building actions to see if they corresponded to their rhetoric. There are a few surprises in the responses here as well, where several of the peace-builders unexpectedly looked to forces that might be considered players in a negative-peace scenario. This, however, might be more of a comment on this researcher’s less-stressed national background — although perhaps that would be different if he were indigenous to NZ.

o) The penultimate question looked to the future and again sought to read the interviewees’ interpretation of community influence and whether they thought they could harness community sentiment. ‘Do you think communities can influence entrepreneurs like yourself into the kind of work you now do? If so, how?’ forced reflection on modes of effectiveness and, it was hoped, would also give this researcher some material to explore in seeking to build a much greater pool and network of peace-builders into the future.

p) Very few responded to this final question, other than to commend this researcher on the breadth and depth of the questions. This was affirming, and several of the interviewees talked of how useful the questions had been in making them think through their philosophy and actions on several key issues. Since phenomenological symbolic interactionism is the theoretical lens by which to view the data, the fact that the questions evoked greater thought and deeper interpretive processes could be considered an endorsement of the methodology.

The write-up

All interviews were transcribed and three different versions were produced. The first is a complete record with all the pauses, laughter, interruptions, incomplete sentences and leaps of logic and grammar all faithfully recorded in detail. This was
all printed out so any detailed checking could be completed if necessary. The second version, with all extraneous words and divergences removed, was used for theme analysis using matrix enquiry with NVivo. The third version had only the interviewee’s words. This was the material used for the analysis of word frequency in NVivo.

The data analysis

There are several ways in which authors refer to key concepts in data analysis. Gibbs lists as commonly used expressions ‘codes’, ‘index’, ‘category’ and ‘theme’ (Gibbs, 2003, p. 39), to which Bazeley adds the term ‘concept’ (Bazeley, 2009, p. 6), while all of these nuanced ideas are subsumed under the heading ‘nodes’ in NVivo. In this thesis, the term ‘category’ is used since it is most commonly applied to a person’s experience of the world. Dey provides an extended discussion of the basis of the use of the term (Dey, 1993, pp. 31–56), which need not be repeated here, but his observation about ‘fuzzy’ boundaries at higher orders of categorisation — ‘Categorizing at this level therefore involves an implicit and loosely defined classification of observations’ (Dey, 1993, p. 21) — is important. He elucidates:

Concepts are ideas about classes of objects or events: we decide whether to ‘count’ an observation as belonging to a category, in terms of whether it fits with a number of similar observations. We compare this observation with similar examples. So we are already ‘counting’ in both senses of the word, if the meanings we ascribe to an object or event are stable over a range of experience. When we categorize data in this way, we make a distinction between this observation and others. We want to know what makes this observation ‘stand out’ from others. (Dey, 1993, p. 20)

However, if a ‘theme’ or ‘concept’ is generated, ‘The data must be challenged, extended, supported and linked’ (Bazeley, 2009, p. 8) to get the maximum value from it. Also considered in the analysis was that while a particular idea or concept may emerge from the data, some thought must be given to the frequency with which it occurs, or to whether it is simply an idiosyncratic idea with little to say to a major concept. Table 15 to Table 18 show the frequency with which a term is used.
Based on the above considerations, therefore, when all 31 interviews had been consecutively categorised, a wider analysis was conducted with NVivo matrix queries, and concepts were developed which gave insight into the thoughts,
worldview structures and general ideas behind the categorised themes. Word analysis was also done but, for reasons mentioned above about translation issues, was not considered attributive in terms of proof, although it could contribute to observed correlations in the qualitative analysis. Feedback was sought about some categorisation from interviewees who could be easily contacted. No attempt was made to contact those in restricted circumstances.

The process of turning qualitative data from interviews and discussion into interpreting themes and descriptions is outlined in diagrammatic form in Figure 22.

**The reflections of the interviewees on the process of interviewing**

A number of the interviewees expressed the value of having to reflect more on the questions they were asked. They were obviously pleased at being asked questions beyond the ‘how to’ level, the level at which many practitioners are asked about their work. They recognised the power of the philosophical questions to help them reflect more deeply on their history, their worldview, and the effect of some life experiences on their own understanding of how transformation actually takes place, as the following few examples illustrate.

**Example 1:**

**Interviewee/Translator**
And that’s all. The questions are really logic and nice, he likes the questions.

**Interviewer**
Oh. Oh good.

**Interviewee/Translator**
Can we have this ordering of the story, he likes to keep it.

**Interviewer**
Ah, yes, I can copy the interview and send you that as well. And I will do the transcript and send the transcript.

**Interviewee/Translator**
As a poet I like to tell you it was very comprehensive questions. (laughter)
So I think it’s enough. You are thinking very deep now about this questions. And I am sure that world is sleeping today also. They awake are only interests. If you can gift me this in a voice so I want to have it to keep in my archive.
Example 2:

**Interviewee**

Thank you, thank you also for helping, I mean, people don’t ask you these questions, and you do, you know, it’s kind of struggling with thinking honestly about your answers, you know, some of these that’s helped me also think about some things in a new and different way. I did the last time as well, and I appreciate that, it’s actually, . . . it’s not a one-sided value thing, is it, when you’re asked? Like example today, I did, you know, I never think about heroes necessarily, but, you know, just being asked the question, and think about it, and think well, they’re all, basically all Christian, you know, but they’re all people with deep spiritual, ah, base, and wow, that’s interesting that they are, they’re ones. It’s not Churchill, or blood and guts Patton.

Example 3:

**Interviewee**

You know something, the more I hear you saying about that, it’s sparked a whole lot of other stuff in terms of things that I hear. I’ve heard other people say, and I’m thinking, ‘Yeah, people who go on this journey do have certain characteristics alright,’ and that’s, you because I don’t think you can be a peace-maker and reconciler if you can’t see other people’s point of view. And if you can’t have the possibility within you that they might right and you might wrong.

All of this shows that you can’t do inquiry like this without making a difference to the objects of the study. From ‘sparking a whole lot of other stuff’ to realising that your heroes are non-violent practitioners, and recognising that giving responses to the questions is making you see things in a different way, it all suggests that at the very least this process produces a Hawthorne effect (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) and perhaps even something more long-lasting. Most of these interviewees had never been researched before and none had been asked questions about motivations, previous experiences that led to change in attitude, or what they thought their work might have been achieving. It is possible that simply paying more attention to peace-builders may motivate others to join their ranks and look for better solutions to intractable social conflicts.

**The issues of translation**

As depicted in Table 3 and Table 4, 13 of the interviews had a translator involved to varying degrees. In three instances, the entire interview was translated in
both directions. In the other ten, the translator was involved at various levels, from frequently supplying words or phrases to and from the interviewee to occasionally helping with clarification for a word or concept with which the interviewee was struggling. The fact that some interviews needed to be conducted through a translator introduces a series of issues that require explanation, because the world of translation theory and practice appears to be an intense minefield already littered with the corpses of those bold enough to venture into cross-cultural communication analysis (Al-Amer, Ramjan, Glew, Darwish, & Salamonson, 2015). A brief literature search throws up examples of scholars focused on sinocentricism versus eurocentricism (Nam Fung, 2015), the issues around translation of sexual identity and whether Western homonormativity adequately translates other cultural attitudes in this hotly contested arena (Bassi, 2014), and whether some kind of mathematical model can be applied to show additions and subtractions to meaning in translation processes (Mushangwe, 2014). All of these conflicts and theories are beyond the purview of this thesis, but they do sit in the background on the important issue of how some of the material obtained through translation needs to be coded. On reflection, this researcher noted:

(a) Translation sometimes changes the dynamic. In several instances, an interview became animated as ideas were exchanged and a particular thought set off an exploration of other concepts that became dynamic interchanges that allowed access to thinking processes of the interviewee but also made the interviewer rethink some concepts ‘on the fly’. The translation process changes that and prevents the rapid-fire exchanges that can take the conversation to new places and provide those flashes of insight sometimes missing from a more pedestrian-paced questioning.

(b) Translation offers one advantage: there is time for reflection during the translation process. This researcher found himself thinking, ‘What have I just been told and how does that fit with what I know of this situation and what could I more usefully ask to understand how they view this particular issue’ while the translation of his words were being conveyed to the interviewee. This can lead to a more thoughtful and perhaps reflective interview process.
Researchers not working in a language they know are at the mercy of the skill of the translator. Are innuendos, nuances, fine distinctions, cultural expressions, words from a national expression or sayings being properly marked and translated? Is the interviewee quoting someone famous in the culture that the translator knows and can understand the context for, yet the researcher has no understanding of the implied background to the quoted phrase? Two very different approaches to translation, taken by Venuti and Nida, may help to clarify the issues. Venuti wants to preserve all the ‘foreign’ aspects of the original words and ideas and prevent Western cultural imperialism, while Nida’s focus seems to be on how a translator can effectively give the recipients of the communication the same thoughts and feelings as are being conveyed to the original audience. The details of this debate, outlined in Shureteh’s paper on the subject, signify an important divide. Should the translator seek to preserve the ‘foreign’ elements in the original, or does Nida’s dynamic equivalence/functional equivalence really represent cultural imperialism (2015)? All of these issues of translation become very important in coding. Many of the solutions are expensive — like ‘assemble a qualified team of bi-lingual and bi-cultural members who possess the expertise in qualitative research’ (Al-Amer et al., 2015, p. 1160) — and simply beyond the reach of a humble PhD student. So, in this research, compromises needed to be considered and choices made. Preferring the notion of translation as dynamic equivalent, the categories were thus devised around a concept rather than a particular word. This somewhat ameliorated the potential bias that the use of the same translator in several interviews might produce in consistent wrong word equivalence through inadequate translation.

The quantitative case study and its methodology

World Vision’s work in post-earthquake Armenia

World Vision entered Armenia after an earthquake there in the Gyumri region in 1988 killed 60,000 people and destroyed half a million buildings. As an
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international Christian humanitarian organisation with a turnover of more than US$1 billion per annum, and working in nearly 100 countries serving people regardless of religion, race, ethnicity, or gender, it brought resource and expertise. Armenia was still part of the Soviet block at that point, and World Vision was one of the first non-governmental organisations (NGOs) on the scene. Armenia appeared to have made good health and educational progress during Soviet occupation, although some infrastructure failure in the earthquake was blamed on Soviet corruption. As mentioned above on page 24, the later collapse of the Soviet bloc towards the end of the cold war has had devastating effects on Armenia’s economy, with many emigrating permanently and thousands taking seasonal work in Russia to provide for their families.

The 70 years of Soviet rule had also left a number of other legacies that World Vision programming was specifically designed to address. Dependency on the state produced a general lethargy and unwillingness for people to help themselves. There was little or no trust in government. There was very little creativity and imagination and very few initiatives to drive community development. As Manastireanu keenly observes, ‘Paradoxical as it seems, communist collectivism, while setting out to seek the good of the masses, in fact destroyed the fabric of society and instilled in many people utter selfishness and lack of concern for the community’ (Manastireanu, 2012, p. 86). An important way to reverse that is to adopt a worldview where community is important and valued, a move that requires a shift in values and ethics. The measurements taken in the EVS were designed to see if there was enough evidence of correlation between programming interventions and values change to warrant further research. Causation would require isolating multiple other variables, which was considered to be cost-prohibitive at this stage.

The second legacy of the Soviet era was subtler, but probably equally as pervasive. Government based on fear and the pressure on family and neighbours to spy and report on ‘anti-government behaviour’ had so infected everyone with suspicion that community cooperation was almost impossible. As Manastireanu notes, ‘a residue rampant in post-dictatorial contexts is a high degree of suspicion amongst people in all social structures’ (2012, p. 85). Seventy years of control by
fear had forced internalisation of thinking and trepidation at sharing ideas, an individualism that had serious consequences for any kind of community sharing. There are aspects of the EVS that also measure the impact that World Vision’s programming interventions have had on the values that produce this isolated individualism worldview.

World Vision decided to stay on in the country after the earthquakes, and, partnering nation-wide with the Armenian Orthodox Church, began a series of Area Development Programs (ADPs) because of growing poverty in a declining economy. ADPs are designed to run for 15 years and donors ‘sponsor’ a child who lives in the ADP by giving a regular amount each week towards that child’s well-being. The money does not go to the child or family but rather funds training on health and nutrition, agricultural training to support this improved diet, workshops stressing education and encouraging parents in getting their children to school, encouragement for participation in community life and, where appropriate, in spiritual life. Three of the four ADPs examined in this study —Aragatsotn (Talin district), Gegharqunik (Gavar district) and Lori (Alaverdi district) —had much of the standard-type ADP interventions.

During the lifespan of these ADPs, World Vision’s goal setting shifted from rather more generic ‘community transformation’ goals to those of Child Well-being Aspirations (CWBA). The change did not represent a shift in methodology as much as a shift in the focus of measurement, in an attempt to address something similar to the dilemma illustrated in Figure 20.
Luke 2 v 52 ‘And Jesus grew in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and people’

| Goals: Sustained well-being of children and their rights within families and communities ¹ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls and Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoy good health</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children well nourished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children protected from infection, disease and injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and their caregivers access essential health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foundational Principles**

Children are citizens and their rights and dignity are upheld

(including girls and boys of all religions and ethnicities, any HIV status and those with disabilities)

---

1. Child focus prioritizes children, especially the poorest and most vulnerable, and empowers them together with their families and communities to improve their well-being (Integrated focus document 2007)

---

**Table 5: World Vision’s Child Well-being Aspirations**


The background to this shift was a global review of World Vision programme reporting in the early 2000s, which noted that regional variations in data collection methods made global data unusable, and suggested that focus on three or four key outcomes was a better way to define key performance indicators (KPIs), provide
greater accountability, and enable donors to better understand what World Vision was aiming to do. ‘Goals’, as descriptors of the community’s hopes and dreams, contained factors over which ADP management had no control, thus giving rise to the term ‘aspirations’ instead. The high-level aspirations (CWBAs) are listed in Table 5. Through CSBAs, World Vision was seeking to achieve a global shift of measurement focus (from outputs to outcomes) through a high level of integration, or a ‘holistic’ approach, which others, playing on the word ‘integrated’, talk of in terms of organisational mission ‘integrity’. A report for the World Vision team in that region, completed in April 2013 (Kilpatrick, 2013a), indicated some integration between the Faith and Development (F&D) department and the overall work towards CWBAs. Significantly, a well-integrated training programme in HIV/AIDS called ‘Channels of Hope’ was the only operational programme working at the CWBA level. Yet little was done to integrate community faith leaders into the CWBAs because of ignorance of what they could offer. Training sessions run by government health officials produced open-mouthed surprise at the depth and significance of questions put to them by priests and local church leaders (Kilpatrick, 2013a). There appeared to be a communal lack of understanding around what the church in Armenia could do to shift general worldview and values, not just in those associated with religion and morality.

However, in some ways this lack of integration was an advantage for this research project, because any shift in values around prayer, mediation, caring for and accepting others and care of creation (ecology) — all of which were key foci for the F&D team — could be more specifically correlated to the F&D interventions, rather than typified as a result of the overall programming. Obtaining a stronger inference between the F&D programme design and goals and then the resulting values shift in the ADP was therefore possible, and this may encourage the organisation generally to look at ways in which greater programming integration could be developed into the future. This research can also contribute to knowledge and policy-making thanks to the growing desire of major development funders like the World Bank to better ‘the quality of development work both through enhanced mutual understanding and specific insights into poverty and equity challenges’ (World Faiths Development...
Dialogue, 2009), areas in which religions have significant experience and ability in terms of changing worldview/values.

The programmes being undertaken within the ADP included mini-development projects that were run in conjunction with church and community members to lift economic activity, provide employment in depressed areas and provide ecological training which was important in mining and deforestation amelioration as well as in providing long-term employment. There was on-going educational programming in understanding ‘the other’, and ethno-integration as refugee numbers from the Syrian civil war were turning from a trickle to a flood. The three main interventions that were national, rather than just ADP focused, were youth camps, ‘Christ for the Child’ and youth groups, and are described below.

Seen by most village leaders and parents as a ‘short-term’ intervention, these programmes have been warmly welcomed, appreciated and valued by all community members including participants, parents /care-givers, church and government officials as well. Previous research suggests this is largely due to the increased value placed on education and on how the participants now relate to others. ‘They are discussing different subjects more confidently and are trying to get more information’, ‘Children experience hope towards the future [. . . ] new confidence for endeavours in their lives’, ‘[There’s] no envy of others for their success’, ‘I respect other religions’, ‘I am more controlled in other situations’, and ‘I am more patient and forgiving’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b, p. 6) were typical responses. Similar comments were made about the values of health interventions and community participation. Community support of these kinds of interventions ensures a high level of cooperation and increases the likelihood of the values being taught in the programmes being much more widely shared in the community. All of this pointed to it being a worthwhile exercise to attempt to quantify this and see if wider community impact could be observed.

**Youth camps**

The Armenian church saw great value in the youth camps, their activity and the reported impact they were having on the young in terms of how they were
appreciating each other, their families and the community they were in (Kilpatrick, 2013b). No longer relying on WV funding, the church was replacing donor contributions with its own money. Many of the leadership were committed to peace-building, although some were vocally nationalistic. Interviews with staff in the Gevorkian Seminary in Vagharshapat, the main training institution for the Armenian Apostolic church, as well as discussions with priests in local parishes, indicated widespread support for both the methodology of the camps and the style of partnership that has been created with World Vision and the focus on values change. This was largely because of the very positive outcomes all of those questioned could name as a result of the programming. These were not vague references to things being ‘better’ but rather referred to specific behavioural changes such as ‘[the children] have learned a culture of listening’ and ‘the children are more interested in children with special needs’. Parents, teachers and leaders linked these positive outcomes to the programming input through the youth camps, along with the ‘Christ for the Child’ programme and youth groups.

A local Armenian mining company that recognises the value these camps appear to bring in terms of attitudes to education is now funding the camp programme, because it sees the increased social cohesion the camps engender. Further study of the impact on worldview and values of the camp and youth group programming on those who are donors would be an interesting extension to this research, since anecdotal evidence suggests that it is affecting teaching methodologies within the church, as well as changing social attitudes of the mining company executives. Measurable transformation of field-based donor worldview/values would be an important breakthrough for NGOs involved in community development.

In terms of the specifics of the camps themselves, cost factors dictate that they run for only one week (although there is demand for more and longer camps from the community because of the perceived positive outcomes that leaders like teachers and priests have noted). The camps are targeted at vulnerable and disadvantaged children and youth who have limited opportunities, giving them a chance to get outside their own village and ‘see alternative futures for their lives’.
The children targeted are all between 6 and 18 years old, often from multi-child solo-parent homes, and they are mostly assisted in the camp by leaders who are either 20- to 25-year-old trainees from the Armenian Apostolic Church theological seminary or young women from training institutions in the evangelical churches of Armenia. All this is overseen by ADP leaders who are experienced in Aid and Development capacity building, and generally have long-term relationship with the ADPs and the children in those ADPS.

A whole variety of teaching methods, including role plays, games, music, dramatic reading, puppets, drama, art, story-telling and sport, make impact more likely and lasting, all of this aimed at worldview/values change. Priests and trainee priests are not involved in dealing with misdemeanours at camp on the theory that this will help foster a overall sense of love and trust, rather than one of apprehension, amongst the children, something that is needed following the years of suspicion and mistrust generated in the communist era.

Three key areas of worldview and values are targeted during these camps, and these revolve around columns three and four of the CWBA, Table 5, while also being important to communal peace-building activity:

- Love and understanding of neighbours, especially those who are disadvantaged or disabled. This includes specific goals like ‘treating each other with respect’ and ‘understanding those who are different to you’, which are necessarily based on ‘positive identity and self-respect’.
- Love of God and participation in religious ritual and personal spiritual development in prayer, meditation and reading. This is aiming at positively influencing participation in community, care of the less fortunate and a strengthening of community ties.
- Love for creation in terms of ecological care and a growing respect for the many and varied plants and animals on this planet and the habitat (sky-water-land) in which they live.

‘Christ for the Child’

A second area of intervention is the ‘Christ for the Child’ programme of Bible studies within the ADP. These are resourced by World Vision but not led by them. Local churches provide the teaching staff, who receive training in creative
pedagogical methodologies, like those used for the camping programme, aimed at reducing the barriers between community leaders and people. Bible stories are also used to reinforce community values like hard work and entrepreneurship, and even common folklore stories like ‘the big bad wolf’ are adapted to encourage community cohesion, hard work and child protection. Some of these values are measured in the EVS.

This programme has involved a considerable amount of community capacity building as well. Local religious leaders and other teaching staff have been equipped with useful pedagogical tools that help not only with this programme specifically but also in the education of the whole of the community. Innovative ways of teaching are required to help ‘break out of the ideological straight-jacket that the communist era imposed on us’, in the words of Danut, a regional leader for World Vision, who also noted that the stultifying effects of constant government spying and general ineptitude in various government-controlled sectors like education have prevented the development of innovation and excellence. The pedagogy encouraged in the programme is deliberately targeted at shifting attitudes in the community to raise questions, think of possibilities and work together towards solutions.

**Youth groups**

The third area of intervention is youth groups. These are an important component in the delivery of the CWBAs on ‘participation’, as they seek to encourage leadership in the youth themselves. Youth are encouraged to be involved in the community in significant ways through *diakona* (service to others) and have been given some resources like computers to assist with that. Youth groups are also encouraged to intermix and share ideas and to compete in various activities like sport. In a post-communist world like Armenia, which one regional WV staff member said operated as if people ‘were like trains, they can only go on the prescribed track’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b, field notes), this has produced real difficulties in terms of finding role models who can show initiative and are willing to take economic risk to succeed. The youth group programming is designed to open young people’s eyes to an alternative future in a country with long-term tensions with neighbours (Turkey and Azerbaijan) and to demonstrate to them that they have the
power to both articulate what they want and make the changes needed to achieve that. This also includes a focus on political involvement where, again, there appears to be a dearth of useful role models and mentors.

**What could be expected from the interventions?**

The EVS produces a great deal of data that would be valuable for research well beyond the scope of this thesis. The full questionnaire is accessible in Appendix i. Only those variables related to the four areas of the CWBAs that the F&D programme staff was targeting were investigated. They are:

1. ‘Love of God’, which includes both institutional religion and personal devotion
2. ‘Love of neighbour’, which looks at attitudes and actions towards those who are different
3. ‘Creation care’, which examines environmental and ecological concerns
4. ‘Community involvement’, which in some respects reflects a connection to all three areas above.

In the EVS, questions are labelled Q1, Q2, etc., and the various areas of response are labelled v1, v2, etc., with a number assigned for each response as in Table 6. These numbers can then be turned into statistics with means, standard deviations, etc. The average for a response for any value (v1, v2, etc.) in each ADP could be found in the 2013 survey conducted for World Vision and then this data compared to the data from the 2008 EVS for the province where the ADP was located. For example, Amasia is in the Shiraq province. If there was a significant difference in the average number value given to a person’s religious life in Amasia versus the average number value given to it in Shiraq generally, then World Vision might be the cause of this effect because ‘love of God’ was a target for change in worldview/values.

Evaluating worldview/values change is measured by sampling a part of the population and extrapolating from there. But if the average number value of the values is different between the Amasia sample and the Shiraq sample, is this
difference real or just an accident of sampling? There are several ways a researcher can check whether the statistic derived from the sample is truly representative of the total population. This can be done by t tests, Pearson’s $\chi^2$ (chi squared) test, or what is called the 2 t test. A sample of the printouts from these tests are in Appendix vi, and some summary tables around the worldview/values responses that might be of interest in answering the question ‘Is there evidence that worldview/values can be changed by targeted intervention?’ are found in Table 25 to Table 32 in Appendix vi.

A typical question from the EVS is depicted in Table 6

**WE START WITH SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT LIFE IN GENERAL, LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES AND WORK**

![SHOW CARD 1]

**Q1 Please say for each of the following how important it is in your life:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>quite important</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>not at all important</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Friends and acquaintances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Leisure time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: The first question from the European Values Survey 2008*

Source: EVS 2008, Master Questionnaire

In this research, the resulting data from such questions was processed using SPSS and the ‘declined’ or ‘not applicable’ figures were excluded from calculations. Then, by comparing the means and standard deviations of these two data sets, the probability of the two samples representing real difference could be determined, and therefore also the possibility that significant worldview/values change had occurred. The provincial figures included those in the ADP itself, meaning that the provincial
figures may have already impacted the provincial figures, so difference between the two means might have been even greater.

However, statistics talk about probabilities and best fit to some imagined perfect model. The results of the EVS study in Armenia ‘prove’ nothing. They do suggest trends and some areas in which more intense study might be focused, but they do not prove causality between the interventions and the worldview shifts that appear to have occurred. Fuller explanations behind this caveat can be found in Chapters 1 and 2 of *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (Field, 2013, pp. 1–87).

**The European Values Study: Quantifying worldview/values**

**The EVS: Some background**

The European Values Study commenced life as an informal group of academics wanting to research civic and political institutions and the values system on which they rested at a time when the first elections for the European Parliament were about to take place and the European Bishops conference — *Consilium Conferentiarum Episcoporum Europae* or CCEE — was also about to move into session.

The EVS researchers were interested in questions such as:

a) Do Europeans share common values?
b) Are values changing in Europe and, if so, in what directions?
c) Do Christian values continue to permeate European life and culture?
d) Is a coherent alternative meaning system replacing that of Christianity?
e) What are the implications for European unity?

The foundation began modestly in 1981 with 1000 people interviewed in 10 countries, but it engendered such interest in the academic community that affiliates were soon formed in North and South America, the Middle and Far East, Australia and South Africa, where affiliated groups were set up to administer the same questionnaire. Eventually this covered 26 countries. Previous surveys to the one used in this research were run, closely following the 1981 style and questions. These were
conducted in 1990 and 1999, with increasing numbers of nations and interviewees each time. By the time the fourth iteration of the survey was run in 2008, there were 47 countries involved and a total of 70,000 people surveyed. There are agreements enacted to share the data, so an extensive data set from consistently conducted surveys is available, enabling longitudinal cross-cultural as well as inter-cultural studies. There are over 1300 articles in the official publication list alone in several languages covering multiple topics, including the methodology of the study itself.

This data set ‘provides insights into the ideas, beliefs, preferences, attitudes, values and opinions [i.e. worldviews] of European citizens and what they think about life, family, work, religion, politics and society’ (European Values Study, 2009a). These studies show that, indeed, there has been a deep and fundamental shift in modern culture and worldview across all these countries but that it is not occurring at the same rate in these various states and regions. The studies appear to indicate that cultural and social values are most affected by the stage of socio-economic development (although that concept itself is fraught with overtones of the debate about the very nature of ‘development’ itself), and that the most profound shifts, particularly in regard to ‘secularisation’ (Norris & Inglehart, 2004), occur where change in economic situation is greatest.

There were a number of compelling reasons for using the EVS for the quantitative section of this research:

a) It has been rigorously examined by innumerable academics and its iterations adjusted for better insights.
b) Its methodology of delivery is completely standardised, even to the size of flashcards as well as what is on the cards.
c) Its theory is well-researched, explained and accepted.
d) Its data is thoroughly checked for accuracy.
e) It is available in about 40 languages (thus far), and every translation is checked and double-checked for accuracy of meaning in different cultural settings as well as for the correctness of its simple word-for-word translation.
Details of the survey conducted in December 2013 and January 2014

The EVS was conducted over four different Area Development Programs (ADPs) in Armenia in December/January of 2013/2014. It was conducted by 15 interviewers who were hired by the Child Development Foundation (CDF). The Foundation was established by World Vision Armenia (WVA) in 2002, but since 2009 it has operated as an independent organisation. The data collection process was coordinated by CDF, and data quality and integrity were checked in the Armenian World Vision office in the monitoring and evaluation department staffed by postgraduate researchers and evaluators.

Sample: To ensure a randomised selection of primary information sources matching the EVS, the survey sample was designed based on two-stage cluster sampling methodology (among populations aged 15 and above) throughout four phases of data calculation and distribution process across the four target areas (Alaverdi, Gavar, Talin, Amasia ADPs). Three of the four ADPs were selected as having consistent numbers of programmatic/project interventions (experimental units), and the fourth, Amasia ADP, was chosen because, although there were several innovative interventions there, they had started just six months before the survey. The interest in Amasia was based on ascertaining if any worldview changes could be detected at such an early stage of the intervention process. The details of the numbers selected from each ADP area are shown in Table 7 and the selection process followed the procedures set out in the EVS guidelines (European Values Study, 2009b).

Phase 1: Resources available suggested a maximum target total of 500, exceeding the 67, 195 and 138 calculated statistically as desirable for a 95% confidence level in the three ADPs of most interest in Table 7. The numbers required to achieve the 95% confidence level using were assigned to Alaverdi, Gavar and Talin ADPs and the remainder allocated to Amasia which was included for the sake of interest. To define the number of respondents to be interviewed per ADP, a simple proportional sampling was applied, i.e., the proportion of target population per area against the cumulative number of target population across target areas was replicated as in Table 7. This simple proportional distribution was applied only for Alaverdi,
Talin and Gavar ADPs. For Amasia ADP, the desired sample size of 100 interviews was considered to be enough to make data comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportional Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population aged 15 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaverdi (Lori Province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavar (Gegharakunik Province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talin (Aragatsotn Province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasia (Shirak Province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Details of those interviewed in the various Area Development Projects**

Source: R. Kilpatrick

**Phase 2:** To select sampling units (in this case ADP communities), probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling technique was applied where the probability of selecting a sampling area is proportional to the size of its population (households). As a result of PPS, 50 communities (out of 73) were selected. Following Field Guide for Transformational Development Indicators, a minimum of 30 clusters (see Table 8) was selected for the survey (number of clusters = \( \frac{sample\ size}{30} \)).

**Phase 3:** The Primary Selection Units (households) were selected using two methods because of the differences between the ways in which household data is stored for urban and rural areas in Armenia. For urban areas, households were randomly selected from community logs containing the list (serial numbers) of families. The random selection was completed using the respective command from the SPSS data set. Serial numbers of households were selected as many times as was
needed to complete the desired sample sizes for target areas. If a respondent was unavailable, the next household from the community log list was picked. For rural areas, the interviewer entered the house or building, the number of which corresponded to the last number of the mobile phone of the interviewer. The sample step for rural areas is 3, with left-handed direction to move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Clusters per target area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaverdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Clusters of houses in each ADP*

Source: R. Kilpatrick

**Phase 4:** In order to assure randomness in selecting respondents from households, the ‘last birthday’ method was used: the person surveyed was the person in the household with the most recent birthday who was over 15 years of age.

**Instruction:** Fifteen interviewers were trained with exactly the same research tool used for EVS 2008 wave. The data was collected between 16 December 2013 and 10 January 2014.

**Data integrity:** Data integrity was assured through several steps:

**Step 1:** Survey route maps of all areas/interviewers were analysed to define the level of variance between planned and implemented random sampling. The variance was equal to 8%, which is statistically inconsequential and with no major impact on efficiency of random sampling.
Step 2: The collected data quality was assured through the double-checking of 20% of questionnaires via phone calls.

Step 3: Following the data coding guidance of EVS 2008, all missing responses were recoded into the values allocated by EVS to the same responses.

Step 4: Data consistency was checked through flag variables and descriptive statistics/frequency and cross-tabulation analysis. 100% of questionnaires were checked. All inconsistencies were respectively double-checked and removed.

Step 5: Data from 2013 was then combined with Armenian data extracted at AUT from the EVS conducted in 2008, and then visually checked. T tests based on year (2008 and 2013) were then run on the data and the resulting output tables examined and analysed.

The hypothesis being tested

World Vision programming is effecting changes of people’s values/worldviews in directions World Vision see as positive and desirable.
## EVS 2008 Armenia and EVS for WVA: data comparability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVS 2008 ARMENIA</th>
<th>EVS testing for WVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey tool</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS 2008 — Armenia</td>
<td>EVS 2008 — Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Questionnaire</td>
<td>Field Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional country-specific questions included in the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Name of the ADP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Name of the community</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population aged 15 and above</th>
<th>Population aged 15 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One interview per household</td>
<td>One interview per household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation-wide (with net sample size of 1500)</th>
<th>Area-specific (with net sample size of 500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratified random probability sampling</td>
<td>Two-stage cluster sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Due to time and organisational constraints and available resources, two-stage cluster sampling was applied</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted by age and sex</th>
<th>Not weighted, since the survey is not nation-wide but area specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Pre-testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 pre-test interviews</th>
<th>20 pre-test interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face-to-face</th>
<th>Face-to-face</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Data verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data corrected both individually and automatically</th>
<th>Data corrected both individually and automatically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 9: Comparing EVS and ADP data collection*

Source: R. Kilpatrick
Table 10: Proportions of ADP and EVS data

Source: R. Kilpatrick

The data

Table 20 (see Appendix vi) shows the proportionality of the data used in the EVS survey and Table 10 the proportions in the ADPs. They match closely. The EVS data shows that 19 of the 1500 fell outside the standard geographical categories, 15 mistakenly coded to Azerbaijan (the 310000001 and 310000003 codes) and 4 to Georgia (the 2680000001 codes).

Detail of how the values were assigned is found in a manual on the EVS (see Appendix v for details), which demonstrates the extent to which the EVS has gone to get consistency of data and reliability of results. The results of the survey are discussed in detail in Chapter 6. The 500 interviews helped make the statistics more robust, with confidence levels of 95%. The means between some values in ADPs and the surrounding areas are statistically significantly different. ‘t’ tests were run on the variables being tested. Only values relevant to the kinds of intervention that the F & D were targeting were investigated. What the research sought to determine was an answer to the question: ‘Is there enough evidence of impact between programming
Pearson’s $\chi^2$ (chi squared) test is the test that can be run on the same categorical data as the t test to indicate whether the difference in means that has been observed is actually just a chance event. The $\chi^2$ test assesses whether the two sets of variables are independent of each other and, secondly, how well they fit to the expected distribution. The output from those $\chi^2$ tests has been transferred to four tables (Table 25 to Table 28) in Appendix vi, one for each of the ADPs, and a small portion of one of those tables is reproduced in Table 11 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value comparing Amasia ADP in Shirak province</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Pearson Chi2</th>
<th>Pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is religion in your life (Q1F)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>30.3261</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all things together, how happy are you (Q8)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>25.8970</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a welfare organisation (Q5A)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>18.6611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a religious organisation (Q5B)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.1308</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: A small sample of the $\chi^2$ charts detailed in Appendix vi

Source: R. Kilpatrick

Table 11 lists the value being assessed in column 1, and the number of samples in the test (which affects the power of the test) with the ADP and the province in column 2. Column 3 is Pearson’s $\chi^2$ value, and column 4 the probability/reliability derived from that value,

Another test that performs a similar function in telling the researcher whether the difference between two means is significant or not is the two-sample t test – 2t test – ttest. This was used instead of the $\chi^2$ test, where there were more than four categories in the variables and the distribution was assumed to be normal. The standard output from the 2t test is also shown in Appendix vi, and the results of that were transferred to the four tables Table 29 to Table 32 likewise shown in Appendix vi. Table 12 is a small portion of one table reproduced from the tests reported in appendix vi to check that the variances between the two samples were approximately the same. Most were quite close and a further visual check was made to see if the
values produced for similar / non-similar variations made significant difference to the resulting statistics. They didn’t, mostly because the size of the samples was big enough to overcome the effect of variation differences.

| The value | Gavar / Gegharak | Degrees of freedom | 95% confidence interval | t | Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| How often do you go to religious services (Q109) | 295 | -0.4879 0.2638 | -0.5865 | 0.2790 | 0.5580 | 0.7210 |
| What is the place of God in your life (Q129) | 300 | -0.4688 0.6237 | 0.2790 | 0.6098 | 0.7804 | 0.3902 |
| Do you get comfort and strength from religion (Q130) | 296 | -0.0199 0.1561 | 1.5219 | 0.09255 | 0.1291 | 0.0645 |

**Table 12: Sample of output from the 2t test table**

Source: R Kilpatrick

There is discussion related to the results in Chapter 6, but a key consideration in the analysis of the data is the purpose of the data. This data cannot prove causation. At best it will suggest a link between the aim of the intervention and the appropriate change in values as expressed in the hypothesis on page 155 — and the need for a much better methodology that is able to better discern the actual impact on worldview/values of any intervention.

**Limitations and potential problems with the quantitive data**

Every reasonable measure was taken to ensure that the surveys in this section of the research replicated in every way how the EVS was conducted. This was done by ensuring that similar geographical sample proportions were taken, as outlined above, that exactly the same survey and the same flashcards were used, that an independent organisation, unknown to any of the respondents, did the sampling, and that the data was checked for integrity. However, two things need to be noted:

1. This survey is a snapshot view. No baseline survey was conducted in the ADP, so the study assumes that previous values held within the ADP area matched those for the district in the 2008 EVS, but without a baseline survey this cannot be determined with certainty.
2. The time of year. An estimated 60% of the eight million Armenians live permanently outside the country (Hovhannisyan 2009, p. 2) and a further 36,000 emigrate permanently each year. Many of these are educated and skilled workers (Harutyunyan, 2013). The local employment rate in Armenia is only about 40–45%, well below any of the European states, or even the ex-Russian states like Georgia that surround it (Hovhannisyan 2009, p. 2). Citizens have a good level of education but there has been no investment in industry, so 60,000 migrant workers — or over 5% of the employed workforce — go to Russia every year in summer on the five daily flights to Moscow. Many of these are young men, which means that during summer months there are villages in Armenia that are almost stripped of their working male population. If the worldview/values of that group is significantly different from the rest of the population, then the time of year the survey is taken becomes important in terms of consistency.

Summary

Using multi-method approaches allows the exploration of the values, worldviews and skill sets of peace-builders (Themes 1 and 2 of this thesis) and the possibility of shifting those worldviews (Theme 3). The use of a well-theorised and tested quantitative approach like the EVS demonstrates the soundness of the hypothesis that there is enough evidence to further explore the premise that targeted intervention and programming can indeed change values and worldview in a targeted direction. The qualitative inquiry, taken from a well-accepted process of phenomenological symbolic interactionism, allows the exploration of the questions raised by the thesis themes. Those insights from the research into the three themes of

- **Theme 1**: In what ways are the worldview/values of peace-builders similar to or different from those of entrepreneurs?
- **Theme 2**: In what ways do the leadership styles of peace-builders align with those who have succeeded in building an entrepreneurial business?
- **Theme 3**: What reciprocal influences do the peace-builder and their communities have on each other?

are explored in Chapters 5 and 6.
Chapter 5: The qualitative data: Characteristics and leadership

Introduction

Standing looking at the little grassy mound in Hiroshima begs the question, ‘What would the dead say?’ History has recorded the words of the survivors in writing, sound and film, but the reactions of the 70,000 humans instantly incinerated on that August day are lost forever. Good approximations can be found by talking to those who were close to the event and have the scars — physical and emotional — to show for it. The documentary *Hiroshima* (Wilmshurst, 2005) draws on multiple voices to get as close as possible to the key actors in this world-changing event. The watcher is left to largely judge for themselves the motivations and actions that contributed to the events in Hiroshima in 1945. This chapter looks at the key actors in community peace-building — the peace-builders themselves — and analyses their words to get a sense of who they are and why they do what they do.

This section of the research is qualitative, exploring the background, experiences, insights and features of the peace-builders being researched, to see if there are common experiences and characteristics, and if...
The business of peace-building

they align in significant ways with the often-quoted characteristics and skill set of entrepreneurs. Although the research doesn’t necessarily indicate that any one particular type of person is predisposed to ‘being entrepreneurial’ (and Isenberg’s comments about entrepreneurs being ‘ordinary people’ (2013, p. 102) is valid here) and the entrepreneurial activity is far from uniform, certain commonalities emerge as focal points in the process of being entrepreneurial. If such characteristics or the life-changing events that such interviewees described could be nurtured, then perhaps more peace-builders could be developed in communities where on-going conflict seems intractable.

Table 3, page 123, and Table 4, page 124, and translation issues are once again underscored when considering and analysing responses. Translation often changes the dynamic because it changes the pace and puts the researcher at the mercy of the skill level of the translator, which can also impact the coding process. The Nida/Venuti debate about decisions between the possibility of leaving ‘foreign’ concepts intact or orienting them to the receptor audience is significant and noted on page 139, and this researcher has preferred Nida’s concept of translation as the dynamic equivalent of the categories for coding (Shureteh, 2015). Thirty one interviews were devised around a concept or theme rather than a particular word, because studies on polysemy show the ways in which words can have multiple meanings (Srinivasan & Rabagliati, 2015) in addition to the translator missing a particular nuance (Al-Amer et al., 2015, p. 1158). Indeed, the same word can be used to express totally opposite concepts when spoken in different contexts and words such as ‘understanding’ or ‘community’ occurring in ‘no community’ or ‘lacks understanding’ could distort a word cloud. Hence a third version of the interview transcriptions was developed, detailed on page 133.

- First version: every word, pause, uncertainty, cough, etc., included
- Second version: all extraneous words, repeats, pauses, etc., deleted
- Third version: interviewer’s words removed.

Even then, care needed to be taken with certain words. For example, the word ‘just’ may have been used to talk of seeking a just solution, or even in the word ‘justice’ (the word count was run to include derivatives of words), but it could also
have been used several times in a phrase like ‘I just mean’, as one interviewee was inclined to do.

Main findings

Analysing peace-builder language: Word clouds

Even given the issues outlined above, to see the words most frequently used by the peace-builders is informative, especially those words not used in the questionnaire itself. NVivo produces a word cloud in which the most used words are reproduced, the size of the word representing the frequency. Page 167 gives the list of words that were excluded, including those removed by default in NVivo itself.

Figure 24: Word cloud for peace-builders — total group

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)
The resulting word cloud graphic from the interviews is shown in Figure 24, illustrating the focus of this group. It brings to mind the Maori (the indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand) proverb:

\begin{quote}
He aha te mea nui o te ao
What is the most important thing in the world?
He tangata, he tangata, he tangata
It is the people, it is the people, it is the people
\end{quote}

The focus of the interviewees is on people, community, what is right and just and good. However, this word cloud also shows the limitations of simple word count as a measure of the focus of the interviewee. Although it is there, the word ‘understand’ (or ‘understands’, ‘understanding’, ‘understandings’ and ‘understandable’) does not feature overly prominently in the word cloud, coming in at 14th place, yet 28 of the 31 interviewees mention understanding as a key concept in peace-building. Indeed, the idea is mentioned 128 times in total by the interviewees, making it the most often articulated value in the peace-building conceptual framework. Nearly all of the interviewees describe a willingness to try and understand and an education towards ‘the other’ as foundational in moving a community towards peace, reconciliation and supportive co-existence. This makes it a very important concept, which a glance at the word cloud might overlook. A further 24 of the 31 either mention the associated concept of respect or tell a story or make an illustration around the idea of ‘respect’, but the actual word doesn’t appear in the overall word cloud (looking at the 100 most often used words) and is ranked 112th in the total frequency table and 78th in the word frequency count for women. However, the peace-builders view respect and understanding as issues of the first order, as summed up by interviewee Kate in Thailand leading her own peace-building NGO in Myanmar: ‘A peaceful community is a place where first of all people respect each, understand each other […] and then to understand, respect each other.’ The importance interviewees’ view place on this concept is not easily detected from a simple word cloud or frequency table.
Given these caveats and limitations, specific comment is inadvisable, but important general observations can be made. Peace-builders think often about the more esoteric and conceptual issues of community, justice, religious expression, giving and taking, relationship problems and conflict. However, connected to those conceptual issues, words like leaders, talks, government, organisation, money and views also emerge, which indicates a practical, possibly even pragmatic side to peace-builders, although this is really only hinted at in the word cloud. Field observation indicated that while communal peace was the goal when issues like unequal rights, poverty, access to resources, government regulation, etc., were identified as being barriers to the peace-building, these peace-builders and their organisations were adept at finding means to both confront and overcome the problem. If government edicts were an issue, they started an advocacy organisation that pressured politicians. If poverty was creating tension, they encouraged business that created work, income and a food supply. If it was access to resources that was a problem, they created networks that would achieve access. Such problem-solving traits are hinted at in the word cloud but are drawn out in the discussion later in this chapter.
Figure 25: First 100 word frequency for women

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)
### Table 13: The words excluded from the word frequency table

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)
Word frequency tables were run against gender, academic levels, religious grouping, and the geographical setting but, because of translation and other issues, no statistical tests were run on word counts. The numbers of interviewees involved are small also, making the power of any statistic weak, which was another reason for not attempting this process. Any numerical reference is therefore descriptive, not statistical, in nature.

Three word clouds are displayed as examples. Word frequency tables were also produced to compare country, religion and education level. Analysis of a visual comparison of tables and word clouds follows.
Gender

The word clouds suggest that there is a language divide between men and women — but only in a few areas. That there would be differences is perhaps expected (see, for example, Bischoping, 1993), especially in relationship to leadership (Javidan, Bullough, & Dibble, 2016). Percentage-wise (as a proportion of the total words used by each group), ‘good’ and ‘love’ feature nearly twice as often in women’s language as in men’s, and ‘church’ more than twice as often. While the use of ‘rights’ and ‘peace’ is closely aligned between the genders, the word ‘education’ isn’t in men’s first 200 words but it ranks 20th for women. Likewise, ‘friends’, coming in at 71st for women, does not feature in the first 200 words for men. Both genders talk of organisation, rights, problems, giving, caring, taking, talking and family, but women like to ‘remember’ about twice as often as men, talk about ‘children’ and ‘feel’ nearly three times more frequently, and use the word ‘power’ nearly twice as often. Meanwhile, men think more about ‘country’, ‘money’ and ‘work’ than women.

Country

Geographically, many of the first 50-plus words from interviewees from Myanmar appear in the first 100 words from Armenia and vice versa, when specific geographical place names are excluded. Of note is that the words ‘sides’ and ‘state’ are both mentioned in the 50 most frequent words in Myanmar (‘state’ ranking 21st in Myanmar but not in the first 100 in Armenia.) This seems to reflect both the internal (often a state-by-state issue) and on-going (at the time of the interviews) nature of the conflict in Myanmar. Another word frequency that points to the different nature of the conflicts is that ‘country’ appears as the 13th most frequently used word in Armenia but not in the first 100 in Myanmar. Another observed visual difference is in the term ‘Christian’, used about twice as often in Armenia (where, despite no formal constitutional link, the Christian heritage of the country is assumed in the language), while ‘religion’ is used twice as often in Myanmar.
Religion

Visual review of the religious division of language suggests that local issues may dominate over strictly religious ones for people from a Muslim background when discussing things like citizenship, state, government, power and community. This would make sense in light of the fact that, as Rohingya and as Muslims (Rohingya are about 99% Muslim), they have been denied citizenship and had their communities ripped apart by what seem to the Rohingya to be government-backed local groups, with a substantial number of imported and violent troublemakers from outside the state. Muslim interviewees do not mention ‘rights’ in their first 100 most used words, while all the others use the term in their top 26 most used words, but it is impossible to draw any conclusions as to whether that result is dominated by ethnic or religious effects. Much more research beyond the scope of this thesis would need to be conducted to make further inferences. That evangelicals don’t use the word ‘change’ in the first 100 words, while other groups do, brings to mind the joke: ‘How many evangelicals does it take to change a light bulb? Change, what’s change?’ Variations of this, like ‘God’ or ‘Christian’ not appearing in the first 100 frequent word tables of agnostics, Buddhists and Muslims, may be likewise unsurprising, but the omission of ‘love’ from the 100-word frequency table of agnostics and Buddhists wasn’t anticipated. Despite these differences, however, the use of words is remarkably consistent between religious groups, the first 50 most frequent words of any one group being nearly always used in the first 100 frequent words of all the others.

Education level

Across the different groupings of education level, there was, for this researcher, a surprisingly high consistency of terminology about attitudes to key ideas of justice, understanding, the search for goodness, the recognition of conflict as not only a fact of life but something, that if handled correctly, could in fact be useful for a community or group, which is very encouraging.
In summary

This data provides some very broad generalisations because of the various caveats attached to it in relation to dealing with translators and second- and third-language speakers (see page 139), and some of the groupings being small, with no wider studies with which to make comparisons. Because no statistical tests were run, words like ‘significant’ or even ‘differences’ when referring to the results are not useful in this context. However, the word count data does give a general sense of where there might be significant differences among the group of peace-builders which is worth a closer analysis in terms of the themes into which the data has been categorised.

Interpreting the tables

In the section that follows, a series of tables contributes to building an understanding of the worldview of peace-builders, which ultimately helps to answer the theme questions of the thesis. Table 14 shows how a number of the interviewees refer to a concept along side the number of times the concept is referred to by everyone. In Table 15 to Table 17, the following applies:

(a) As noted on page 168, the table statistics are descriptive only. No tests have been run to demonstrate statistical means, deviations, significance, etc. They are a visual guide as to what peace-builders mentioned most often in response to questions, and are therefore an indication only as to what peace-builders consider to be important. They therefore do not stand on their own, and it is the qualitative comments that form the argument and mould the conclusions.

(b) Column 2 shows the number of the interviewees out of 31 who fit the category of country, education, religion, organisation or person, the translator being present or not, and the length of time they have been working in the field.

(c) Column 3 is the percentage in the colour band (representing a category) of the total colour band or category.

(d) The colour bands represent the following categories: Blue for country, light green for education level, grey for gender, pink for independent or organisational representative, green for religious affiliation, light blue for...
whether or not there was a translator used, yellow for the years working in the role.

(e) The labels at the top represent the node or code that was applied to responses made by the interviewees.

(f) The numbers in column 4 upwards represent the total number of times (frequency) that a particular category responded in a particular way (the code or node).

As outlined on page 126, originally an open/closed divide was intended on the basis of security concerns, but several interviews were ‘closed’ simply to reduce background noise and enhance audio clarity – or for cultural reasons, rendering the original intent void. These categories have been removed from Table 15 to Table 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: The category a response was coded to</th>
<th>Sources: How</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God as prime relationship</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships general: shalom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, respect and acceptance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love and empathy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and self security</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish and generous</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the created order: the earth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict and Peacefulness</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic insufficiency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal rights (lack of)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear and Loss</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed and selfishness</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and politics</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride and nationalism</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and gender conflict</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious difference</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction and Contentment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cycle of conflict and oppression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: doubts and questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity: culture and the nature of humans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith, duty rules, integrity, relationship</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith, love, bounty, expression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human compassion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income, Personal gain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative data
Table 14 The sources and frequency of peace-builder insights

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)

The tables from Table 15 to Table 18 can be understood as follows:

Table 15 categorises what the peace-builders vocalise as the factors that build a community of shalom, while Table 16 analyses the factors they see as the key causes of tension in their communities that most contribute to the communal violence experienced by those around them. Table 17 examines what peace builders express as the factors that motivated them in their peace-building work, and Table 18 seeks to analyse what the peace-builders interviewed have attempted to do in response to what they saw as the felt needs of the community in terms of what was needed to move towards reconciliation.

What makes a peaceful community?

For Table 15 below, peace-builders were asked to reflect on what aspects of community they have observed to the most significant in creating shalom—that kind of community where there is not just a lack of violence but a positive community interaction and well-being for all. In Table 15, the first two rows (blue) show that the number of people interviewed from Myanmar was 16 (or 52% of the total interviewees), while Armenia was represented by 15 people (48% of the total number
interviewed). Looking down at the grey bands, the number of men interviewees is 21 (68%), with 10 women (32%), adding up to 31, or 100%. Large variations of expected percentages in other columns warrant explanation.

Johan Galtung’s theories addressing the notion that peace is more than just the absence of conflict are discussed above in Chapter 2. ‘Just stop the fighting’ was a frequent comment made by community members in informal settings, with the thought that life would go back to normal; but normal was defined only in terms of no violence. Few could articulate what they thought their peaceful society would look like when the violence stopped, and even fewer the steps they would take to move society in that direction by ‘addressing the root causes’ of violent conflict — another phrase popularised by Galtung and adopted by the United Nations as part of Boutros Ghali’s 1992 report on ‘An Agenda for Peace’ (UN Peacebuilding Support Office, 2016). Galtung’s attention to structural and cultural conflict producers is particularly relevant to the differences noted between peace-builders and the wider community.
The business of peace-building

| Attribute / Value | Numbers | Percentage | Courage | Forgiveness | Honesty | Justice, respect and acceptance | Love and empathy | Being Organized | Being Organized and Loyal | Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect | Being Organized and Loyal and Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect | Being Organized and Loyal, Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect | Harmony with the created order (the earth, ecology) | Harmony with the created order (the earth, ecology) and Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect | Harmony with the created order (the earth, ecology) and Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect and Being Organized and Loyal | Harmony with the created order (the earth, ecology) and Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect and Being Organized and Loyal and Mutual Organizational Trust and Respect |
|-------------------|---------|------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Country = Myanmar | 16      | 52         | 11      | 7           | 3       | 39                           | 22             | 5              | 56                             | 24                                     | 18                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Country = Armenia | 15      | 48         | 13      | 16          | 21      | 48                           | 27             | 22             | 64                             | 39                                     | 24                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Education level = College | 9      | 29         | 5       | 6           | 12      | 28                           | 6              | 10             | 18                             | 11                                     | 2                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Education level = Graduate degree | 13    | 42         | 13      | 9           | 6       | 35                           | 26             | 9              | 49                             | 27                                     | 18                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Education level = Post-graduate | 9      | 29         | 7       | 9           | 6       | 28                           | 18             | 8              | 61                             | 26                                     | 22                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Gender = Male | 21      | 68         | 18      | 20          | 20      | 64                           | 33             | 22             | 89                             | 43                                     | 30                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Gender = Female | 10      | 32         | 7       | 4           | 4       | 27                           | 17             | 5              | 39                             | 21                                     | 12                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Personal | 9      | 29         | 8       | 12          | 12      | 39                           | 11             | 14             | 43                             | 7                                      | 4                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Organizational | 22      | 71         | 17      | 12          | 12      | 39                           | 13             | 8             | 85                             | 57                                    | 38                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Religious affiliation = Buddhist | 2      | 6          | 0       | 1           | 0       | 3                            | 4              | 0              | 6                              | 3                                      | 11                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Religious affiliation = Protestant | 6      | 19         | 12      | 4           | 8       | 12                           | 15             | 1              | 22                             | 13                                     | 9                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Religious affiliation = Agnostic | 2      | 6          | 4       | 0           | 4       | 5                            | 0              | 1              | 5                              | 0                                      | 1                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Religious affiliation = Orthodox / Catholic | 9      | 29         | 9       | 3           | 5       | 18                           | 10             | 15             | 33                             | 23                                     | 15                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Religious affiliation = Evangelical / Independent / Charismatic | 9      | 29         | 8       | 14          | 4       | 44                           | 21             | 10             | 58                             | 23                                     | 5                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Religious affiliation = Muslim | 3      | 10         | 4       | 2           | 0       | 2                            | 9              | 0              | 4                              | 0                                      | 1                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Translator = Yes | 13      | 42         | 5       | 14          | 9       | 45                           | 17             | 15             | 31                             | 14                                     | 17                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Translator = No | 18      | 58         | 20      | 10          | 15      | 48                           | 33             | 12             | 97                             | 50                                     | 25                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Involvement period = 1–5 years | 11    | 35         | 2       | 13          | 6       | 39                           | 13             | 14             | 32                             | 10                                     | 12                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Involvement period = 5–10 years | 6      | 26         | 12      | 7           | 15      | 32                           | 27             | 8              | 59                             | 22                                     | 16                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Involvement period = 10–20 years | 6      | 26         | 4       | 4           | 1       | 14                           | 6              | 5              | 31                             | 23                                     | 13                                     |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |
| Involvement period = more than 20 years | 4      | 13         | 7       | 0           | 2       | 6                            | 4              | 0              | 6                              | 3                                      | 1                                      |                                      |                                 |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |                                                      |

Table 15: What makes for a peaceful community?

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)


**An ability to articulate the vision**

This researcher anticipated that in the research, in the same way that ‘Entrepreneurs […] see or sense value in things that many other people see as worthless, impossible, or stupid’ (Isenberg, 2013, p. 3), peace-builders, if indeed entrepreneurial, would see possibilities for a different society where everyone else saw only tension, conflict, violence and hopelessness. This also ties in with Lederach’s ‘moral imagination’ and the ability to see beyond the present sources of conflict and the cycle of violence produced. In fact, the interviewed peace-builders readily articulated the alternative society they imagined, with a sizeable number of concrete ideas on what that society would look like.

A whole hub in the Joint Learning Initiative Faith and Local Communities (JLIF&LC) website is devoted to the gathering of such evidence of this resilient, peace-oriented worldview. As Agar points out on that site, ‘JLIF&LC evidence briefs are full of evidence regarding the contribution of local faith communities in humanitarian crisis […] and of the international community capitalizing upon, but all too often ignoring, disrupting and, on occasions, subverting such contributions’ (A. Agar, 2015). It may be that, because many of these peace-builders are connected to local faith communities, they already share what some have called cohesive community-level relationships that provide for ‘community formation’ (J. Agar, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, & Agar, 2015).

**The centrality of respect and understanding**

*Table 15* demonstrates the high frequency with which peace-builders suggested that an essential element for peace in a community is an understanding of ‘the other’ and a respect for people with whom you disagree. ‘Understanding’ in this context doesn’t mean the person necessarily rationally apprehends the logic of another person’s point of view, rather that they accept that the other person’s or group’s approach to life has foundational values (a worldview) with which the peace-builder can engage and enter into meaningful dialogue. Of the interviewees, 28 out of 31 placed understanding as a key principle for peace, while 24 included respect as being vital. A frequently used word was ‘talk’ or ‘talking’, and it is clear that most
peace-builders saw understanding as arising from dialogue, with attitudes of tolerance and appreciation being prerequisites.

Murray, a native of Myanmar who had trained as a Buddhist monk in Thailand, and had been in his peace-building role for three years, described a difficult situation arising from a boundary dispute. His solution involved dialogue between interested parties first, and the participation of a community mediator in those discussions. The issue was resolved without violence only after the people talked and saw the issue from all sides, with one party ‘opening his heart’. ‘I will help you a bit when you move [the boundary], because you spent a lot [putting it up]’ was the statement in response to a request for understanding about how a mistake in placing the boundary had been made in the first place. Murray commented: ‘This is the first — understanding.’

Likewise, for Ophelia, a Scandinavian, who had been working with local providers in IDP camps for 20 years, the first thing that came to mind when asked about a peaceful community was understanding. ‘Having people laugh at the same things you laugh at,’ she said, was only possible because those people ‘know you’. As Maxine, an Muslim living in a difficult IDP setting, said, interviewed while living in a concentration camp in the middle of very difficult ethnic and religious conflict: ‘They have to accept difference because if people cannot accept something which is different from them, there will never be peace.’ Nathan, a Thai ex-Buddhist monk working cross-border, brought this down to simple humanity: ‘So one thing is very important, that we have to value and understand each other. And also, ah, treat each other as human.’

Closely aligned with the concept of understanding is that of respect. Some of the peace-builders used the terms almost interchangeably. Keith, leading a peace-building NGO in Armenia, said: ‘What is peace in the community? These the people are listening and respect each other.’ Others like Nigel, a Burman Christian working amongst Rohingya Muslims, echoed Nathan’s point, saying that the only way to have that respect was to honour our common humanity: ‘I mean, we are not Rakhines, or we are not Burmese, but we are all brothers, like this, we have to stay together and,
like brothers and sisters.’ Murray put it similarly: ‘Oh, they are human being, we are human being, we have spirit, you also have spirit.’

Peace-builders don’t see this respect growing out of pretending things are better than they actually are either. ‘You know if you live in a community where people respect each other’s differences and short-comings, strengths, that’s at least you’re on your way to having peace,’ said Ophelia. Sometimes respect comes from just sheer practicality and compromise — but built on a developing relationship of trust. As Shawn, a long-term expatriate peace-builder in South East Asia, said of his home country: ‘[There is a] need for civil society to have the same kind of trust that a healthy team would have. And when trust is broken nothing works. And that’s essentially what America is right now. There’s no trust.’

Billy, a man with Anglo-Saxon evangelical Christian heritage, was born in America but spent most of his childhood in South East Asia and, at the time of this research, was leading a Myanmar-focused team. He told a story illustrating this respect and understanding — and how it is achieved too. During a past emergency aid trip to Pakistan after devastating earthquakes there, he struck up a conversation with a man who approached him on the street in Karachi:

And his assumption was that we’d feel the same way about him. His very first words to me — and there was a group of them there, it wasn’t just the two of us — but he spoke English so we were able to talk. His very first words when he walked up were ‘I have a big beard but I’m not a terrorist’, and he said it, not with a smile, with anger. Like, how do you respond to something like that? So I said the first thing that came to my mind. I had a little goatee at the time. ‘I have a little beard. I’m not a terrorist either.’ He laughed hard. He said ‘we can be friends’ and I said ‘let’s talk.’ I was there doing communications for the UN. We put in a communications system for the UN of all things, and the inefficiencies and all of that, it drove me nuts. But here was a little experience that I was able to have in the midst of all of that, that affected me.

What is striking about this conversation is that Billy, a peace-builder, does not respond with anger or negativity to someone expressing some level of hostility. Instead, he connects with a common humanity, shows respect and understanding to a man who is clearly used to being misunderstood and painted in a negative light,
diffuses what could have been an awkward situation with some humour, and builds a relationship from it that affects how he sees other people into the future.

Respect and understanding can be expressed in many ways. One observation made while interviewing these peace-builders and observing interaction with the others around them was their appreciation of difference and even the celebration of it. Tegan, another evangelical expatriate peace-builder in Myanmar, talked of how people in her adopted country saw her: ‘I think that they see me probably as someone who appreciates South East Asia, and South East Asia’s culture.’ A further example is Frank, who was leading a Protestant church in Yerevan, where a number of refugees from the war in Iran had sought refuge. He described their ability to understand the other from a minority perspective, saying ‘when they come they teach us more than we can help them [...] because they come with this heritage, and they are looking for to practise this heritage. And we don’t have this field [...]. We are not ready. But the church benefits [...]. The church is learning.’ This is recognition of the struggle to accept the other but also the appreciation of what such acceptance brings and the value of that to the whole community. Frank understood because he had studied in Lebanon and had made many Muslim friends there: ‘I have many family friends who are writing me, when it comes to Christmas [...] and they’re congratulating and saying, Happy Christmas to you.’ It was clear from the dialogue that this was because of the respect they had for him and his understanding and respect for them.

Such stories illustrate why the words ‘understanding’ and ‘respect’ don’t feature so prominently in the word frequency table, despite the fact that the peace-builders clearly see these things as seminal to both how they might frame and then undertake their work. Lederach writes of ‘this part of the world where you have to circle the truth through stories’ (Lederach, 2005), and many of the stories told in the process of the interviews explained these principles without using the actual words. Ruth, an evangelical minister, used the words ‘honouring each other’ and ‘appreciating each other’, while Elliot, leading a secular peace-building NGO, also in Armenia, expressed the same thing quite differently: ‘Ah, it’s a community when
human rights, and human beings are, are respected, and human beings become the most, like, important value for the community.’

Further expanding on the idea of respect, Frank said, ‘Showing respect […] I don’t want to repeat myself, but love is the central part, in the community.’ So here respect is being expressed in terms of love. Ruth went further and reflected that ‘It doesn’t mean that they are, they’re passive, just loving, you know, you are there, I’m here […] but still, I think that peaceful community is when there is love, respect, and justice’, echoing Lederach’s work. Peter, an USA expatriate living and working in a very tense setting in Armenia, actually made reference to Lederach and agreed with him that it was not possible to have respect unless there was both justice and truth present. Matt, leading a faith community, who spoke English as a second language, said, ‘You have to have his shoe’, when reflecting on the difficulty of having Turkish people confronting the fact that their fathers or grandfathers were ‘killers’ in the Armenian genocide. It was a deeply reflective moment from someone who lost relatives himself in the first genocide of the 20th century. With those words, Matt was almost musing on what he might feel about the possibility that his forefathers may have been killers, and thinking about how he would want to deny that about someone he loved and respected. The words reflect one thing these peace-builders are able to do that many can’t; to indeed ‘have his shoes’, to try, even while recognising their own and others’ imperfections, to live what they are calling others to: understanding and respect for others.

**Other key factors to making a peaceful community**

*Education*

A number of the peace-builders linked understanding with education. Carl, an academic activist working with displaced Burmese in Thailand, commented that ‘both sides Rakhine and Rohingya community have lack of education. So they cannot understand the real conviction of the situation’, ‘conviction’ clearly meaning ‘worldview or values’, those things that give conviction to a stance. Nancy, working with a group of churches for community reconciliation and dealing with similar issues in Armenia, responding to a question about how children are socialised to
hate, made this comment: ‘A peaceful community is where people understand each other, and love each other. For ages people lived together and never had problems, this Armenian or Georgian or Azeri or whatever, they are just give the seeds of love and appreciation of each other from childhood.’ Surely this understanding is why so many of these peace-builders are involved in education. As Kera, a long time peace-builder working with an NGO in Armenia, said, ‘Second, I find out that it is probably time to change the job because I get that habit — every job have some habit — I get that habit that teaching, explaining, teaching, explaining’, and much of her explaining in her work was to teach communities an appreciation of others.

Diversity

Eleven of the group thought that the celebration of diversity in a community was helpful to building peace and suggested ways of celebrating that ranged from sharing food and praying together to discussion groups. Mike, a church leader based near Armenia, summarised the sentiments of the others well: ‘The peaceful community is where people celebrate diversity — ethnic diversity, linguistic diversity, cultural diversity, gender diversity, sexual diversity — and expect everybody to invest their creativity for the benefit of the wider community. And this is a peaceful community.’

Other-directedness and kenosis

Given the work they do, it was not surprising to find peace-builders stressing the need to be what some have called ‘other-directed’ in their relationships. They are there for others. It may be another way of saying ‘understanding’, but it goes further than that. As Mike said, ‘Well a peaceful community is the one which is looking outside rather than inside’, and Eddie, in a self-reflective moment, made this comment: ‘So, sadly, I probably would desire a few more gifts but the ones I’ve got I’m going to have to try and use as well as I can — and one would be that listening thing. The other thing I think I have is openness to the other.’ Listening to Eddie’s story, it comes as no surprise that he has made good progress in peace-building in a culture completely foreign to him. He’s a humble man who sees things happening and asks himself, ‘Ah, I wonder why those people are doing that?’, and then asks and
listens to the answer, completely non-judgementally and with one intention: ‘To understand the other.’ As a Catholic priest in a busy religious studies teaching schedule where he is exposing his students to completely different worldviews from their own, his willingness to truly enter into and hear things from their perspective, allowing his own faith-based worldview to be shaped by that, shows the level of understanding and respect he anticipates in a peaceful community.

It was in this area of ‘other-directedness’ that the concept of kenosis in the context of peace-building began to form more clearly. As the peace-builders articulated the characteristics of a peace-filled community and those practical steps to achieve that goal, the whole concept of self-sacrifice began to emerge. Eddie’s attitude was typical. Letting go of 30 years of immersion in a faith community and a theological understanding shaped by nearly 10 years of study and practice in his priestly vocation in order to see the world through Buddhist eyes is an act of significant self-sacrifice. Talking of the fear of letting go of what we ‘know to be true’, he had this to say: ‘It’s like the seamless web arguments; in the seamless cloth once a little spring or a thread comes loose, then you’re in fear it’s going to unravel. And I think that’s a religious fear. And I can understand the fear. And it’s made worse in certain contexts. But I think it’s one that has to be dealt with.’

This researcher consciously avoided directing interviewees in a line of thinking focused on self-sacrifice and letting go of position and authority, instead waiting to see if the theme emerged in the philosophy and practice of people where a detached observer could detect signs of kenosis.

Table 15 shows that the third most often mentioned category by peace-builders is that of unselfishness and generosity, one of them making the observation that ‘my dog isn’t going to give up his bone to another dog because he thinks the other dog is more hungry. But a human person can do that.’ Ophelia, who herself makes the sacrifice of long times of separation from family, expressed it by saying she was guided by the need ‘to be unselfish, to give of yourself’. She saw it in other community leaders, saying ‘they have such a commitment to their people, and [they] sacrifice a lot to help’, talking of leaders of a community that are almost totally
‘other’ to her, different in ethnicity, gender, religion, social status and education level.

The same spirit came through in others, although it was often expressed in a very different way. Murray talked of unity coming when you help other people do what they want to do, and!spoke!of being told, ‘You said you didn’t have this but you are a man who are really think for other people, and want other people better than you.’ He saw this sacrificing for others as a result of ‘not being eager, not being selfish’ but of loving others as a Buddhist. Sam, a New Zealand expatriate working from Thailand into Myanmar, expressed it in terms of his Christian faith: ‘To follow Jesus means that I will be prepared to put my desires on the line every day and pick up my cross daily and follow Him and that would be the central principle in my faith life.’ He also noted, ‘If Jesus is invading my day properly, I’m going to meet a Muslim who hates me and I’m going to find a way to love him.’ This is determination, a stubbornness that is aimed at understanding the other and being reconciled to them but at cost to oneself. This is the basis of kenosis. The stubbornness, however, is a characteristic of entrepreneurs, explored below on page 202.

Christian interviewees used the term and concept of self-sacrifice often, but the agnostics and Muslims didn’t mention it as such, although adherence to the ‘golden rule’, which has some aspects of kenosis, was universal. Shawn mentioned it in terms of needing to ‘have connection with God and serve one another’. Catlin, a New Zealand nurse, talked of it as being ‘tainted’ by the character of God and being prepared to sacrifice to do good to others. Marilyn, an Australian nurse working in Myanmar, related a story about costly (to the host) hospitality, while Jim, an Australian businessman working in Armenia, exposed the same truth in saying, ‘The lady who runs out in front of the car to save the child doesn’t think about. She doesn’t think, “Is this a smart thing to do? What are my chances of survival? Let me rate this. What about my insurance?” She does it, you see.’ He thereby makes the point that there is a certain spontaneity to self-sacrifice if it is motivated by love, care and concern, something he struggled with in himself if given too long to reflect on an action.
Matt expressed this sacrificial love and giving as a duty, talking of the way in which humans, as the highest of all the animals, have an onus to use their brains and power in the service of others, and that the strongest had a duty to help the weakest by giving something of themselves and their power. He suggested that if self-sacrifice operated at national level, international relations would be transformed. Matt maintained that communities like this are not egotistical, not concentrating on themselves but thinking of others. He felt it was the responsibility of people like himself to inspire self-centred communities like his community of origin into a better way of living:

That’s why we have rich people who think only of themselves. And it’s, it’s not a problem of Armenia, it’s a problem of the world. Why I am saying this? Because in Armenia now it’s everything about ‘my profit’ — and it’s capitalistic system of thinking. ‘What is my cut?’ But if, first, when these people came here, if I would say them, ‘Take this glass, put here,’ they would think, ‘What is my cut?’ But if I ask them to go out now and clean the street, they would do without thinking ‘What is my cut?’ And the main reason is that they have seen that not everything is about money. There are more important things that give you happiness and satisfaction without money. Because they have my friendship.

His illustration is one that speaks of inconvenience to self for the benefit of others. Sampson also felt it was the duty of the rich to give to the poor — and in a sacrificial way. He talked of a rich farmer giving sheep for a meal for the poor and indicated that his own expectation was ‘you should take the best sheep’ to give to the poor. This was certainly his attitude to the things he gave away to the poor of his community; he didn’t give away the scraps from his enterprise but the same core materials they used in the business.

Knowing the ‘back story’ of many interviewees also helps interpret some of the statements on self-sacrifice. These are not empty words. Four of them had given up good business prospects to be peace-builders, and at least three were leading professionals in their fields being head-hunted for key roles. They’d all given away their career prospects and promised wealth to instead help those unable to help themselves because the conflict around them had robbed them of prosperity and
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hope. None of them wore it like a badge of honour either, and this researcher had to ask several questions about their former professions, almost dragging out of them that they’d been at the forefront of thinking and research in areas of biology, the development of nuclear power, and engineering. Indicative of the attitude was Keith, who took the question about the purpose of man very literally: ‘Men are created to serve women – to help her, and to serve her. And to make her happy.’ Seeming to reflect several others who had taken a similar path to him (from positions of high academic influence to that of serving the community as a facilitator), he commented that he didn’t encourage talk about sacrifice but said, ‘By the example maybe, that’s what can I give to those people.’ He is representative of this group of peace-builders as a whole—actions are so much more important than words.

Kenosis and reflections on the human condition

This was a highly educated group, involved in strategic community development planning and the pastoral care of their staff. They were self-aware and understanding of the human psyche generally. One interviewee suggested that it was important to understand that people were weak and sinful and humans, but that despite acting as we shouldn’t, we weren’t ‘really bad’. Six of them reflected on the pressures that leaders operated under as drivers, which made them act out of character or do bad things. They recognised that sometimes leaders were restricted because of the communal feelings underlying the violence and that this took time to change. In other words, leaders could push community values, but sometimes community values could push leaders too. Several of the interviewees attributed this to ‘the human condition’. When questioned about community influence, Billy was asked why many of the community he was involved with made the right noises about peace and reconciliation, but little seemed to happen. He paused, laughed and replied, ‘Well, man [. . .] this sounds so cynical, I believe if they wanted to they’d be doing it.’

Sam expressed the frustration of that human condition like this:

And so the advice of a monk to somebody who’s going through something [difficult or tragic] is, ‘Well, let me teach you how to let it go. And we’ll do a prayer, and here’s a prayer, here’s the prayer in Bali language, and
just say this over and over again, and here’s what it means, it means you’re going to let it go’ [...]. But, you know, what percentage of people can do that, 10%, 5%. Um, I would have to say that on the theoretical level Thais [Theravada Buddhists] actually have some pretty cool ideas. On the practical level, the fact that we have a country that’s completely divided at the moment, and on the brink of civil war and having to be controlled by a military coup, is an indication that deep down it doesn’t really work. In the human part of it.

This is perhaps why peace-builders and reconcilers are actually not all that common. Theorists like Galtung and Lederach point to the conditions under which macro-reconciliation can be achieved, but these interviewees point to the pre-conditional characteristics of the humans involved in community reconciliation, where who you are as a person is as important as the community role you fulfil. Personal character seems to matter less in national reconciliation events where those responsible for the deliberate bombing of civilians and similar war crimes can receive the Nobel Peace Prize. A more realistic assessment of the human condition might lead to better and genuine community reconciliation.

Ophelia expressed kenosis in Christian terms, saying, ‘Unless I’m willing to get dirty with these people, and unless I’m willing to give to them, I can’t really claim to be a Christian, I can’t claim to believe that God’s word is true.’ Murray as a Buddhist expressed it thus: ‘This job is for my people [...] I want to show love to others and to help others.’ And indeed, Murray continues to make many sacrifices to show that love to people from a very different ethnic background to his own. For him, ‘the other’ has truly become his people. Josh, a Muslim community leader, has spent some years in jail for simply obeying the law and seeking legal regress for the obvious injustices done to his people. Offered assistance by friends to leave the country for medical help and a better life elsewhere, he responded with ‘I will stay until I die’ and continues to stand peacefully for truth and justice. This is kenosis lived out Muslim-style. His gentle non-violence and insistence on the rule of just law has forced his persecutors to treat him as human when they would love to have the excuse to crush him as some kind of wild animal.

Kenosis in the face of oppression
However, the peace-builders also seemed prepared to name failure, particularly structural justice failure, and stand against it. Nigel talked of locals forcibly removed from their land with little or no compensation by government-backed Chinese corporates. Stuck for two years in a concentration camp, Maxine said what she has said to authorities: ‘I think the government is unfair, we should have citizenship rights, freedom of movement, freedom for education, the central government should be non-biased between these two groups.’ This comment elicited snorts of derisive laughter from two community leaders sitting in the meeting at that point. Overall, although being honest about the problems, peace-builders seemed to be far more understanding of leadership failure and more interested in ‘where do we go from here’ rather than assigning blame and guilt to those who have clearly failed to lead others effectively. It would appear that the whole confluence of respect, understanding, forgiveness, courage and empathy produces a forward-looking aspect to the lives of the peace-builders, where the view of a better future is what enables them to overcome the present failures of others in leadership.

Surprisingly, peace-builders do not eschew conflict itself, seeing it as necessary and also important. Where they differ from their communities is in seeing how that conflict can best be resolved. Shawn referenced Walter Wink, saying that the theologian was ‘the guy when it comes to non-violence — in my opinion’. Wink has written extensively in the area of power and non-violence (Wink, 1984, 1992, 1999, 2003) focusing on non-violent change. In his book *Jesus and non-violence* he gives some pragmatic reasons for the support of non-violence, which most of the interviewees would likely agree with, but in the final chapter he talks of the Christian way of non-violence in different terms: ‘Violence simply is not radical enough, since it generally changes only the rulers but not the rules. What use is a revolution that fails to address the fundamental problem: the existence of domination in all its forms, and the myth of redemptive violence that perpetuates it?’ He continues: ‘Nonviolent revolution is not a program for seizing power. It is, says Gandhi, a program for transforming relationships, ending in a peaceful transfer of power’ (Wink, 2003, p. 71). He ultimately states that the ‘third way’, the Jesus way, is the way of the cross. This is *kenosis* writ large, whereby giving away the right to power and violence...
The business of peace-building

offers a whole different order of solution. Wink concludes: ‘It was not because he was a failed insurrectionist that Jesus died as he did, but because he preferred to suffer injustice and violence rather than be their cause’ (Wink, 2003, p. 87).

Peter noted that he had difficulty with conflict from a young age, saying, ‘when I see people with conflict, either with each other, and particularly with me, my first impulse is to make everything chill, to make […] especially if they’re in conflict with me, to find a way to make them not angry, not upset, like me’, but he realised this made him lose himself in the relationship. Working in a very difficult conflict zone where, not long before the interview, several soldiers had been shot and hurt and two had died, he concluded: ‘I think conflict is a natural by-product of being different. I mean even people who are the exact same, they end up being in conflict because they’re the same […] You know, they’re trying to have control of the same areas […] So I don’t think that conflict is necessarily a bad thing […] I think it’s a natural by-product of interaction.’

Ruth made the observation that systems naturally oppress as part of the difficulty of reconciling the value of the individual and the life of the community: ‘You cannot be just only individualistic, and it’s only a human being which is worth living and nothing else matters. Or I cannot think that all your thinking has to go through this community and cultural channels […] but you yourself are a precious thing, so […] both are valuable.’ Other peace-builders likewise recognised the inherent problems in accommodating both individuals and community.

Two peace-builders noted that shying from structural conflict was counterproductive in the long-term. Peter: ‘like the continuation of a conflict, the embracing anger or ignoring a conflict, not dealing with it can be very poisonous to relationships […] [and you have to] work through that conflict so that same thing doesn’t happen again.’ Nancy put it differently but clearly: ‘I do not imagine the life in this dimension where we live that there won’t be any problems, because without problems and obstacles you could not be developed.’ The recognition that problems and conflict can develop us positively is something that many of the peace-builders identified and is foundational to Hiebert’s theory of cultural change.
Reflections on positive and negative peace

This researcher had assumed that all the peace-builders would be operating in Galtung’s ‘positive peace’ framework and that, where peace was imposed forcefully from the outside, it would be seen negatively. However, peace-builders generally supported respect for the law, even by unjust governments, although seeking also respect for justice and truth. This should not be surprising given the length and intensity of conflict in the focus countries. Tegan noted that, when it came to conflict resolution in the village setting, ‘there is a level of respect for the systems of conflict resolution [. . .] whether that’s the law or whether it’s just a tribal mechanism.’

Harry, who started his own peace-building NGO in Armenia, who had lived long enough to remember the mess of refugees at the end of WWII, stated: ‘People need to be in peace together, and they to respect to the law, laws should be respected.’

This is a theme in Wink’s writings too (Wink, 2003, location 612). Sampson noted the effect of law and order: ‘First of all a peaceful community is a fertile community, where jobs exist, it is safe, they, the residents, have welfare life. When we have government we have order in that community.’

This imposition of law is similar to the peace-builder’s dilemma. Peace-builders are unable to operate effectively unless the vast majority of the population wants peace and they have sufficient strength to stop those who want to continue the violence. Tragedies like the Srebrenica massacre in 1995 reinforce that perspective. This is what these local community peace-builders search for: general acceptance of the rule of law and sufficient community pressure to keep everyone to that.

There was a substantial caveat to the comments on the need for communities to respect the law, however: the government should be just. Maxine, in a community suffering gross injustice at the hands of the government, spoke about having peace: ‘First there should be justice by government.’ Later she added, ‘So, if central government’s not taking responsibility then there should be a powerful international organisation, who can force central government to make a justice decision among two communities.’ Nigel, who had seen the government and foreign corporations
The business of peace-building

combine in greed to remove and impoverish local farmers, regarded the government’s unfairness as a cause of unending clashes involving locals, both those displaced from their homes and those still in constantly ransacked villages, against the army, whom they saw as the land thieves.

Others went further. Shawn, working in conflict zones and witnessing daily oppression by the government, wanted a rebuilding of the law because there had been no civil society input into it and ‘it has to be, in some way, a democratic, or a representative process for the law, the constitution to be retooled.’ Tegan pointed out that when the law is determined by ‘who has the biggest guns’, grave injustices follow, while Josh, who had been detained at the end of a gun on more than one occasion, said, ‘This government is using “might is right”. Might is right for them.’ Josh went on to say that there must be ‘peace with justice [. . .] [which] depends on the government’. Elliot saw multinationals paying off politicians to create unjust laws, avoid tax and pollute the countryside. He noted:

In our country when we have no civil society, and the governments are completely corrupted, so they [the multinational corporations] have all the chances to do whatever they want. So that’s why it’s important to develop the society so the society is able to resist their unjust actions [. . .] [because] creating a just society is the key to a positive peace. Yeah, well, I mean it’s very easy to get negative peace.

Elliot was one of the peace-builders who was able to articulate the difference between positive and negative peace very clearly and, like most of the peace-builders, was able to point to justice and equity that all of society contributes to as being the best basis for a sustainable peace.

Some interviewees also reflected on peace-building leadership within a community. As Shawn suggested, ‘A peaceful community has infrastructure that is agreed on by the stakeholders.’ Where the leadership ‘leads them towards this compromise’, this agreement of how and where the process happens is led by ‘a man [sic] with a vision’. Vision was a recurring theme, and one thing that virtually all these peace-builders could do was articulate in some kind of concrete manner what they were looking ahead to, painting a broader, better vision for their communities into the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute / Value</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Corruption</th>
<th>Economic insufficiency</th>
<th>Equal / rights</th>
<th>Fear and loss</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Past experience</th>
<th>Good and selfishness</th>
<th>Lack of trust</th>
<th>Ignorance</th>
<th>Power and poltics</th>
<th>Pride and national</th>
<th>Sexual and gender</th>
<th>Religions difference</th>
<th>Satiastion contentment</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Doubts and questions</th>
<th>Unity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country = Armenia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = Graduate Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = Post Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender = Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender = Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Buddhist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Protestant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Agnostic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Orthodox/Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation Evangelical/Ind/Ch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Muslim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator = Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator = No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement period = 1–5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement period = 5–10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement period = 10–20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement period = More than 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: The cause of conflict and violence**

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)
‘Having patience towards their community, that’s very important. To have overall understanding where we want to be in the next five years…. Having clear vision’ was how Grace, leading a peace-building team in Armenia, summed it up. Sam, using micro-finance to establish health and education facilities in on-going conflict zones, observed that when there is openness, transparency and community participation in decision-making, ‘everybody’s in it together’. He added, ‘And it takes into account the natural leaders who’ve already risen to the top, they’ve been chosen as community leaders for whatever reason, and if they’re good leaders they can bring the whole community in together and say, “What are WE going to do about this?”’, thus affirming that communities with this respectful cooperative leadership approach will be communities of shalom.

The causes of conflict

Peace-builders continually reflect on the causes of conflict. It is difficult to fix a problem if you don’t know the cause. The semi-structured interview questions called on them to reflect about what they saw as the contributing factors to conflict, going beyond the presenting issues and to the hearts and minds of community members. Their words were coded and depicted in Table 16 and the following sections examine some of the key factors of power and politics, religion, fear and loss, lack of trust, greed and selfishness, and demographics as the peace-builder’s most cited factors causing conflict.

Power and politics

Of the 31 interviewees, 29 mentioned power and politics as a leading cause of violence — and the issue is mentioned around 160 times and only one grouping showing significant difference from expected proportions—Orthodox and Catholics tended to downplay this power and politics, while Muslims mentioned it disproportionately more often. The Orthodox church is closely linked to and supported by the political system in Armenia and all the Orthodox and Catholic interviewees are from the Armenia area. The Muslim interviewees are Rohingya from Myanmar, where they have suffered from unjust government action. The Rohingya people, named by the UN as one of the most persecuted and neglected
ethnic groups on the planet (Hamling, 2015), were all stripped of citizenship in 1982, restricting their freedom of movement and any form of representation in government. Those factors probably account for the deviations from expected proportions.

The peace-builders in both settings do not think well of governments in general and are sometimes scathing of manipulations around ‘the greed for power’. Maxine observed that various politicians used religious leaders to stir up trouble, and a number of the interviewees also knew of the way in which businessmen approached politicians to use their powers to move inconveniently located groups in the way of mines, pipelines and dams. No interviewee had actually seen kickback money change hands, but an observation of politicians’ lifestyles was ‘proof enough’. The interviews took place before the 2015 elections in Myanmar, and most of the peace-builders interviewed from that regional area had hopes that Aung San Suu Kyi (ASSK) might change things even though they recognised the huge uphill struggle she faced with the way the military controls security.

**Religion**

The second most frequent cause of violence was attributed to religious differences, and the data for both country and gender segmentation was remarkably consistent with expected proportions. In terms of length of service, if a worker had been involved for more than five years, there was a tendency to see religious issues as more significantly contributing to violence than if they’d been working at peace-building for less than five. It may be that longer time involvement exposes more clearly the worldviews of the various community members and that those peace-builders who are conscious of the religious component become more aware of its pervasive nature. Another interesting deviation from expected numbers came from the agnostics, who appeared much less willing to attribute violence to religious belief than those who expressed commitment to faith, an attitude that, to this researcher, seemed both surprising and gracious, given the context.

**Fear and loss**

The next two most commonly mentioned causes of violence were fear and loss, with greed and selfishness and some interesting variations beginning to occur
alongside these slightly less frequently mentioned causes. Fear and loss were mentioned twice as often in Myanmar as in Armenia, and in the case of gender, women (relative to men) mentioned it twice as often. There are two possible reasons for this latter statistic. Men often hesitate to talk about fear as being unmanly and are less likely to ascribe it to other men, even when related to factors outside themselves; fear can, instead, be expressed as aggression (Kimmel, 2006). The second reason is that in issues of fear and loss, many women looked at individual motivation and not just the communal fears that this researcher thought would be uppermost in mind. Tegan said, ‘internal insecurity is expressed in aggression and domination as a kind of coping, subconsciously, not even consciously, necessarily, and not necessarily directly related to community’ and listed ‘lack of family support’ and ‘not knowing where they fit into the world’ as key contributing factors. Ophelia referred to a Napoleonic complex, saying ‘Some of the world’s worst tyrants are some of the smallest people in the world. You know, they are the most insecure.’ And Catlin similarly suggested that fear sprung from not being ‘willing to hear someone else’s world view’ because of personal insecurity and commented that faith had to be big enough to overcome that kind of self-limitation. Marilyn, who spends time in jungle locations with women fleeing the army, talked of fear of conflict reigniting and ‘fear of not being able to provide for your family’ driving some women to irrational reactions, saying, ‘The response might be to bury your head in the sand, or it might be to go on the attack, or it might be the fear of becoming bitter.’ Nancy, who in addition to her usual work in development has been part of several post-conflict relief teams in emergency situations, told of being where one group of faith leaders were breeding fear amongst refugees by telling them ‘don’t sell your souls, don’t sell your souls’ simply because they were accepting aid from others. She said quietly, ‘You’ve got to be pretty insecure to do that.’

The men came at the fear question from less of a psychological and more of a collective viewpoint. Billy’s response was fairly typical: ‘It depends on who those other people are, but other groups, whether they be Muslim, or immigrants from Mexico, are viewed, many times, as a threat to their way of life.’ Working with Rohingya refugees, Carl quoted a local: ‘You have to understand, Carl, that for us in
Malaysia, Malays in Malaysia, we are taught from the grave to fear. To fear God, to fear the Chinese, to fear what might happen if we don’t.’ Peter talked of the fear of being personally under the control of the other group and one’s land being under their control too, saying, ‘The land belongs to one group and needs to be in [the] control of one group and anybody else needs to be under them or will suffer under that.’

Overall, an in-depth and repeated read-through of various sections of the transcripts reveals two points: the women seemed to be more aware of the potential psychological drivers of violence within the community, while the men appeared to capture more of the socio-political fears that infested the communities.

Within the fear and loss category there was a division around the various factors considered to be fuelling the responses to loss and the fears it created. Women mentioned past experience almost twice as often as men because the loss of men from the family left them more vulnerable than men. Women who had either lost family members and their homes or were working closely with women who had were more connected emotionally with other women suffering similar loss. In observing the interactions in the communities around where these women were interviewed, it was not difficult to see why this reason rated far more highly for women than for men.

**Lack of trust and a peace-builder’s integrity**

‘Lack of trust’ as a reason for igniting conflict was evenly divided geographically but, when it came to gender, woman pointed to this nearly twice as often as men. The question was not specifically about any particular form of violence, but it is perhaps significant that domestic violence is a given in areas of conflict (Miedzian, 2002, Chapters 2 & 8) and that women are more likely to be on the receiving end of it. For women, the lack of trust seemed to be more personal, the antithesis of love. For example, as Ruth stated, ‘Love your neighbour, and show another cheek, it does not work on international level.’ Nancy didn’t trust some of the international NGOs, because she felt they came with ulterior motives and a sense of superiority: ‘Here, you come in my country, community, which is traditional and
If peace-builders identify lack of trust as a cause of conflict, then trust must be the coinage of the peace-builder and the basis on which they work. Without trust from members in the community peace-building is impossible, and this trust can only be built by the integrity of the peace-builders themselves. A peace-builder’s idealism (a term mentioned multiple times by peace-builders) may also engender trust in people, which may not be all that different from the trust an entrepreneur is able to engender in investors through their idealism and confidence in their product. When talking of their heroes and those they sought to emulate, as well as their own approach to doing peace-building, many of the peace-builders spoke using words like ‘non-biased’, ‘credibility’, ‘guard my neutrality’, ‘idealism’, ‘tolerant’, ‘by my example’, ‘I never make friendship out of interest [advantage] for myself’, ‘I treat all people equally, [...] mayor, governor of this region [...] people are already equal for me’, ‘it’s my character [...] that is my work’, ‘it’s courage [...] I have no clue what to do, just breathe [...] and the right thing to do will emerge’. There is a level of trust that is engendered by such integrity, humility and honesty that is disarming. The matter of integrity might also impact at the level of material wealth. More than one peace-builder commented along the same lines as Kate: ‘He will not be a peace-builder to this community. This community will look at him, that person who has everything, his life is better, and that will make the villager feel shame.’ Thus the level of living for these peace-builders, while comfortable, is not lavish and many have left security and greater wealth for the work they now do.

This humility, honesty and integrity consistently came through in the peace-builders’ comments about themselves. Murray, for example, said, ‘But only one thing that I have, I trust, and I believe, I can work for others, this is only a good things.’ Shawn said that what made a good peace-builder was ‘a humble, curious, people person [...] somebody who loves people’. Billy commented, ‘You know, humility, compassion, these are things I don’t know that I have, but I would expect that those would be traits that would, would give people an advantage’ when talking
of peace-building activity, and added, ‘It was our lives. And now, you know, it, the work goes hand-in-hand with, I think what, all of our life experiences.’

**Greed and selfishness**

Greed and selfishness was the other largest category in the cause of violence. There was a geographical divide here similar to that of loss and fear. Greed and selfishness rated significantly higher in Myanmar than in Armenia and more frequently than expected amongst evangelicals. Again, this has much to do with context. Armenian peace-builders were able to see greed in the form of political misappropriation, but that political corruption and greed seemed one step removed from most ordinary life, as Harry’s comment illustrates: ‘US$17 billion was provided to Armenia as a support, US$6 billion even doesn’t enter the country, it was somehow swept to the private bank accounts of those who are in power.’ The government in Armenia is not stepping in and confiscating lands for mineral exploitation and offering no compensation, as is so often the case in Myanmar. And whole communities in Armenia are not on the run with their houses and livelihoods burnt to the ground through what looks like state-sponsored terrorism, as in Myanmar. Greed looks different when it is remote.

The issue of greed and selfishness may also have to do with major cultural perceptions. Müller’s work (2000) on differences between honour–shame, guilt–innocence and fear–power cultures shows that humans interpret behaviour through a cultural lens. Matt noted that in Armenia the word for greed is ‘marchon’, meaning literally ‘first myself’ or possibly ‘me first’, so greed for wealth is treated somewhat ambivalently. Additionally, the many evangelicals and Protestant peace-builders in Myanmar tended to see evil as quite personal, so to name greed is to name a personal evil that would fit with the guilt–innocence framework that guides much of their understanding of human nature.

Greed and selfishness barely rated at all with Muslims. The Muslim peace-builders saw equal rights as the more pressing issue because, more than the greed and selfishness that has been experienced, they have been on the receiving end of appalling human rights abuses and even possible crimes against humanity (M. Smith,
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2013) that have seen over 100,000 leave the country at the mercy of human traffickers (Holmes, 2015). Rights therefore overrode just about all other considerations and were frequently mentioned.

**Demographics**

In Armenia, demographics was not a significant causal issue for conflict, however in Myanmar, four interviewees often referred to changing demographics as an issue. All four worked with Muslims in Myanmar and the issue of Muslims and demographics is not just communal but is related to religion, politics and economics. It is well-documented, despite some extremist claims to the contrary, that Muslims have been a part of Myanmar for centuries (D. G. T. Hall, 1964), but the ones in Rakhine state seem to pose a problem for Buddhists there. While it is true that the Muslim population has been expanding through having larger families than their Buddhist neighbours, the percentage of Muslims in Myanmar is somewhere around 4% and could hardly be deemed a threat in a country where 9 in every 10 people is Buddhist. However, it is true that there are parts of Rakhine state, where most of the communal violence has been centred, and where Muslim populations form a significant minority.

The Buddhist monk Wirathu leads the 969 movement calling for the boycott of Muslim business and, while claiming the movement is peaceful, he says in reference to Muslims, ‘You can be full of kindness and love, but you cannot sleep next to a mad dog.’ ‘If we are weak,’ he continues, ‘our land will become Muslim’ (Fuller, 2013). The demographics clearly form part of his argument. The state has imposed all kinds of restrictions on Muslims in Myanmar ranging from marriage restrictions to limiting families (M. Smith, 2014, pp. 22–43), and it’s the implied threat of a Muslim takeover, should the demographics keep showing a growth in the Muslim percentage, that is the issue. While the demographic issue is not unique to Myanmar (Chiku, 2015), demographics and some kind of minority takeover is not a consideration in Armenia at all. For Armenians, outside threat is a far greater focus, which may explain the divide in the responses.
Motivation for peace-builders

Faith

Of the 31 interviewees, 25 placed faith as a very important motivator and there were two views of faith, perhaps best explained by the analogy of a glass and water. One group could be typified by ‘faith as duty’ people who view faith-based work as the act of filling up a glass with water. They work at it because it is their duty to do so; they owe God and God has a right to demand this of them, so they had better do it. Nigel, in Myanmar, put it this way: ‘He wants to use us to save these people and we are His sons so we have to do what He commands us to do, and we are His instruments.’ (‘Save’ here was being used literally.) Marilyn told the story of how she came to be working in the jungles of Myanmar, working for peace and reconciliation by strengthening and encouraging women in childbirth, and concluded, ‘I guess it has to be, because […] God designed me, and I believe that God designed me with certain passions on my heart, and what I’m doing is definitely not something I would’ve come up with on my own.’ Jim was wonderfully pragmatic, saying, ‘The most important thing is turning up’, when talking about how to negotiate peace-building activity in communities with tensions all around. While these and others expressed faith in terms of duty, this researcher did not ever get the impression it was acted upon begrudgingly or unwillingly. It was a happy duty!

The second group in the glass/water analogy saw their faith-based work coming from water that was overflowing the cup. Their view of God’s grace and bounty was that God was continually filling the cup to overflowing and so there was excess to go around. Kera put it like this: ‘And I am more than happy to serve community together with the church. I am more than happy, I think God just heard my prayers, through World Vision.’ As another interviewee put it:

And I never feel bad about telling them, ‘I do this because I think this is what Jesus would want me to do.’ I’m not embarrassed to say that. And the interesting thing is that people who are very critical towards Christians and faith and religion really admire. And they’ll say, ‘Wow, that’s the kind of Christian I would want to be if I was a Christian.’ But if you just try to be Jesus then people are going to get drawn to you. They’ll want to be with you, is what I believe.
Given this division, coding of faith was divided two ways: (a) by faith motivation based on duty, rules, maintaining personal integrity and maintaining integrity, seemingly associated with the need to keep relationships ‘right’; and (b) by faith expressed more as love and an outworking of bounty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute / value</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Doing good</th>
<th>Environmental concern</th>
<th>Environmental concern</th>
<th>Duty-rule</th>
<th>Maintaining personal integrity</th>
<th>Maintaining integrity</th>
<th>Personal comfort</th>
<th>Personal gain</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Justice for children</th>
<th>Making merit</th>
<th>Self-actualisation</th>
<th>Skill set/ability to help</th>
<th>Storytelling passion</th>
<th>Sense of something to give</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country = Myanmar</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country = Armenia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = Graduate Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = Post Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender = Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender = Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Buddhist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Protestant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Agnostic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Orthodox/Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Evangelical/Ind/Charismatic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Muslim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator = Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator = No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = 1–5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = 5–10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = 10–20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = More than 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/closed interview = closed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/closed interview = open</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: What motivates peace-builders
Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)
Reflecting on not just what, but how peace-builders expressed faith, analysis suggests the kind of love associated with the first type of faith is more like the faithful love in a marriage, designed to bring families together for resource building, or countries together in alliance. It works, but there’s not much passion to begin with, although love can grow. As an illustration of this, Ophelia even described her and her partner’s commitment to faith and peace-building as a marriage: ‘When people ask us how we’ve stuck with this work for so many years, I often say that I think it is because we’ve — it’s almost like a marriage, I mean we’ve just decided we’re not going to give up on it.’ And while it was clear that to her, marriage had more than a little romance to it, she also described the work in these terms: ‘I think if it wasn’t for that we would’ve give up, because it’s been, so many times that it’s been so hard. And there is definitely other options out there that are more, a lot more attractive.’

The second kind of faith is like a hot-blooded, passionate, love-at-first-sight kind of relationship.

The first two rows of Table 17 show the difference in the expression of faith motivation between the Myanmar and the Armenia groups. One possible clue for this disparity is a comment from Art in Armenia, which seemed somewhat representative of many of the people there because of the way that faith has been inculcated into the psyche of most of the population: ‘And whatever I do I don’t see that I must target Christianity — that I must link everything to my faith. I link it more to the being human and loving people.’ This difference in expression of faith may be something to do with the expectations of the various faith communities. Evangelical and many Protestant adherents (as interviewed in Myanmar) are generally expected to make reference to key faith propositional foundations in discussing aspects of their life. The Orthodox and more Catholic expressions (the background of the majority interviewed in Armenia) assume faith does not need to be expressed; it just is and it is an integral part of the whole of a Christian society following the rather misattributed words of St Francis of Assisi, ‘Preach the gospel and if necessary use words’ (Galli, 2009).
Where a community has over 1700 years of its official religion being Christianity, the church is involved in power and politics at every level. The recent removal of the obligation of the church to pay land and income tax in Armenia is just one reflection of that. Article 8.1 of the 1995 constitution says, ‘The Republic of Armenia recognizes the exclusive historical mission of the Armenian Apostolic Holy Church as a national church, in the spiritual life, development of the national culture and preservation of the national identity of the people of Armenia’ (National Assembly of Armenia, 1995), although this entanglement is under challenge (Chakarian, 2010), with non-transparency practised by the church an on-going problem. When the national religion is so closely tied to the state, much seems assumed about the contribution of faith to life.

**Determination, stubbornness and sheer bloody-mindedness**

For anyone wanting lots of loving warm feedback and encouragement, this research shows peace-building is not where to find it — ‘There is a surprisingly ubiquitous relationship between adversity and entrepreneurship’ (Isenberg, 2013, p. 58). Peace-building consists of a large amount of hard and unappreciated work, multiple obstacles, both in terms of resource and human resistance, and a myriad of disappointing failures along the way. It does, however, parallel the life of many entrepreneurs who struggle to get capital and who suffer business failure to some extent or other along the way until they finally succeed. Peace-builders have the added component of human resistance, suspicions of the ‘other’, and deeply embedded cultural norms that increase resistance, slow the speed of change and produce negative experiences of oppression and marginalisation. These are not usually factors entrepreneurs face when bringing a new product or service to market, although the birth of products like the iPads demonstrates the possibility of initial cultural resistance. The similarity of entrepreneurs and peace-builders in terms of determination with a goal in mind should be noted, however.

Stubbornness and persistence are definitely traits in peace-builders that motivate them to stick at their work. The following snippets of comments exemplify this well: Shawn: ‘We didn’t give in and we didn’t give up when we had hard times’; Billy: ‘This is what we really want to do for the time we have left’; Kate: ‘So if
people are facing a difficult problem I will be ready to help them’; Marilyn: ‘Probably a bit of stubbornness [. . .] then [the problem] pushes you to find a way to make it happen’ and ‘Well it’s courage really [. . .]’; Matt: ‘Yes, we do create conflict, but there is no other way of doing peace. Because if I don’t change community, even creating conflict, we would not have better future’; and Grace: ‘I’m very self-orientated from a purpose point of view.’ The peace-builders also told stories about resisting those who wanted to stop their work by citing safety concerns (Carl) or offering money and prestige to take a different path (Keith, Kate, Mike), or powerful friends offering patronage (Gregory), all of which was persistently resisted. Two interviewees had spent extended times in incarceration because of their stand for justice in pursuit of peace. These people are determined, stubborn and often unwavering and yet at the same time wonderful and open.

Such traits are arguably common to entrepreneurs, and in the same vein, Gladwell’s comments about entrepreneurs having been in the right place at the right time, but usually also having had to put in the hard yards beforehand (Gladwell, 2008) could equally be said of peace-builders, a point made by many of the peace-builders themselves. Nathan said, ‘Some people might have the same heart that I have, but maybe they don’t have the opportunity to do. yeah, opportunity, and heart, and also ability’ — although he also had education and training as a Buddhist monk enabling him to do the job of reviewing and encouraging self-sustaining schools in a conflict zone. This was not dissimilar to Sam: ‘I just keep searching, and searching, trying different things, butting heads, like an ant trying to find its way through a room, and hitting my head on things, and moving to the next space, I think, I am a person who’s persistent. I process thoughts and discussions very slowly, and then I go, “Well, how about this”? ’ Sam’s comments show the value of persistence. Although he claimed he’s not good with ideas, it was obvious that he has achieved remarkable success with medical training programmes, sustainable schools in conflict zones and business links that are beginning to spawn social businesses in the area.
Human compassion and wanting to ‘do good’

As also shown in Table 17 other motivators were human compassion (mentioned by 21 of the 31 interviewees) and ‘wanting to do good’ (19 of the 31). These two motivators are linked. Seeing the suffering and needs of others and having empathy for them is compassion; the instinct to want to alleviate misery and suffering is the result of compassion. To alleviate misery and suffering was seen as ‘doing good’ in the eyes of these peace-builders, so the two concepts were very closely related in their minds as well.

Human compassion springs from being exposed to the situation in some way, and this may give a clue as to how to help redirect or ‘redeem’ the entrepreneurial spirit. Shawn expressed this compassion in classic terms: ‘But helping that one child opened our eyes to a war by degrees. And opened our eyes to human suffering that we’ve never really examined before. And as we examined it we felt morally obligated to help these people who had so much less than ourselves.’ The mixed motivation of duty and compassion is fairly typical, and Shawn’s response is a common reaction for Westerners faced with the poverty, oppression and hopelessness of the developing world. Sam, another expatriate who had been involved in this kind of work for a long time, said, ‘I think I’m a very sensitive person so I feel what other people feel but the thing that, in terms of driving, is a sense of “I understand that person’s pain [. . .].” And it’s the desire to connect with people at a real level [. . .] so that I can share my faith, so that people can have life, they can have here and now.’ Billy said similarly, ‘The tsunami, the earthquake in Pakistan, the cyclone in Burma, those things had a very big impact, and I think keep us passionate and very interested in the work. That’s our love for people, the people who are suffering around us.’

Sam also made this observation: ‘We don’t have a corner on the compassion market, you know. I think that’s what we should all be about.’ Many of his fellow interviewees felt the same way, but this is not the standard response of many who see this conflict, alienation, hardship and oppression. If that were the case, more people would do what peace-builders do. This is key area where peace-builders differ from entrepreneurs; most entrepreneurs usually bring products to market not out of
compassion for the plight of their fellow humans but rather out of seeing a profitable gap in the market. If peace-builders simply saw a gap in the market to exploit, they’d be in the small arms and distribution business, which is another possible response to oppression. Not only are they in many ways entrepreneurial, they are counter-cultural in ways that most entrepreneurs are not. It is clear from the discussions above that peace-builders have many of the same gifts and skill sets as entrepreneurs, but they chose a different path. There seems to be an innate depth of compassion for the needs (rather than the wants) of people in the peace-builder.

What is it that produces this compassion though? Mike, who was a priest, told a story of his transformation in this regard, a story that many of the interviewees would identify with. Talking of the Chechens, he described them as ‘our traditional enemies [whose] economy was kidnapping’. He continued: ‘So they would come to Georgia, they would kidnap lads and ladies and take them down to Istanbul market [. . .] [and] the Chechens, we always associated with atrocities committed against Georgia [. . .] [because] they did the raping, or beheading people [. . .] And these refugees came to Georgia, 1999 and nobody wanted to see them here.’ Mike was challenged by a woman writer who had visited the refugees and who spoke at his church, saying, ‘if you are Christians you must do something about them.’ She told them that these refugees were coming through the mountainous passes in winter, without clothing, without enough food, and they were dying on the way, women and children too, and that the suffering was intense. Mike said, ‘And she challenged us, “Can you do something?” And that was Advent. And in Advent we are preparing for Christmas, you know, family reunion etcetera.’ This challenge was made to his congregation of 600 people. One woman in the congregation stood up and said, ‘We should cancel Christmas, and give the money we have for our Christmas to the refugees.’ Mike jokingly said that ‘this was the first time and the last time the Holy Spirit spoke through her’, but it stirred him to action. He collected money and clothes and delivered them to the refugee camp and saw the refugees for himself. He could not walk away from the misery and needs he saw. He asked these traditional enemies if there was anything else he could do for them. They had a list with everything from bandages to tea leaves. Realising he was about US$500 short to provide the help, he
Sam told this story as an analogy of his own journey:

There was once a man enjoying an afternoon of relaxing on a riverbank. Lying in the sun with a drink in one hand and a book in another, he heard the cries of distress of someone drowning. He jumps in, rescues them and returns to his drink and his book. Ten minutes later the same thing happens. He repeats his rescue. Another ten minutes goes by and he is again jumping in to pull the next drowning soul to safety. After the fourth one he leaves his book and drink and goes walking up the riverbank to find who is throwing them in.

Again, this seems very much like the stories of many of these peace-builders. It begins with seeing the need and feeling compassion for the people involved, usually because of some experience during their teenage years or into their early twenties. This compassion, often fuelled by an underlying faith motivation, results in working with groups of people who are generally marginalised or oppressed, looking for solutions for them whether through equal rights, economic empowerment, or education and health to ensure a better future for their children, and then moving to seeking reconciliation for them in their communities or country. It has been said, ‘There is no reconciliation without justice’, and this is what gets peace-builders involved in community projects and social businesses that provide equity and income for the community. Part of it is motivated by the desire to give people the communal standing that enables them to be heard by the stronger, more dominant voices of the
community. This also suggests a way forward that is picked up in Chapter 7, that of exposing young entrepreneurs to human need and challenging them to use their skills to make a difference.

Several of the peace-builders saw this compassion as motivating donors as well, one even noting that the compassion and generosity could have its roots in the donors’ own life stories. Kera commented that lots of 1915 genocide survivors had made donations to help with the rebuilding in Armenia after the 1998 earthquake:

Children were taken to orphanages in America [and] many of those children become very committed, very wealthy, very good charity people. These rich people in America, there are some survivors from genocide. Second, third, fourth generation, whoever, so this is, on my understanding this is Christian love, do good to others. Love your brothers.

This link of shared values with shareholders is developed further in Chapter 7.

In terms of ‘doing good’, two-thirds of the peace-builders expressed their work in this way. Billy said of his previous organisation that ‘they prided themselves in serving those who serve’ but it was his ‘hands-on doing good’ that motivated him. When talking of his workload, which was very heavy, he said, ‘I’d hate anyone to say “you need to quit travelling”, because it’s that travel and getting out and being a part of meeting those needs and helping people in need that really keeps me energised.’ Catlin expressed a comparable notion in theological terms: ‘We’re also created in image to Him, so we also want to love and create. We want to create out of love, or to bring about good things, I suppose.’ And Carl, when reflecting on his life purpose, used similar theological thinking: ‘[It is] to leave the world having done as much good in line with His will as you can before you leave it.’ Marilyn was more practically focused in her ‘doing good’ and put it in terms of wanting to ‘provide good things for [people in need], to provide them with a standard of living that doesn’t involve conflict’.

Creating in order to ‘do good’ is not a far stretch for many entrepreneurial types whom those in the charitable, NGO and social business world might be quick to write off. Many entrepreneurs see themselves as ‘doing good’ whether it be for animal welfare like Anita and Gordon Roddick and The Body Shop, Richard
Branson wanting to give the joys of world travel to the working class, or Steve Jobs wanting to get a computer into the hands of everyday people. As Branson himself states, ‘If you get into entrepreneurship driven by profit you are more likely to fail. The entrepreneurs who succeed usually want to make a difference to peoples lives’ (Branson, 2013). In that regard, peace-builders and entrepreneurs share much in common in their motivation and goals, but the approach outlined by Branson also separates compassion from doing good. You can do good in order to succeed, without calling on the deep wells of compassion and self-sacrifice.

For the interviewed peace-builders, compassion was also mixed with a rational assessment of what they could offer. Maxine is a case in point. She talked of the dire needs of her people, which were very clearly on display when her interview took place in a concentration camp. Thousands were housed under canvas and on thatched straw flooring on mud. Sadness and anger for their plight had motivated her, but she also said: ‘They want help these people, but they need someone to help them [. . .] and I have the skill and this is something I can afford.’ Likewise, Murray persuaded his wife he needed to change jobs in order to help his people, because he saw that he had skills to offer. Working alongside another peace-builder ‘who is not looking after himself only’ but was working for the good of others, Murray was dismissive of those he felt were in it for the money: ‘And these people are, they say, “Oh, how much you will give me. If I could not get a salary high like this, I could not work” and they think of themselves more than others, and they quite limit what they will do (unless it is paid for). For me, I don’t do that. For me, even though I’ve got the money, or not got the money, I feel like, I can tell, I help you 100%.’ These two examples alone show the spirit of so many of the interviewees, who beautifully intertwine their practicality with their passion, commitment and self-sacrifice.

What do peace-builders do? Interactions with community

*Table 18 outlines several activities that peace-builders regularly undertake but underlying these activities is the reciprocal influence between community and peace-builder. There is a very direct question relating to this in the semi-structured interview: ‘Do you think communities can influence entrepreneurs like yourself into the kind of work you now do? If so, how?’ This is linked to the question regarding*
‘the most important things that should be done to help restore or maintain peace’, which in effect is asking what work peace-builders are doing in the community.

In terms of community influence, several of peace-builders were clear that they were in peace-building in reaction to the attitudes of the community rather than being encouraged into that field by positive affirmation of those around them. Tegan, an American now working in Myanmar, said to people who questioned her working in such a dangerous place, ‘Yeah, I’m going to do this because I don’t want to be like you.’ This negative reaction to arrogant superiority, ignorance and disdain of ‘the other’ and violence in the community was mentioned by two others and could be inferred by the comments of several more. Stubbornness, discussed above on page 202 is clearly also a factor.

These peace-builders generally belong to multiple communities and often referred to diverse types of influence from those different communities. For example, they could refer to the community in which they had been raised, the community of faith in which they worshipped and often received support, the community of the organisation for which they worked, or the particular community in which they were actively involved in peace-building work. Each of these communities could be seen as influential. Tegan’s negative response was to the community of her place of origin, both the township and the faith community, but her work at the time the interview was being conducted was amongst a very supportive and affirming group of people involved in similar work.

Building community strength

‘In community’ can be a very strong place to stand. Frank clearly realised the strength that community gave when dealing with wider society, saying, ‘Thank God I am not alone in this community. This is my mission, in my country, and especially in this community.’ Ophelia was encouraged by the strength in communities themselves, particularly those subjected to long periods of conflict: ‘I am amazed at some of those Karen NGOs, the kind of work they do, totally on their own initiative, without any money, and how they’re able to organise, and raise support, and help
their communities. I think in my country the only way people would do that was if they got a good salary.’

Sam saw strength in some of the community rituals of the new community of which he was now a part, telling the story of a woman who had her expensive phone stolen from her desk, went to the local Buddhist temple and, after talking with the priest, did the ritual and ‘let go’ of her phone, giving it to the person who stole it. He commented on how useful this was in providing non-violent responses to wrong perpetrated by others. Sam was impressed by the strength of his original support community too, noting how they gave sacrificially and how accommodating they were of his journey:

They’ve done absolutely everything that they could. I don’t think they know quite what has happened to me but they’ve never got in the way and said, ‘We don’t like where you’re going’. They never got in the way and say, and said, you know, ‘You’re not orthodox enough for us anymore’ or anything like that. [They] allowed me to think this stuff through, to see Jesus clearly. And what I hope is that we would be able to take that, what we’ve learned back, lovingly, to show people back home how it can work.

Elliot summed up the thinking of several others about the strength of community when talking about seeing community potential rather than seeing the need, highlighting Paulo Freire’s theory opposing the notion of student-as-bank-account-to-be-filled-by-teacher model, instead suggesting that critical pedagogy enabled freedom of thought and action in a new way of learning and freed communities from the negative self image of the oppressed (Freire, 1970), which is very like Jayarkumar Christian’s ‘marred identity of the poor’ (Christian, 1994, p. 98). For Elliot, the strength was already there in the community, it just needed the opportunity to be ignited. Many of the peace-builders spoke of the community vision and strength to support non-violence, which simply needed the encouragement of some illumination to be given life so as to achieve their (the community’s) vision of reconciliation’.

One piece of evidence about the strength and influence that various communities have is the way in which those wanting to impose an oppressive hegemonic government on them have attacked these communities. Several peace-
builders from Armenia and from the ‘black states’ of Myanmar (Shan, Kachin, Karen and Chin) would agree with Harry, who, talking about communism and Armenia, said, ‘Probably the government see that we are becoming very powerful so they try to destroy us. [It used to be] totally different. [At] that time communities, Christian communities, were not very strong, and it was easy to destroy. This is serious question for me.’ For him, this was a tacit acknowledgement from the government that indeed, local community can be very powerful in supporting movements of any kind, even those of peace-building.

**Education**

Peace-builders work to change communities. There was an unequivocal agreement between peace-builders that an essential part of the process of bringing understanding, reconciliation and community progress was education. Of the 31 interviewees, 26 mentioned it several times. Earlier, 29 of the 31 had stated that for peaceful community there has to be understanding, acceptance and respect. This requires education but of a different kind to the giving of classroom information. ‘I think the role of education is absolutely massive,’ said Eddie, but at the same time he wanted to see it ‘absolutely re-planned from the bottom up again’, a sentiment expressed by many of the peace-builders. Nancy commented reflecting on her own on-going holistic growth: ‘Still it’s education [. . .]we grow [. . .]that’s why I say that for youth it’s very, very important to send them outer world.’ A high proportion of these peace-builders are committed to a holistic education that develops (mostly young) people into empathetic individuals able to understand and respect ‘the other’. This attitude is clear in so many of the peace-builders’ comments. As Maxine said, ‘Of course people should be educated. People should be educated, and people should have respect [. . .] Muslims should understand the values of Buddhism and Buddhists also should learn the values of Islam. Now here, so this is ah, how to learn each other’s differences.’ And as Nigel noted, ‘Because they have no education [. . .] we have to give awareness for their future.’ When thinking of the future of many of the village communities in Myanmar, Nathan said, ‘So I think if they understand the value of education, then one day they will have their own, you know, children to lead in their communities.’ Murray, a Buddhist working for a Christian NGO and very
keen on inter-faith exchange, commented, ‘From the beginning we are building education for our young, new generation. Mostly not a subject, but this is a knowledge that we have to put into their mind-set [...] this is to love each other.’ And Shawn echoed this point, saying, ‘If they own what they learn through their curiosity, through their love and their humility, ‘cause when you’re loving in humility you learn inner secret stuff right?’

Peace-builders see this education at a community level as being more effective than almost anything else in shifting values, worldview and perceptions of ‘the other’. Asked about legal or informal routes to reconciliation, Tegan said: ‘I’m a teacher, big on education, and all this I think that’s likely more effective, informal, but the legal stuff is much more known.’ Other peace-builders expressed similar views, that standing on your legal rights is one way, but it may not be the best way to resolve the problem. In this group, there would undoubtedly be a very animated discussion about whether the International Court of Justice and trying people for war crimes was an effective way ahead. In fact, the debate within just a single person would be animated if they had to choose between the desire to ensure ‘the justice of the law’ and the need to say ‘What have we learned and where do we go from here?’.

Education about rights was certainly perceived as very important for establishing the sense of justice that years of conflict has blurred or extinguished, but the kind of education that was being discussed here was much broader-ranging and the reconciliation being sought was at a very different level altogether from that which the law could provide.

Open set boundaries: It’s not in or out but direction of travel

Peace-builders saw that boundary-setting was a two-way process. Some of the peace-builders laboured under community restrictions but worked to shift the attitudes involved. Sampson observed, ‘It is difficult to have such kind of, ah, to bring up this kind of people’, referring to the problem of having communities see things from the other side’s point of view in border disputes. On the other hand, Maxine, as a single woman, could have only very limited impact on religious leaders in her community because of cultural restrictions: ‘I know what to avoid, and I understand in which role I can take part [...] and I know it is not good for me to take
part in a discussion about religious things in a mosque.’ Neville spoke of the fear that
his Christian community had of the much larger surrounding Buddhist group and
their violent reaction towards anyone who helped Muslims in the community. He felt
very restricted by their fears, saying, ‘So, in fact, you have to keep working so that
nobody knows what you are doing, and you are very quiet, and very careful, and you
don’t expect any encouragement from anybody.’

Tegan suggested that what you thought and did affected your standing in the
community and your ability to influence things: ‘So whether you vote the right way,
or whether you have a lifestyle the way that they think is admirable [. . .]so then
you’re either promoted or demoted in society. And I think it’s whether they have
authority to speak into certain things, or whether they’re given authority in different
areas — or not given authority kind of shooed away.’ A peace-builder without
community acceptance and standing can achieve nothing; they are simply ‘shooed
away’. This is the reason for the unwillingness of several in this research to be
identified in any but the most general ways; they know their underlying desires for
peace and their methodology for achieving it might find no community acceptance
and they would be quietly side-lined — or in three cases, killed.

Peter’s comment on this stands out:

I think there are a lot of people who are ready to work towards peace but they
don’t, they’re not vocal because they’re seen as traitors. Or they would be
seen as traitors if they were vocal. Um, [pause] and I think, a lot of that
comes from the society in general, but a lot of it is also encouraged from the
authorities, that the authorities, if they started working towards peace,
seriously considering different forms of compromise, talking about the
benefits of compromise and how to work within that, that they may have
success bringing out.

It would be hard to find a more eloquent statement of the power of
community, the influence of leaders and the real potential for peace in genuine
dialogue — and the influence all these have on genuine peace-builders.

These kinds of negative restrictions can go beyond the threat of physical
action too. Shawn noted how religious communities use psychological violence to
prevent questioning:
I think that we assume what we hear at church, what we’re taught, the books we read, that these are the experts [. . .] they’re the experts of the law, and when they’ve said it it’s cannon, it’s truth. And then because of the fear factor of going against the inspiration of scripture, we can’t curiously ask something alternative than what they have interpreted. And so in that way it’s exactly like Matthew 23, it’s exactly like the Pharisees and Sadducees. The scribes and the experts tell you what to believe, and you assume that that is the way it has to be or you’re going to hell.

However, the vast majority of the comments about community influence on peace-builders was positive. Billy noted, ‘I think all of our life experiences, which then would make up our community, have been a part in, of forming us and bringing us to the point where we are today.’ Catlin observed that ‘regular spiritual rhythms or patterns together, as communities’ were important to longevity of service, and that these supported a sense of ‘call’ in a stressful area of work. Carl observed how in many village communities the structures enabled dispute resolution in an easy way (‘Listen now, we need to kind of sort it out’), and he could contribute to that, shaping values, something that was harder to do in urban communities. Elliot pointed to the way in which a regional peace deal emerged ‘from the ground’, and then wider regional partners joined in the peace plan because ‘things are really very much interconnected.’

Shawn knew well how his work could be affected by community: ‘So if in the community they assert an issue that is more important than the one we have taken on as ours, in collaboration with them, then we would seriously reconsider our entire approach to the community.’ Kate concurred, suggesting that the government was failing because they didn’t listen to local communities enough, nor change their approach, noting also, ‘[Investors need] to understand, listen to the community and civil societies voice. Don’t listen only to the government. Because in the lands people, community live a lot, so they should listen to the community most.’ She suggested this be extended to people like the UN, pertinent advice for the UN-led commission on the Rohingya.

Several of the peace-builders noted that individuals who are loved, respected and supported by the community can have positive effects on, and for, the peace-builders themselves. Nathan observed, ‘Yes. Some, some monks are very good
example to follow’, and related how his wife encouraged him to follow the example of those monks. Murray saw good examples from the West who would be very influential as long as they ‘really have spirit to want to see Myanmar become a peace country, this is the most important’. Eddie saw context as important, saying, ‘[In our context] religious leadership has a big role to play. And a lot to answer for also, well, of course, they’re also the product of the context, so, [laughter] but you have to actually say at some stage, religious leaders have had an opportunity to reflect and study in these things.’ As Kera, talking of leadership that peace-builders could support and encourage, said, ‘It is a very challenging time [. . .] to have charismatic leaders, brave leaders to stand up for people’, and she gave multiple examples of good leaders who were drawing the best community spirit out of their local contexts. Matt noted, ‘Unfortunately so much of our community seems to push people like that to make wealth for themselves, or just for their group. But you see [. . .] you don’t make wealth for yourself, you make wealth for this community.’

Communities can go further than just being supportive too — like shoulder tapping. George, a mayor in a small town in Armenia, was almost strong-armed into peace-building. Recognising this man’s standing and values, ‘about 10 politically active people [. . .] just came to my bank, entered my room, locked the door from inside, and said, “If you don’t promise that you are going to be a candidate for this upcoming elections, we are not going to let you from here.”’ Nathan said of his community, ‘they didn’t do anything to push me into this’, but indicated that, although he felt he had a choice, he also felt community pressure. Murray, starting sustainable schools in conflict zones, recognised that community had expectations of him for their best and brightest pupils. He said, ‘So when we build like that, these people [the children], they will know when they are growing up, “Oh, I need to help others.” And the community can do that.’ This is a reciprocal influencing process where the community influences the peace-builder, who influences the next generation of village children, who will influence the community.

This empowers local communities to influence wider decisions too. Murray’s community could see their problems but, like Elliot, using Paulo Freire’s lens of the pedagogy of the oppressed, they too could see a better future for an educated and
organised community. In a similar vein, Frank said, ‘I would love to see more influence of the community. Unfortunately, our communities are not organised yet, because of, first of all it is legacy of the Soviet Union, unfortunately our parishes are not organised well, and church is working on that sense.’ Frank saw the church as producing a power of persuasion from service and love and not from might and/or strong-arm muscle, and suggested these characteristics would be useful to any organisation really wanting to have wider influence for peace in the community. Frank’s comment was true for many peace-builders in both Armenia and Myanmar, who expressed recognition of the fact that grass roots movements need leadership, but leadership of a certain kind, to direct the rising energy of a community as it emerges from violent suppression.

Of course, leadership doesn’t have to be formal to be formidable. Jim had formerly worked in an ADP in Kenya and met a group of women who went under the name tunituni, which means ‘steam’. He related how these women simply got together and said to the men in this situation of violence all around them, ‘Look [...] you know, we can do a lot better together, and earn more money and have better lives if we work together and you’re in trouble if you engage in this violence.’ That is leadership and the power of community rolled into one and clearly it has a strong effect on individuals when it has a community focus. That informal leadership was inspired by Jim in the way he encouraged those women. And ordinary communities can inspire peace-building leaders too. Nancy shared this about her experiences:

I had a lot of international students and I can say that they changed my thinking, and my life [...] This is the time when I start thinking about why I’m here, what I am doing, and, you know. Um, I remember this once, my student said, this American student said ‘Whoever discovered the water, it was not fish,’ you know this comments. So, exactly, [this is what it’s like] when you are, um, living in your closed community.

Mike found a way to have separate communities of Christians and Muslims influence each other where there had been a lot of tension. He sent them out on photographic missions where Christians had to tell a story about Muslims and Muslims about Christians using the photos they had taken. They needed to conduct one another through their communities and explain sights and events as they went.
This was a great way to build understanding and peace and, again, to show the influence that community can have on an individual who is looking at it through different eyes.

A comment made by Ruth sums up the two-way nature of influence that most peace-builders alluded to in their comments as well. They seek to have, and see the results of, influence on the community and they know the community can both inhibit or expand the work of the peace-maker by their influence on him or her. Ruth said, ‘It’s not only just leadership makes that influence. It’s very much on the grassroots. Though the grassroots is very much influenced by the more powerful institutions, like political institutions or, or religious institutions, or media.’ This brings to focus the final set of influences that peace-builders would add to community and government as affecting them — that of the media.

**Using media**

Few would dispute the effect of media on community consciousness and attitudes. Several of the peace-builders are part of organisations that take the peace-builder’s information and feed it to HR organisations who use newspapers, radio and TV to spread the story. The globalisation of media makes them pervasive and powerful, and even remote communities where some peace-builders work are feeling the effect of exposure to freer media access. Ophelia noted, ‘If media makes it so that somebody is a hero or a villain then, you know, if they succeed in that campaign then they’re going to make people believe that.’ And Matt spoke at some length of the impact that media (particularly Western media) was having on his urban congregation in Yerevan, where he felt that everything was about ‘my profit’ and a ‘capitalistic system of thinking’ where everyone’s wanting to know ‘What is my cut? What is my cut?’ Others like Grace noted the impact on children in particular, saying, ‘Children’s programmes on TV, or our films and programmes are so much not peace-oriented. Even on gender-related, even interpersonal relationships, everything is so aggressive. And we have to talk about that peace building, about teaching people being tolerant, being caring rather than being aggressive and self-protective.’
Elliot and Gregory are representative of a number of peace-builders who are proactive in the area of media and the arts. Gregory uses an extensive art practice to coalesce the societal desires for a more communal way forward, picking up on the passions of the young by encouraging free expression of art in his studio while using public media to encourage observation of the beauty of life all around. It was not surprising that during the semi-structured interview he was called away twice — once to do an interview with a local TV station where he included this researcher in the interview, and once to look at some art being done by a visiting group of students. The community shapes his art and he in turn shapes the focus of the community. Elliot studied the techniques of the Brazilian Augusto Boal, and likewise uses street theatre to engage local community:

[You have people] democratise a little bit the space of theatre, that when everybody could become an actor. So it’s like you visualise, like concrete scenes from daily life, and people come and try, and replace the main characters in order to, to the audience and for themselves, you know, to understand what’s going, how they can change their own life, you know, to find some, some, ah, possible, like, opportunities to change their lives.

In this process, peace-builder and community work together to inform each other and provide expression for community concern that can be converted into more concrete action.

**Peace-builders and global concerns**

As noted in Chapter 4, the questions about issues such as environment, corporations and the military were designed to gauge how peace-builders connect their work to global concerns and influences. As might be anticipated, peace-builders were generally well-informed about not only the impacts of corporates, climate change, military expenditure and key global pandemics like AIDS but were acutely aware of the implications of most of these issues for conflict in their areas. The deeper analysis undertaken here in this section concentrates on only one area, that of environment, because a high proportion of interviewees mentioned it in relation to their view of a peaceful community. Not one talked about peaceful communities in terms of corporate law, universal health care or reduced military spending, but many mentioned environmental harmony as key to a future survival.
This should come as no surprise, as there is growing evidence of a link between environmental damage and other social ills, and that abuse of the planet opens people to abuse of others (Whiteman & Cooper, 2016). While few of the peace-builders had much to do with issues of the physical ecosystem, they were connected enough to communities to instinctively be aware of the environmental link. This care for the environment was expressed in different ways between different religious groups, but of interest is the fact that all four religious groups (including agnostics as a group) looked beyond the physical universe as merely a resource to see it in interaction with the humans who inhabited it. The view of an interaction of life between ‘things’ and people may be quite common in Buddhism and agnosticism but is not often expressed in Islam and Christianity, both religions tending to see the physical world as a resource for exploitation.

Buddhist peace-builders’ expressions revolved around the oneness of all things, with Murray saying that eventually ‘we go back to being part of the universe’ when ‘we are at the end of our life [. . .] not life anymore’ and concluding that there is therefore a need for us to be thoughtful and careful with all things in that universe. Nathan noted that ‘if, at least I can support and help the poor in the community then I also believe that if the reincarnation really exist maybe I will be born to man again’ and that this involved respecting all things. This reverence came through from agnostics as well. Elliot talked of the awesome forests at risk because of the mining companies polluting the waterways from which they drew life and of his anger about the way in which these beautiful areas were being degraded.

Muslim expression of creation care revolved around the concept that Josh defined as ‘all these things in the universe, were created only for human being use’, although he was aware that sometimes people ‘wasted’ the environment. Earlier in the week before the interview, he’d been trying to stop people burning the stubble from harvested crops because it ‘made global warming’ and he saw the negative consequences of that on the IDP population around him, perched, as they were, precariously only a couple of metres above sea level. There was an appreciation of symbiosis for mutual benefit in the interviewee’s understanding of life that didn’t come through in discussion with the general members of the community intent on
seeing the land and plants around them only as a rather inadequate means of survival. Maxine also looked beyond the earth simply as a resource. Commenting that it was provided for human use but that human beings had ‘destroyed the harmony’ between the green environment and themselves (in the conflict they created), and noting their ignorance of life within the earth, she felt that many in her community were unaware of the damage they were doing to themselves in harming the environment.

Christians had a similar view of the environment, sharing the Muslim view that it was created for human enjoyment and exploitation. The idea of stewardship was present in their conversation around the physical environment and some, like Catlin, talked of stewardship in terms of being part of the restoration of creation to how it should be, or as Carl said, it was ‘a new creation’ as we restored relationship with God. Mike probably went the furthest with this concept, suggesting that a community of shalom included ‘not only human beings [but] the well-being of animals, the well-being of the planet and the well-being [of] the environment, so the peaceful community has a sort of, inclusive view of being human, and inclusive view of being citizens of the world’. In general, however, the Christians viewed creation as something to be enjoyed and used as an entity separate from themselves — although not to be overused. As Ruth stated, ‘We exploit too much.’

There were two outliers in the Christian expressions that could form bookends to a continuum. One was from Nancy, who said, ‘Find God, and how we, as one, can be in, I mean, you know, we are not separate. Separately living in this world, we all are one, as God is one.’ This seems quite close to Buddhist terminology for someone living in Armenia and coming from Georgia. At the other end of the spectrum was Jim, who reflected on his experiences in Africa and seeing animals tear at each other around a waterhole. Reflecting on the planet as a whole, he commented, ‘This is not a benevolent place.’ He was the only person to express a profoundly negative view of some aspects of the wider universal picture, although even he said that he tried ‘to do what it takes to be a good man in relation to the environment’.

What emerges from the interviews is that the peace-builders have a profound respect for creation overall, which parallels their view that peaceful communities
have respect for each person and for those people and things around them that make the wider environment. There were often in the interviews moments when this researcher felt the presence of an awareness and reverence for life, for everything that drew breath, and for the environment that created fresh air to breathe, so often missing in everyday conversation and reflection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute / Value</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Creation of economic activity</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Food, clothes &amp; shelter</th>
<th>Reconciliation (events, process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country = Myanmar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country = Armenia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = Graduate Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level = Post Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender = Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender = Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Organization = Personal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Organization = Organisational</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Buddhist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Protestant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Agnostic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Orthodox/Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Evangelical/Ind/Charismatic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation = Muslim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator = Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator = No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = 1–5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = 5–10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = 10–20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement period = More than 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: What peace-builders do

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by NVivo version 12.2.0 (1701)
A reflection on the process

This researcher has re-read the interviews multiple times to get a ‘feel’ for the thinking and feeling that sits behind the words. Recalling the laughter and tears shared in the stories of success, failure, misunderstanding and oddball encounters as well as the often mind-numbing details of inhumanity and brutality, it would seem that there are two substantial differences between the characteristics of the general entrepreneur and those of the peace-builder. One is an understanding of profit; the other is the focus on self-sacrifice. All entrepreneurs seem passionate and committed. They take others along for the ride by ‘selling’ their confidence in themselves and the product or service to which they are committed. They are also self-sacrificing. They work long hours, take risks — even to the point of risking everything except perhaps life (and sometimes even that) — and ‘put themselves out’ in pursuit of the goal of ultimate success. In all of this there is no difference between the peace-builders and the entrepreneurs examined in the literature and the research. The substantial difference is the depth and focus of that self-sacrifice. Entrepreneurs in the ‘business as usual’ sector sacrifice themselves for their ultimate self-benefit. For the peace-builders, the focus of the sacrifice is the good of others, the well-being and shalom of the wider society, and better connection with wider creation into the future. In many of the cases in this research, the peace-builders’ focus is on what they see as God’s desire for humanity. The motivation for this focus seems to be a vision of a harmonious future (not so much an idealised past), and for many it is also in response to a deep spiritual experience that has given them insight into the meaning of life in a new way.

Leadership style doesn’t show any major difference from the multiplicity of ways in which entrepreneurs set up and run for-profit enterprises or markedly shift the culture and performance of corporates and government departments as noted in the discussion above between pages 61 and 68. It is fair to say that the most obvious common feature of peace-builders and entrepreneurs is their self-sacrificing driven-ness, which inspires confidence in others and a shared vision of profitable outcomes. As noted between pages 50 and 52, the vision for shareholders in most for-profit businesses is good returns on money invested. For the people that these peace-
builders would see as their shareholders, things like *shalom*, well-being, harmony, security, good relationships and the like are the ROI they seek, and these peace-builders work and lead their teams for those goals. However, while it is true that many of these peace-builders also lead from the front like entrepreneurs do, they have one substantial difference: *kenosis*. The thesis returns to that theme in the final chapter.

**A brief summary of the qualitative findings**

Summarising all the data in the discussion of this chapter leaves these lasting impressions about peace-builders, not listed in any particular order of importance:

- They focus on people and community
- They value understanding and respect for others
- Both genders value holistic education highly as a way of achieving understanding and respect, but women even more so than men
- They see a different future from most people in their community
- They all can articulate very clearly what a community of peace (*shalom*) looks like and that is the goal they work for
- They want to ‘do good’
- They live with, and enjoy, diversity
- Women more than men want to place events of the present against what is ‘remembered’
- Religion is important to them, both as a means to peace and as a cause of conflict
- Their religious heritage brings perspectives they openly acknowledge and generally use to their advantage
- They are ‘other-directed’ and practise self-sacrificing love, *kenosis*, to achieve good for others
- They are stubborn in their determination and are not ashamed to stand for what they believe to be right
- They are motivated by what they have seen and experienced and are determined to stand on the side of the oppressed and marginalised, and their faith provides a philosophical scaffold in which to hold their experience
- They are not simplistic in their analysis of the causes of conflict and violence, recognising a wide variety of contributors like individual greed, party politics, ethnic group divisions fueling comparisons and a sense of relative deprivation, government ineptitude and abuse, religion, personal and group lack of trust, and fear — both real and imagined
- They seek to shape their communities while recognising that their communities shape, and have a right to shape, them
- They are generally well-informed about issues outside their immediate environment and are well-read

Perhaps the final word in this chapter should be left with Gregory, who penned a poem and had a friend take a picture that sums up the reverence for the fragility of life, together producing something that beautifully reflects the wonderful difference about peace-builders that this researcher discovered in the course of his inquiry: their willingness to sacrifice being acceptable to those in power for the sake of those who are marginalised and reviled.

*Figure 27: An imponderable planet*

*Source: (Cross of Armenia Unity NGO, 2016)*
Chapter 6: The quantitative data: A case of causation or relationship

Introduction

The mound. The constant reminder to everyone who ever visits Hiroshima, sees a movie about it or looks at a photo. Its silence speaks to humanity still. But what have people learnt from the instantaneous incineration of 70,000 mostly civilian Japanese? One lesson might be that actions have consequences. ‘Pearl Harbour led to Hiroshima’ is the standard justification for the bombing. But, of course, it didn’t have to. The two events are correlated but it is interesting to reflect on causation; there were choices involved.

This chapter looks at one question: Is it possible to move worldview/values in a particular direction? Evidence from the interviews indicates that peace-builders are a subset of entrepreneurs, with a particular worldview/values set that differentiates them from the wider group. Further, the indications from the discussion in Chapter 5 are that certain events or experiences cause that change. If targeted interventions can be shown to affect worldview/values, then giving entrepreneurs those experiences could produce a growing group of peace-builders. This chapter explores that possibility with an eye to ‘redeeming’ the entrepreneurial spirit.

Figure 28: Thesis flowchart Chapter 6
The quantitative research

The World Vision programme in Armenia is specifically targeted at the Child Well-being Aspirations outlined in Chapter 4, but the perceived nature of the programme itself can be deceptive in leading to thinking that aspirations like education and health are focused on purely ‘physical’ aspects like learning to read and do maths in education, and having better immunisation rates when it comes to health. In reality, the Faith and Development (F&D) team in the Middle East and Eastern European region is focused on community attitudes and values. For example, one section of the health curriculum targeted by the F&D team is changing attitudes to people suffering from HIV and Aids. The stigma and the moral judgements towards HIV/AIDS sufferers are a substantial barrier to both the reporting of the disease and community assistance for the families of sufferers. The health curriculum aims to confront those attitudes and replace judgement and dismissal with acceptance and assistance. The F&D team also aims at educating all those within the ADPs to better understand ‘the other’, the immigrant and/or the socially despised, and thus change worldview/values.

Another area where education in values and worldview has sizeable impacts is ecology and what might be called ‘creation care’ in a religious context. There are some American evangelicals who operate under a theological worldview called pre-millennialism, which anticipates the sudden return of Christ and the removal of all true believers to heaven prior to the destruction of the earth at Armageddon. This concept developed early in the 20th century and is outlined in The Fundamentals (Torrey & Wiersbe, 1915/1990). While this rather quaint modern theory of eschatology might appear to have only religious implications, its unfortunate corollary has been that, because of its escapist vision and apocalyptic ending, Christian adherents to this belief need have no care of the earth nor concern about a military build-up and conflict resulting in widespread destruction. There are those who work to spark conflict between Israel and its neighbours in order to provoke the final great battle of Armageddon (Halsell, 2003; R. Koehler, 2011). This has had top-
level political influence in the USA, where people like President Reagan, in ‘his
coolness to all proposals for nuclear disarmament, [have shown attitudes that] are
consistent with such apocalyptic views. Armageddon, as foreseen in the books of
Ezekiel and Revelation, cannot take place in a world that has been disarmed’
(Halsell, 1986, p. 49). ‘Why be concerned about conservation? Why waste time and
money preserving things for future generations when everything is going to come to
a fiery end with this one?’ (Swomley, 1996). This argument has carried forward into
disregard for the science of climate change and a refusal to heed ecological concerns,
which has in turn pervaded church — and general populace — understanding. This
was an area of educational concern in Armenia.

In the F&D programmes, values like the love of God and participation in
community life are targeted in order to have a well-functioning and harmonious
community. Details about the organisations people volunteer for, whom they would
like — or not like — as neighbours, how they view people in general and others’
trustworthiness are all values questions that give insights as to what level of trust and
cooperation a community might be operating at. Relationship with God and the
universe can be determined by the answers to the questions about meditation, prayer,
church attendance and care of the environment but are also hinted at through
questions like the cause of poverty. People’s responses to choices like ‘laziness’,
‘being unlucky’, ‘structural injustice’ and a ‘kind of inevitability associated with
progress’ as reasons for poverty give some very good indications of the values that
people generally hold, and thus their worldview in terms of cause and effect.

This researcher had completed an evaluation for the Armenian F&D team six
months before undertaking the research for the present thesis, leading interviews and
discussions in the traditional manner in which World Vision had been conducting
this sort of research, based on a ‘Most significant change’ practice (R. Davies &
Dart, 2005). The report from that round of inquiry, ‘World Vision MEER faith and
development mid-term evaluation’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b), based on one-on-one
interviews and focus group discussions with students, parents, teachers, priests and
pastors, shows that there was certainly perception of change in the desired direction
amongst groups of the community. Comments included: ‘They [the students]are
discussing different subjects more confidently and are trying to get more
information’; ‘They have learned a culture of listening’; ‘They have become more
sensitive to the social, economic and spiritual issues’; ‘Children experience hope
towards the future [. . .] new confidence for endeavours in their lives’; ‘The students
are more interested in children with special needs’; ‘Community members […] pay
more attention to the issues related to children and their education’; ‘Children are
more interested in different subjects’; ‘Children were more educated in holistic
issues’; ‘Helps [the child] adopt right attitude towards various material and spiritual
aspects of life’; ‘[The children] have another evaluation of the situation and things
around them — and they study handcrafts and handmade things.’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b,
p. 6)

The comments from the children themselves included: ‘I am more open-
minded and have an ability to express my ideas freely’; ‘I have confidence to chase
after my dreams and believe they will come true’; ‘I realise the family is very
important’; ‘I am more sensitive’; ‘[I have] no envy of others for their success’; ‘I
have changed my views regarding human relations, now I am more able to forgive,
love and be patient’; ‘We did a charity action to help a friend improve his health’; ‘I
respect other religions’; ‘I am more controlled in other situations’; ‘I am more patient
and forgiving’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b, pp. 6, 7).

Parents and community leaders had also noted other changes in behaviour.
Parents’ comments included phrases like: ‘I can mark positive changes in their
behaviour, they became more patient and tolerant to their friends and relatives’;
‘[They are] more tolerant [. . .] towards other community members’; ‘[They are]
more kind, more condolence with others.’ Some faith leaders noted: ‘They learned to
express their condolence with others’; ‘children became more charitable’; ‘they
respect parents and neighbours more’. Community organisers said, ‘After the topic
“Being more tolerant”, children showed more tolerance at keeping turns and
apologising for mistakes made during a game’ and ‘The principal reported no more
violence in the playground’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b, p. 7). World Vision staff members,
who had a background in community change and evaluation of that change, also
noted changes and improvement, with comments such as this one: ‘Children
recognised their own rights and responsibilities well, taking role on positive changes and ownership for their future’ (Kilpatrick, 2013b, p. 6).

While all of these comments suggested there had been some values change in the desired direction, such an evaluation has an inherent bias. Everyone involved in the process knows the work is conducted for the service provider, who has lots of nice supportive people in the community. The community focus groups and interviews gave substantial anecdotal evidence on the effect of the interventions from the point of view of students, teachers, parents, priests and pastors, but it raised the question: Could the effects perhaps be substantiated in a more rigorous way?

The consequence of this raised question was the survey undertaken for the purposes of this thesis in an attempt to check these findings against a far more academically rigorous process. The details of how the survey was conducted in line with the comprehensive EVS data-gathering instructions and how the tests were run are provided above in Chapter 4 starting with the discussion on page 150. It may be useful to note again here, however, that in this later survey the success of the World Vision programmes and interventions was judged by differences in the mean value produced by the allocation of numbers to responses to certain values questions. While the data from the earlier report supports the general outcomes of the EVS it must be recognised as suggestive only, anecdotal, and inherently likely biased.

**The quantitative data**

Noting again that, of the many values questions in the survey, only those most closely linked with the CWBAs were analysed, a quick perusal of the results suggests that World Vision Armenia can certainly draw encouragement from the fact that many of the values they are seeking to impact through their programmes appear to be moving in the desired direction, although much more research would need to be done to show causality with any certainty. That said, there are statistically significant differences in values — and in directions that World Vision would want to see — that can’t easily be ascribed to potential randomness in measurement. This is true in many values areas. While numerical differences seem very small, the $\chi^2$ analyses suggest it is real.
### Table 19: t tests for the Talin ADP minus the district of Aragatsotn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD of MD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 6: How important is religion in your life</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.389</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>-3.932</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 8: How happy are you</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-2.058</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 11: Do you volunteer for a religious organisation</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>4.209</td>
<td>-1.004</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 15: Do you volunteer for local community action</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>9.976</td>
<td>-1.513</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 17: Do you volunteer for local environmental</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>8.039</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 23: Do you volunteer for local health organisations</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>-0.965</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 104: Are there clear guidelines about good and evil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 109: How often do you go to religious services</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>-1.974</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 114: Are you a religious person</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>43.704</td>
<td>-3.422</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 119: Do you believe in God</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 120: Do you believe in life after death</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 124: Do you believe in reincarnation</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 125: Do you believe in a personal God</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>5.841</td>
<td>-2.069</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 126: How well do you connect with the divine</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 127: How spiritual are you</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td>-6.818</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 128: Is there one true religion</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-0.644</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>-6.218</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 129: What is the place of God in your life</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>7.532</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 130: Do you get comfort and strength from religion</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>26.475</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 131: Do you meditate or pray</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>52.362</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 132: Do you pray outside religious services</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>6.924</td>
<td>-2.470</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 186: How interested are you in politics</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 187: In political action would you sign a petition</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 188: In political action would you join a boycott</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-0.426</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 189: In political action would you attend a legal demonstration</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 190: In political action would you join an unofficial strike</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>15.570</td>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 191: In political action would you occupy buildings or factories</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 205: How much confidence do you have in the church</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-3.307</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 206: How much confidence do you have in the army</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-1.868</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 233: Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 234: Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have the chance</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>8.571</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 235: Is it ever justified to go joyriding</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>-0.720</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 236: Is it ever justified to take hashish</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>2.731</td>
<td>-0.891</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 237: Is it ever justified to lie for your own</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.798</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>36.543</td>
<td>-3.999</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 238: Is it ever justified to have an affair</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>24.375</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 239: Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.462</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>15.261</td>
<td>-2.425</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 268: I think Immigrants take jobs away from locals</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-0.991</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-2.044</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 269: I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-0.319</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.716</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 270: I think immigrants make crime worse</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 271: I think immigrants put strain on the country’s welfare system</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.988</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 272: The future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 273: I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>6.038</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The business of peace-building
The data for all four ADP’s is in appendix vi and all four show similar, if somewhat uneven trends. Because the EVS data is produced to test the hypothesis that World Vision programming is effecting changes of people’s values in directions they see as positive and desirable this data is only discussed in the broadest of terms. To do more would be to try and explain the many variations in the data and to begin a process of ADP evaluation, which is not the intent. Table 19 above shows the data from Talin ADP in comparison to the surrounding district of Aragatsohn. Negative signs in the Mean difference column denote a shift in the direction desired and any values in the p column under 0.05 show statistical significance. As can be seen from the table there are 16 values that have shifted in the direction desired — and attempted — by World Vision. This data combined with the comments on page 227 — where teachers, priests, parents and students attribute changes to the F&D — gives support to the idea that there appears to be an impact that is worth further investigation. While the participants in an earlier study may attribute these changes to the interventions this statistical data makes no comment on causation, only stating that there are good grounds for exploring the relationship between intervention and values shift. The $\chi^2$ and two t tests that are appendix vi support this analysis and give more detail.

It should also be noted that there are 4 values that have moved in a direction contrary to that targeted by World Vision. This may be explained by the timing of this survey, which occurred 5 years after the original EVS survey, and the values have moved in the direction that others researchers have explored previously (Pickel & Sammet, 2012; Pollack, 2008) i.e. The difference is due to the overall change in values in the country in the 5-year period under consideration. Again, this points to the need for further research.

Each of the values above can be assessed against the tables of tests in Appendix vi and are not detailed here, suffice to say that, based on these, it would seem prudent to conclude that there are significant shifts in a large number of values and that they mostly shift in the direction that the interventions intended to achieve. This semi-consistent shift, some of it in the opposite direction to the slow drift of
Armenian and European values in general, needs a research process that is able to eliminate other variables and would probably exceed the limitations of the EVS data set.

While it might be tempting to speculate on issues like the leadership in various ADPs, the length of time the ADP has been running and other regional, national, provincial, and even local community factors affecting these results only very broad generalisations can be made in line with the data. It appears that, generally, the longer an ADP has been running the more values have been shifted and there was some anecdotal evidence from general conversation (not recorded anywhere in this thesis) that the ADP leader’s worldviews might have significant impact on the direction of the values in the ADP. However, this line of inquiry was not taken because this researcher worried it might become a performance review of the ADP leader, which was not the aim of the research. Analysis of the data from the results of the SPSS inquiries shows that values and thus worldview show sufficient trend in direction of change to suggest to the desirability of further research to seek ways of producing value change in the education of young entrepreneurial types and to assist them to move towards becoming peace-builders.

One minor observation is that all four ADPs appear to struggle more in shifting political action values, perhaps because they are more ‘public’ and to that extent more affected by surrounding popular thought. Interviewee’s responses to values 186 to 189 indicate their commitment to various political actions, starting from low-level petition and rising through to physical occupation of space, and show little change from the surrounding population. That seems a great pity and something that might be considered for future attention in these kinds of interventions. The likely kinds of changes represented by the Table 19 do not appear great enough to produce the changes that we see in peace-builders who are willing to risk life and limb in the task. It could arguably be suspected that this is related to not only a strong ‘privatisation’ of religion, where religion is about a person’s private spiritual life and not something that affects political policy, but also an overall approach to change that is too timid. In Armenia there is not the fall-back excuse, so often wheeled out in some of the rest of Europe, that it is the negative effect of Luther’s ‘submit to
authority’ theology that has led to this. Armenia has been strongly Armenian Orthodox since declaring that Christianity was the state religion in 301. The fact that there has been no shift in the value placed on trust in the army during this time suggests that some government institutions have retained the confidence of the people, despite the obvious difficulties and corruption.

Value 205, measuring confidence in the church should encourage both the Armenian Orthodox Church and World Vision, who have been in partnership in these programs. The general rise in confidence is almost certainly directly related to the fact that the church is involved in delivering useful community development projects in both places, and the teaching techniques being employed there have been steadily upgraded to reflect modern pedagogical approaches. Teaching has encouraged questioning, exploration (as opposed to a more rote style of learning under communism) and innovation. Along with much more open approaches to issues like HIV infection, which WV’s programmes like ‘Channels of Hope’ (with its gender equality and non-judgemental attitude to sufferers) encourage, the church’s enthusiastic embracing of community-issue problem-solving has clearly raised its standing in the community. The Armenian Orthodox Church is seen by many citizens as a bulwark against foreign imposition of ideologies — from communists to the East and Muslims to the West and South. A new post-communist generation of priests and the use of modern methods has clearly assisted in making this rise in confidence so significant.

Given the number of studies linking racism, bigotry and judgemental behaviour with religion (Sherkat, 2014a), the emphasis on love of others and acceptance of some measures of difference might indicate how successful the general ADP programming as well as the camps and ‘Christ for the Child’ programmes have been on wider community attitudes. This emphasis may be inferred from questions such as ‘On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any you would not like to have as neighbours?’ where ‘People of a different race (value 46)’ and ‘People who have AIDS (value 55)’ were in that list. A closer and more detailed analysis as a follow-up would be useful. This study didn’t segregate the various ADPs any more closely on those issues because they fall outside the purpose of the
data used for this thesis. The information is there and could be used in further studies, however. For example, given that all the ADPs are in remote rural areas, comparing these values with a sample that includes the capital city, Yerevan, may account for some differences. Cities are more cosmopolitan (Sevincer et al., 2015) and therefore both more open to outsiders and more informed about issues like AIDS. Further analysis is needed on this question because the results from Talin and Amasia seem incongruous with the fact that the positive impact of something like Channels of Hope in this regard is well-known and documented. The other potential factor in this unexpected result is the overall rise in national tension in the country, which was apparent between 2013 and 2015 when these surveys were being taken. These tensions relate to unresolved conflicts with neighbouring countries and could well contribute to fear of ‘the other’.

The study did, however, disaggregate the attitude to immigrants in values 268 to 273. While the results overall are mixed, Table 19 suggests that ADP residents have a more positive view of immigrants than their surrounding districts. This indicates that some of the teaching that was anecdotal about students and the ‘acceptance of others’ in an earlier report (Kilpatrick, 2013b, p. 6) is widespread enough to have affected the wider community.

There has also been a measurable impact on ethical behaviour, as shown in the responses to values 233 to 239. While this is not consistent over all the ADPs, the data indicates that Talin and Amasia, as longer-running ADPs, are both having measurable impact on multiple ethical attitudes and behaviour in the intended direction, and this would be anticipated by the hypothesis, in that the longer the programmes in the ADP are running the more observable the shift in values.

**Summary**

The statistics show enough of a consistent impact over many values in the ADPs for further study to be done. There is even a suggestion in the data that more should be done to examine what features of the programming are different in the Amasia the most recent ADP, since it is new and yet has recorded some significant changes. Perhaps the CWBAs and their focus of measuring has encouraged more
effective methodologies targeting these key concerns. Overall though, it would seem that targeted change of worldview/values does have effect. That measurable effect begins to affirm the idea that shifting the entrepreneurial values system, often expressed as the pursuit of autonomy (Carsrud & Brannback, 2011; Shane et al., 2003; Wilson et al., 2004), to a focus on community *shalom* and well-being — which reflects increased emphasis on the values of peace-builders — is possible. However, it needs to be stressed that the theory of targeted change is tentative only; though there appears to be reliable evidence that change is occurring as shown by the $\chi^2$ and two t tests, the tests do not show causality, but focus on the worthwhileness of testing for it. The implications of these statistically significant shifts are discussed in Chapter 7.
Chapter 7: Conclusions and implications

Introduction

The mound draws your eyes. ‘Lift up your eyes to the hills. Where does your help come from?’ the psalmist cries, troubled by many doubts and fears and shedding tears of remorse for wrong he has done. It is not much of a hill, but many tears of helpless anguish have been cried near this mound and prayers of hope offered in this place. It is a good place to cry and to express one’s regrets, not just for oneself but for a vibrant and well-resourced world beset by suspicion, greed, bigotry and hatred — the drivers of violence.

But the mound does not have to be the final word. Looking out from the park surrounding this memorial, there is a bustling city, happy children, commerce and leisure, food and entertainment, industry and retail. There can be a future and it is to that future that this thesis now turns.

Sandra Waddock, among others, has elucidated the concept of intellectual shamans, wayfinders and edgewalkers with her description of such scholars as performing the ‘intellectual work (theory, research, writing, and teaching) that integrates healing, connecting (intermediation or the mediating of boundaries), and sense-making to serve the greater good’ that may be ‘attuned to a purpose
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others cannot see yet’ (Edwina Pio et al., 2017, p. 53; Waddock, 2014, p. 3). She suggests that “through the power of our intention and the strength of collective will” (Nicholson et al., 2015), we can become brave enough to take up the challenge of seeing and calling new islands, new ideas, new ways of doing scholarship and being scholars, to us. If you hear this call then hope rests with you.’ This researcher seeks to take up that call, even if, as stated at the very start of this thesis on page 21, it is with the kind of desperate hope that Visa CEO Hock famously expressed: ‘It is far too late and things are far too bad for pessimism’ (Hock, 1999, p. 3). This thesis is built on the contention that while there is something radically wrong with how we envisage wealth, wealth creation, business and success, there are people who work amongst communities that are in conflict who can show the way to a better human future, where well-being, both personal and social, is a focus of business.

Wayfinding and edgewalking scholars (Dana, 1999, 2010; Dana & Dana, 2005; McFague, 2013; P. Morris, 2015; E. Pio, 2014; Syed, 2010; Waddock & McIntosh, 2011) call for business that serves both planet and people. This thesis shows that there are ways forward to achieving that by growing the group of entrepreneurs that it has labelled peace-builders. This chapter identifies the conclusions that can be reached, the contribution to knowledge, and points to some possible practical steps to expand the group of peace-builders, as well as highlighting areas for further research.

Towards some conclusions

Three themes are set down as the goals of this thesis on page 18. These are now examined again in the light of the findings in Chapters 5 and 6 before conclusions are drawn.

Theme 1: In what ways are the worldview/values of peace-builders similar to or different from those of entrepreneurs?

As noted above, entrepreneurship is difficult to define as a closed set of characteristics (Knudsen et al., 2011), but the concept is central to most modern theories of economic development (Hérbert & Link, 2009, p. 67). Defining those
entrepreneurial characteristics has been a quest for many (Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991, p. 47; Kirzner, 2009, p. 145), so some attempt at generalisation could be made made. But while ‘ordinary people’ (Isenberg, 2013, p. 102) seems the most encompassing and adequate description, it is very unsatisfying as a summary generalisation. Following the methodological approach on case studies as outlined on page 118, where particulars can be generalised to give insights into big-picture characterisations, this research shows that some entrepreneurial characteristics can be generalised and that peace-builders share many, if not most, frequently identified key characteristics of entrepreneurs.

Perhaps one of the significant keys to answering the question of peace-builder and entrepreneur characteristics was supplied by one of the interviewees, Marilyn. Asked about the work she has done to contribute to peace-building, and reflecting on the need for education so people can understand ‘the other’, she said, ‘It needs a school, so we’ll put a school in. It’s problem solving. I don’t, I see it as problem solving rather than entrepreneurial. To me entrepreneurial is making money.’ That is precisely the issue. Most people see entrepreneurs as purely money-focused but, as noted above on page 208, not even big-thinking ‘for-profit’ entrepreneurs see it that way (Branson, 2013). This is why this thesis, on viewing the multiplicity of schools of thought on the matter (Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991), defines an entrepreneur as ‘One who takes an opportunity with the resources they have to mould what most others fail to see or see as worthless or impossible, into something of sustainable value where both assets and returns can be economic, social or psychological.’ In that sense entrepreneurs solve problems — so do peace-builders. Sam, with his expanding school network that is educating thousands of children in Myanmar for just US$5000 per school start-up cost, Matt, a church leader in Armenia, giving dough for free to the poor outside Yerevan, supported by the bread shop providing work for locals, and Billy, leading an NGO in Myanmar, getting fishing boats and nets, and leasing land to enable IDPs with nothing to have the satisfaction of at least helping feed themselves, are typical of the peace-builder businesses this researcher saw being put into practice, where readily available resources, both material and communal, are utilised to achieve a vision.
Diagrammatically, making explicit what is hinted at in Figure 2, this could be represented in the following way:

![Diagram showing the relationship between General population, Entrepreneurs, Social Entrepreneurs, and Peace-builders.]

Figure 30: Where peace-builders fit in society. Indicative only, not to scale.
Source: R. Kilpatrick.

This research indicates that through many shared characteristics, leadership traits and methodologies, peace-builders are, like social entrepreneurs, a subset of entrepreneurs. To use the kind of terminology used by others (but conflated in this thesis), they are social entrepreneurs, and through the definition elucidated on page 73, entrepreneurs. Those similarities are reviewed below, where the specific traits that make this group a definable subset of entrepreneurs in general are outlined.

**Research insights in relation to theme 1**

In the course of reviewing the question about the ways in which the worldview/values of peace-builders are similar to or different from those of entrepreneurs, five areas emerged:

- Similarity in having a different view of the future
- Similarity in facing sizeable struggles
• Similarity in their persistence and risk-taking
• Difference in their conception of timeframe and profit
• Difference in embracing and exemplifying kenosis

A different view of the future

Peace-builders, as a whole, like entrepreneurs, have a different view of the future from the rest of the community. Where many in the community simply want violence to cease but have few ideas — and often even less willingness — to achieve that dream, peace-builders can clearly articulate the aspects and activities of a prosperous, wholesome community. Discussed at length on page 176 in Chapter 5, this point is perhaps best summed up by Ruth, a minister, who said, ‘I think that peaceful community is when there is love, respect, and justice’, and reiterated by Josh, who said, ‘I love justice.’ These are not just words; Josh, a community organiser in Myanmar, has been to prison for that cause and is willing to die for the kind of justice that brings peace and prosperity. This prosperous, wholesome community is what this thesis defines as shalom, and the interviewed peace-builders could not only ‘see’ that state of shalom as a future but could enunciate the steps and long-term plan on how to get there — or at least ideas and strategies on how to approach it. There is amongst peace-builders something that innovative entrepreneurial types seem to have: a discontent with what is and a desire to create what could be. In this aspect, peace-builders match the kind of very basic entrepreneurial characteristic that writers on the subject describe (Heilman & Chen, 2003, p. 350; Isenberg, 2013, p. 31).

There might be a better term for this particular trait in peace-builders, however: what this researcher calls a ‘holy discontent’. This is a discontent driven not by material problems but spiritual ones. They want the essence of ‘being’ to change and want it to start with them. In Myanmar, Sam’s comment, quoted above on page 183 sums up so many of the peace-builders’ approaches to life: ‘If Jesus is invading my day properly, I’m going to meet a Muslim who hates me and I’m going to find a way to love him.’ Even a cursory examination of their analysis of what
creates conflict and what motivates them to action puts their insights and desires into the realm of the spiritual, that very other part of human beings that seems to be a defining point separating them from other sentient beings. Entrepreneurs and even social entrepreneurs work to change the outcome of things and systems. Peace-builders work to change the very kernel of being human. Even with its level of unreliability, the word cloud points to this focus in the frequency of the words used: people, human, peace, just(ice), community, good, different, well, believe, love, living. They are words of existence, perhaps even described as words that outline our communal aspirations.

When listening to and transcribing the answers to what makes for a peaceful community and seeing the summary emerge in Table 15 on page 175, the concepts of understanding, respect, acceptance, love, empathy, forgiveness and honesty pour out, rising to the top of the discussion agenda when peace is being sought. Peace-builders have an internal compass that has been oriented to these important aspects of life and the determination to follow that course through storms that blot out landmarks that might otherwise provide bearings for the stoic traveller. This does not mean that peace-builders view the issues they face in esoteric terms alone. As can be seen from their analyses of trust, greed, religion, etc., outlined in Table 16 on page 191, peace-builders are very aware of the kind of material factors that might point to Runciman’s relative deprivation theory (RDT) and Tajfel and Turner’s social identity theory (SIT) — and the very material basis those theories provide for material deprivation creating conflict. What seems to separate out peace-builders from social entrepreneurs, who very often treat the presenting symptoms of the underlying issues, is the ability to see the faith, fear and human frailty lying behind the power plays, politics and nationalistic pride and the desire to address these underlying human issues to achieve a different outcome from what history has so often provided.

*Action and growth in the face of difficulty*

A second similarity with entrepreneurs is that peace-builders recognise the positive value of struggle and conflict and its need for appropriate ways to resolve it.
They are people of action and problem solvers. Looking at words they used to describe what they are doing, ‘start’ and ‘now’ feature prominently for several of them, along with ‘going’, ‘talk’, ‘help’, ‘love’, ‘give’, ‘care’ and ‘create’. These are important indicators, and the discussion in Chapter 6 expands on the words themselves to show their relationship to the determination to succeed.

This very closely parallels the experience and character of entrepreneurs of whom Isenberg says:

There is a surprisingly ubiquitous relationship between adversity and entrepreneurship. The overarching reason is that the process of entrepreneurship is seeing value where no one else does, and persistently refusing to cave to the naysayers. That means that entrepreneurs are always bucking the current, going against fashion, doing what the rest of us think is not worth doing.’ (Isenberg, 2013, p. 58)

This is true of the peace-builders in this sample. Even those who, when they were younger, were conflict avoiders saw that difference and that the adversity surrounding conflict — when approached with an appropriate frame of mind and with a view to a settled future — could be a positive thing that contributed to the well-being of all. As noted on page 188, interviewee Nancy, working on community development in Armenia, felt that ‘without problems you could not be developed’. This determination in adversity relates to values and worldview, those things a peace-builder sees as most important and the sense of call that gives the strength to achieve those goals despite adversity, opposition and conflict. Seeing things differently is one very clear area in which peace-builders and entrepreneurs are similar. Struggle in adversity is another.

**Persistence and risk-taking**

A third similarity is outlined in the many different ways the peace-builders spoke of themselves in the selected quotes on page 202, where phrases like ‘I always argued with people’, ‘driving me to do this’, ‘I need to help others’, ‘we didn’t give up when we had hard times’, ‘this is what we really want to do for the time we have left’, ‘a bit of stubbornness’, ‘there is no other way of doing peace’ all point to the
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determination that successful entrepreneurs need to have to win through. There is also similarity around the attitude to risk. Both entrepreneurs and peace-builders refuse to allow the fear of risk and the unknown in the risk to deter them. The difference is the focus of fear and risk. In entrepreneurs it is generally about finances, and business failure. For peace-builders the focus is ‘the other’ and the risk and difficulty in engaging with diversity and difference and the violence that can ensue when dialogue, understanding and trust fail.

Conception of timeframe and profit

The research indicates two differences between entrepreneurs and peace-builders in visualising success and profit. The first emerges when the issue of timeframe is considered. Most entrepreneurs want to see benefit within their lifetime, and in part that’s because ‘benefit’ has to do with benefit to them personally. Peace-builders, on the whole, seem to have a longer timeframe in view, which may be related to a question of idealism versus realism but is also related to the issue of profit. Other than the possibility of some kind of ‘feel good’ experiences to stroke the ego (and, listening to the stories, there seem to be few moments that produce those), there is little personal gain. In fact, as already noted, mostly these peace-builders are following this path through personal sacrifice. Tegan’s comment, as she works to assist refugees and IDPs in Myanmar, highlights this: ‘[They] may be all idealistic, but people who actually can sustain on the field, and, for longer term, don’t expect everything to be fixed in their lifetime.’ While comments about survival and maintaining passion for the task could be seen in terms of stubbornness, examination of the interviews suggests that these traits of endurance have more to do with the fact that peace-builders either have a different timeframe or see the goal differently. Josh, in a concentration camp in Myanmar but able to leave and possibly even leave the country to seek medical help, said, ‘I am going to die. Because my age is 75. So, I will, I can stay next 5 years, or 10 years.’ And he does this to fight on for all who have been disenfranchised by the Myanmar government. Compare this with entrepreneur and lawmaker Tsongas’ oft-quoted comment, ‘No one on his deathbed ever said, “I wish I had spent more time on my business”’, and both the goal and the timeframe difference become apparent. For many entrepreneurs, achieving business
success and comfortable levels of wealth may be sufficient, whereas for peace-
bUILDers the task is never complete, and they seem content to do their part in planting,
watering or weeding the seeds and leaving the harvest to others.

**Embracing and exemplifying kenosis**

The second difference between entrepreneurs and peace-builders in
visualising success and profit is attitude. The popular perception of entrepreneurs is
masculine and endowed with ‘independence, aggressiveness, autonomy,
instrumentality, courage’ (Gupta, Turban, Wasti, & Sikdar, p. 399). This stands in
stark contrast with the interviewed peace-builders, who repeatedly emphasise a
prerequisite of showing respect, understanding and love. This is the result of an
attitude of humility and service that comes from what is identified in this thesis as
kenosis. This researcher was overwhelmed by the numerous stories of self-sacrifice
that came from the interviewees and those around them: Buddhist monks trekking for
days through the dangerous jungle passes of Myanmar to get training so they can
educate the children of their villages; leaders in biology, engineering and nuclear
research who walked away from lucrative offers and prestigious positions in order to
bring hope to their communities by working and walking among them; people who
stood in front of soldiers with guns aimed at them and said, ‘No, you will not
displace this community without proof of good intention’. These, and many like
them, are the people this researcher met in the course of this research. They humble
and inspire anyone seeking genuine human transformation. Lederach’s conclusion is
that this kind of thing is a ‘serendipitous appearance of the moral imagination in
human affairs’ (Lederach, 2005), which is a reasonable conclusion but does not take
note of something that is clearly resident in all of those stories and which is exposed
in this research, namely, the manner of humble respect towards others that is based
on an attitude of kenosis. It is surprising that this is not commented on more. C.S.
Lewis brings together this concept along with the previously identified trait of
toughness, identified in this thesis as determined stubbornness in struggle, in his
poem ‘Love’s as warm as tears’: 

Conclusions and implications
Love’s as hard as nails,
Love is nails;
Blunt, thick, hammered through
The medial nerve of One
Who having made us, knew
The Thing He had done,
Seeing (with all that is)
Our cross and His. (Lindskoog, 2001, p. 145)

This points to the most significant difference of focus. The focus of peace-builders is ‘others’ and the well-being of those others. In other words, it is a focus on the humanity of others rather than just on solving some economic or political difficulty. Peace-builders seem to recognise the political, economic, educational, health and social steps needed to address the issues of community violence, but the focus of their attention in solving those problems is at a spiritual level. This certainly puts peace-builders into the general set of social entrepreneurs who also have a wider community well-being focus, but peace-builders have a specific goal in mind: reconciliation that leads to communal peace, harmony and shalom, which is accompanied by self-sacrifice focused on the good of others. Nancy’s story is typical: ‘I mean my profession is, first profession is linguistics, and I was teaching, ah, at the university [. . .] when I start thinking about why I’m here, what I am doing.’ So she gave up her secure job and high pay and took on a role encouraging churches into peace-building activity at a substantial reduction in salary.

Theme 2: In what ways do the leadership styles of peace-builders align with those who have succeeded in building an entrepreneurial business?

The characteristic of kenosis emerges strongly when considering leadership styles. One of the stand-out similarities among peace-builders is not something that is restricted to the peace-builder and their enterprise alone. The attitude of kenosis in both the peace-builders themselves and the communities that support them (which is often not the community in which they are working) is detailed in Chapter 5. This applies across all groupings of gender, faith, education, length of experience and
geographical area. Listening repeatedly to the interviews and reading the transcripts, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that either something these people have read, seen or have had mentored by others has turned the ‘self-sacrifice’ switch another way from that of the standard entrepreneur, who also makes sacrifices but largely in pursuit of personal autonomy (Carsrud & Brannback, 2011; Shane et al., 2003; Wilson et al., 2004) — although Branson’s comment, noted earlier, indicates the sole focus on autonomy is not universally true. Matt, an ex Buddhist monk in Myanmar, for example, wanted his community to say of him, ‘he had, he gave’, and went on to say, ‘I want to justify why I am in this world […] It's a short time. It would be meaningless to come and do nothing and go.’ The interviewed peace-builders were also realistic about who they were — self-deprecating was a word that often came to this researcher’s mind in the interviews. Jim, seeking reconciliation and communal well-being in Armenia, made the wonderful comment underscoring this: ‘Christ ended up crucified, and that’s what happens to, from my point of view, to every single follower who’s brave enough to do that; you end up dying on a cross […] I’m sorry, there’s a line, it’s the chicken line for me, I’m this side of the chicken line [laughter].’ These peace-builders and their supporters are ‘other’ focused. Social entrepreneurs and even entrepreneurs make sacrifices. That is the shared characteristic. It is who the sacrifice is for that makes the difference and that sums up both the similarities and differences in leadership style.

To grow and expand a successful business, entrepreneurs need capital and shareholders, and to do that they sell the dream of what they are going to do to people they hope will become their backers and shareholders. Those shareholders shape the growth of the business to quite a large extent, perhaps by providing more capital for expansion in a certain direction or by having a place on the governing board. Often the shareholders have financial profit in mind. This would be true for many start-up entrepreneurial types, as evidenced in such programmes as ‘The Shark Tank’ or ‘The Dragon’s Den’, which are intensified microcosms of what a budding enterprise builder might find when seeking shareholders.

The significant difference for peace-builders is their capital and shareholder base. They know, and they let it be known to those with whom they work, that it is
often people in the West who are relatively poor who help pay for peace-building work. Sam, Shawn, Billy, Jim, Maxine, Tegan, Ruth and Catlin all mentioned in the interviews or informal conversation supporters they knew of, retired people or students on very limited income, who might skip a meal simply to provide US$5 per week towards the peace-building businesses in which they were involved. All of the peace-builders knew people in difficult circumstances who give towards people they don’t know because they trust the team doing the job. None of these peace-builders has the kind of problems discussed (page 50) relating to social shareholder engagement (Van Cranenburgh, Arenas, Goodman, & Louche, 2014) or to the tools used for ‘engagement’, which include threats of divestment (2014, p. 198). Interestingly, threat of divestment is a tool suggested for Islamic Financial Institutions that lose their perspective on justice, fairness and compassion (Ullah, Jamali, & Harwood, 2014, p. 219). The peace-builders in these interviews — or the organisations they serve — have shareholder backing from shareholders who are committed to their kenotic philosophy. All seem to operate in the stakeholder model praised by Benedict XVI (Van Cranenburgh et al., 2014, p. 199).

Knowing that this self-sacrificing love is operating amongst shareholders empowers the monks of Myanmar as they climb the long, slippery and dangerous trails back to where they will encourage the start of the businesses to fund schools that will teach respect of ‘others’. It gives hope to the defenders of human rights in the concentration camps of Sitwee and the community organisers in Kachin state, where both groups struggle to support families traumatised by violent eviction and loss of their property, livelihoods and communities. That same knowledge of that band of self-sacrificing supporters encourages Matt and Kera in Armenia, struggling to gain trust in an economy laid waste by forces beyond their control and to find ways to dampen community unrest in the wake of the kind of forfeitures described by some as ‘former status’ losses (Stinchfield & Silverberg, 2016, p. 681). It is also a constant reminder to the staff of these various enterprises that their sacrifices are part of a long line of kenosis-inspired action that includes self-sacrificing activist shareholders and unpaid hours of work for those on the governing boards of many not-for-profit non-governmental organisations. Those working for faith-based
organisations know you don’t join church, temple or mosque to become rich. There is a strong line of *kenosis* running through many of the organisations that are represented by the interviewees, which emerges in the sacrificial service of the staff in the peace-building businesses. It is servant leadership writ large.

In many ways peace-builders do with peace what Chesterton suggested was true of the *kenosis* way of Jesus: ‘The Christian ideal has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and left untried’ (Chesterton, 1910, location 372). These peace-builders have chosen a difficult task and a near impossible road, and they recognise that to achieve the communal good they seek requires sacrifice on their part. In some cases, they have the option to take up arms and defend themselves when under armed attack while doing medical training and food supply work, but instead they have chosen non-violence, non-retaliation and quiet retreat. Their self-sacrifice and servant-heartedness to others without the usual compensations of capturing extraordinary value (in monetary or some kind of personal gain) is best explained by *kenosis*, and for many of them the prime example of *kenosis* is Jesus.

**Theme 3: What reciprocal influences do the peace-builder and their community have on each other?**

Many of the peace-builders interviewed for this research honoured the communities in which they grew up, or the ones in which they now work, as people who encouraged them in the path they now trod. Of course, not all comments about communities were positive. Participants Catlin and Tegan both talked about people from the communities in which they grew up who affected them negatively, so that their response was along the lines, ‘Well I’m not going to grow up to be like you’. Peace-builders also expressed negative attitudes towards the anger and violence of the places where they lived and worked, as explained on page 212.

However, these peace-builders also repeatedly affirmed the positive influence they received from sections of the community, which was important in keeping them committed to the task to which they felt called. For Jim, working and learning alongside each other was key: ‘I mean it’s moving out of our comfort zones, it’s moving with others and so, that we discover ourselves.’ Frank, who had begun some
significant peace-building work, similarly noted, ‘Thank God I am not alone in this community [. . .]. There were few, but everything starts with few.’ Several of the interviewees, when asked about community influence, talked of how they had been educated by the community and wanted to give education (in the widest sense of the word) back to the community. As Murray, a participant from Myanmar, said, ‘[When] I was young, or when I was in the university, I got this scholarship and I told them, “I will help my people.” [. . .] [Now] we are building education for our young, new generation.’

From the interviews, most of the peace-builders either had a confronting experience or read or heard something that made them aware of issues in the world that they wanted to try and help solve. This formed and forms part of their motivation. Those sections of the community that helped them assimilate that experience or that learning were very influential in terms of the direction taken by these peace-builders, as illustrated in quote after quote and story after story.

**Two further positionality reflections**

Two surprises stand out from this research with regard to positionality. The first was to do with the mind-set of this researcher going into the interviews that the peace-builders would be universally recognised as community heroes and be fêted as such. A short reflection on history should have shown how wrong-minded this was. People who have sought peace over conflict have often been castigated, accused and belittled. Prophetic voices that called on leaders to sue for peace rather than carry out grandiose political schemes were imprisoned and sometimes killed, like Jeremiah of the Old Testament. They were often seen as traitors. So it is with the present-day peace-builders. Those working in places of disputed ownership in both Armenia and Myanmar know the sting of words when suggesting things like power sharing and some sort of political, economic or even nominal compromise.

The second was this researcher’s assumption that peace-builders would be working only within Galtung’s positive peace framework. Perhaps only a white male, like this researcher, living in a relatively benign place like Aotearoa/New Zealand which, other than the incursions and subjugations by the first white settlers, has never
been invaded or even bombed or shelled by a foreign power, would be naïve enough to think that positive peace was the only valid expression of well-being and *shalom*. In that context of peace, wide respect and obedience for the law and the on-going resolution (through negotiations and payments of compensation) of some very serious breaches of its founding treaty and mistreatment of indigenous peoples, it is easy to lose sight of the fact this sort of peace is an exception, not the norm. It should not have been surprising that several of the peace-builders supported a peace installed by powerful force because it at least provided a level of security and prosperity, with at least some justice, that years of fighting had destroyed.

**Summing up**

This research has shown many of the characteristics shared between entrepreneurs and peace-builders, while some key differences are also identified. It has demonstrated that peace-builders are a subset of entrepreneurs—they are entrepreneurs of a particular type because of their worldview/values. It has highlighted that key element of leadership style in peace-builders, namely, the embracing of *kenosis*, which, while not unique to peace-builders, is very strongly represented in this sub-group of entrepreneurs. The research demonstrates that *kenosis* is not something promoted in business schools or in business itself, because it appears that *kenosis* is not primarily a function of information transfer and cerebral analysis; rather, it is often birthed in a person through a dramatic experience, encounter or enhanced (by some emotive response) learning moment — what this researcher would call an ‘aha’ moment. This does not make the work of business schools unimportant, but does suggests that at least some staff should be demonstrating and mentoring *kenosis* as a lifestyle. This would make the education available at business schools more holistic and transformative in its approach. The research has also unearthed the reciprocal influences between peace-builder and community. However, while the research has provided answers to the thesis, it has also raised further research issues outlined in the limitations and further research sections.
Limitations

The limitations of the findings of this research are noted in the relevant sections and chapters of this thesis, a brief summary of which follows:

- With a larger sample of peace-builders, a mixed method might have been attempted to confirm what in this thesis are only inferential statistics. A sample of over 100 peace-builders could produce the kind of power in 2t and $\chi^2$ tests that might increase the certainty that they were in a different category from their communities regarding their worldview/values.
- The timing of the EVS in the ADPs may have affected results because of the large number of migrant workers in Armenia. With some of the worldview/values being so substantially different, alternate timing would not affect the general conclusion that this is worth further research, but it might give different emphasis as to where and how the changes are occurring. The lack of a baseline study in the ADPs points to the importance of measuring the EVS values in each nine-year cycle at the same time as the EVS is completed.
- This is a two-country study. This researcher will eventually extend this study into continental Africa and South America, where different cultural values and practices might see peace-builders acting in highly contrasting ways.
- The limitations of using translators are explored in great detail in Chapter 4, but this is an issue that cannot be overly reiterated. Worldview/values go to the core of being and are some of the most difficult concepts to translate.
- Additional useful information could have been obtained from Buddhist monks in Myanmar who were starting schools in Karen, Shan and Kachin states but they were either several days walk away or across highly restricted borders in ‘black zones’ and the presence of a white male “foreign researcher” would create unwelcome attention and definitely endanger them, so it was deemed advisable to leave that project for a Myanmar based researcher in the future.
- Several mentions have been made of the plight of the Rohingya (pages 24, 125,170, 177, 180, 192, 194, 214) but because of safety and security concerns efforts have been made to disguise both the participants and their circumstances, hence this thesis has worked within these very real limitations prevalent in Myanmar.
- As work on this thesis was concluding, there were indications that the situation was somewhere between stages 4 and 5 of Green’s 5 stages of genocide (Green, 2015). These 5 stages are listed as beginning with stigmatization, moving to harassment, then isolation, systematic weakening and finally mass annihilation. The United Nations is seeking a full and independent inquiry into the events around this most persecuted of minorities in Myanmar despite the words and actions of Ang Sung Suu Kyi’s government to minimise the on-going crimes against humanity. Some participants have been involved in efforts to expose these crimes and so because participant safety is of paramount importance it limits specific details.
Further research: Where to from here?

The limitations above point to a need for larger NGOs like World Vision to set up pilot projects in at least three continents in order to measure worldview/values shifts in their ADPs at the same time as WVS and EVS projects are being run, and to do this over longer timeframes than the life of a standard 15-year project. This would provide much better data with which to explore the key factors in producing shifts in worldview/values that can have a positive effect on social capital.

Kenosis is identified as both a possible metaphysical framework for the universe and a pronounced characteristic of peace-builders in this research. Kenotic behaviour needs both widespread understanding and support as well as further examination, as faith is re-emerging more strongly as a fundamental issue in the public sphere and addressing ecology and environment, as called for by Gardner (McFague, 2013, location 31–33). Identifying and promoting people who offer real and lasting solutions at different levels to some of these systemic failures of business to generally provide answers to sustainability issues and the inherent problems of human greed is an idea that is well overdue.

This research also indicates (page 206) that those presently involved as peace-builders, and the communities in which they work, need to identify and shoulder-tap young people with entrepreneurial skills and the appropriate character earlier in their lives, provide them with worldview-changing experiences, create internships and opportunities to mentor such young people, and then embed them in situations where their non-violent approach, kenotic character and entrepreneurial skill set can transform the future prospects for a community. This could be achieved by having the appropriate people embedded in business schools, or business schools having useful partnerships with kenosis inspired business leaders. Alongside this, more detailed research needs to be done to pinpoint causality and the most effective methodologies for successful worldview and values emendations. The descriptive statistics produced in Chapter 6 suggesting that targeted worldview/values may be shifted contain too many caveats to allow certainty about the central factors in producing change and also how significant that change is. Statistical significance
should not be confused with significant outcomes that genuinely alter life trajectories for those being targeted.

The structure of business, particularly the nature and structure of corporate business, needs to be researched in the light of diminishing resources, global climate change and growing disparity between rich and poor. Business structure and the legislation that supports it is a human invention. We can re-engineer a human invention if that is what is needed to refocus business on wider community concerns such as ecology and social equity. Mention was made on page 94 of New Zealand corporate law where, at the time of writing, a managing director/CEO of any shareholder company, by law, has a single focus: to act in the best interests of the company, which usually means, protecting the (financial) interests of the shareholders of that company. Similar focus and structure is found in business structures in many countries and could be usefully reviewed. This thesis indicates that peace-builders, with a focus beyond themselves and to the wider community, might provide a better model for long-term human sustainability and a community where shalom is enjoyed and celebrated.

In a similar vein, research needs to be undertaken to explore how a different kind of pedagogy could be imagined so that the lessons learned about the failure of trickle-down economics and the kind of leadership that best produces peacefully negotiated outcomes can be taught using techniques that go beyond the cerebral to the existential. This would include a concerted push to research ways of finding and further educating shareholders who are willing to advance funds for non-financial gains and who share a spirit of self-sacrifice in order to achieve communal shalom. Along with these initiatives, to support the good work already being done, a greater investment into researching improved efficiencies of peace-building enterprises by government, developmental organisations and multilateral funders should also be encouraged.
Concluding thoughts

Despite the words of that great peace-builder, Jesus, ‘When you can show people how to cooperate instead of compete or fight, you’ll be blessed’ (Peterson, 2014, Matthew 5:9), the rewards of working for peace seem very distant to the interviewed peace-builders. Very often they face a discouraging, uphill battle against the odds and often against community sentiment as they go about their business: peace-building. Yet they persist. They see a different future and they work hard for it and they sacrifice for it. They show us a different way and goal for business. Martin Luther King, one of the great 20th-century practitioners of non-violence, said, ‘I refuse to accept the view that mankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daybreak of peace and brotherhood can never become a reality [. . .] I believe that unarmed truth and unconditional love will have the final word.’ (Echeverría, 2005, p. 9). The 31 peace-builders interviewed in this thesis would agree with him, just as they would with Hock’s bold statement, as quoted at the start of this thesis on page 21: ‘In times such as these, it is no failure to
fall short of what we all might dream — the failure is to fall short of all that we might realise. We must try’ (Hock, 1999, p. 3).

So the small mound in Hiroshima waits with stoic patience beneath the gentle touch of the shadows of the trees brushing its sighing slopes. It waits for us to rethink the business of peace-building. The small eddies of breeze whirl in mute testimony to the rushing wind that instantly transformed more than 70,000 living beings into smouldering ash on 6 August 1945 at 8:15am. The grass on the mound whispers, ‘There has to be a better way.’ This thesis points to ‘a better way’
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Appendix i: Participant information sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Date information sheet produced:
15-06-2013

Project title
The business of peace-building: Redeeming the entrepreneurial spirit for reconciliation

An invitation
Hello. I’m Rob Kilpatrick. You probably already know me from my evaluation work with World Vision and I’m very interested in what you do, so I’m doing a PhD on the values you share with other peace-builders. Your friends in this community have identified you as a peace-builder or entrepreneur, and I’m doing some research to see if people who do peace-building share a view of the world with entrepreneurs. How you see the world, your values and your personal characteristics are all of interest to me because they obviously combine together to encourage you into the sort of work you do. I’d love you to take part, but it’s a voluntary participation and I wouldn’t like you to feel you have to take part simply because others think you should. There is no problem at all if you say no, and if you agree and then change your mind, you can withdraw at any time while I’m collecting the data.

What is the purpose of this research?
The research is being undertaken because, in the course of doing evaluations in communities for World Vision, I began to notice that leaders that were trying to rebuild community harmony after conflict were often the very same people who were encouraging and sometimes starting community business themselves. I looked for insights from other people as to why that might be and could find none. So I decided to research it myself. I hope that from this research I get a very interesting PhD thesis, and that we produce a book that talks about the characteristics of peace-builders and the process of getting people with the right skills involved in peace-building. Finally, it might encourage some NGOs working in post-conflict situations to run workshops and build capacity for communities to identify and train peace-builders.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?
The reason I am asking you to take part is because I noticed you and the work you were doing when I did an evaluation in your area OR someone from an NGO working in your area identified you as someone doing the kind of work in which I’m interested.
What will happen in this research?

What I’m doing is giving a survey to everyone I am studying — and there will be only about 30 people altogether that I’m interested in — and then doing a more in-depth interview with you. The survey takes about 60 minutes and the interview about 90 minutes, so it will be nearly 3 hours of your time that I need. The survey, called the World Values Survey, is one that has been done on hundreds of people in your country, and the reason I want to use that is because there is lots of data about what people consider to be important, and I want to compare the general population with the group of people I call peace-builders. After I’ve interviewed you, I sit down with the survey data and everything you said and see if there are themes and ideas that I can draw out that help distinguish you (as one of a group of peace-builders) from the general population. When I’ve done that, I will send the results to you for comment and correction before I publish the insights.

What are the discomforts and risks?

I don’t think there are any risks in this for you. The community people that identified you as being a person of peace were proud to do so. However, if you think that people identifying you as having friendships on both sides of a conflict might endanger you, then there are things we can do to avoid trouble if you decided to still take part in the research.

How will these discomforts and risks be alleviated?

If you think that this research might put you or your work at risk, just say so. I will disguise your details and that of your community, and you can have a final check before the information is released in any way.

What are the benefits?

The benefit for me is that I get a PhD. The benefit for the academic community is that a gap in study will be filled, because no one else seems to have looked at the shared characteristics and values between peace-builders and entrepreneurs before. Ultimately, the research will, I hope, benefit your community and others like it, because they will have useful tools in identifying people with good peace-building skills and then guidelines as to how to encourage them into that kind of useful community work.

How will my privacy be protected?

Whether or not you want to be identified is entirely up to you.

What are the costs of participating in this research?

As I said above, I will need 3 hours of your time. If you are worried about being interviewed by me within your local setting, I’m happy to provide transport to some other place a little further away.

What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?

I’d like you to have 24 hours to think about this before you reply. Maybe your spouse/family will be worried about you taking part, or your spiritual advisor might counsel against it. I will come back tomorrow and see if you are willing to participate.

How do I agree to participate in this research?

You will need to sign this form: Consent form attached.
Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?

Yes. First I will ask you to read a transcript of the interview and check that you are happy with it. When I have completed the work, I will send anything directly related to the interview to you and if necessary provide an interpreter for you.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Professor Edwina Pio, edwina.pio@aut.ac.nz, +64 9 921 9999 ext. 5130.

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O’Connor, ethics@aut.ac.nz, +64 9 921 9999 ext. 6038.

Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

Researcher contact details: rob@traidmission.com, +64 21 807 692

Project Supervisor contact details: edwina.pio@aut.ac.nz, +64 21 807 692

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 26 May 2014, AUTEC Reference number 14/125
Hello, my name is Robert Kilpatrick and I am doing research for a PhD.

So you know a little more about me before the interview, here is a brief introduction:

I was born in New Zealand in 1952 in a little town called Gisborne, and I grew up there until I went to Auckland to study.

I began my working life as a physics and maths teacher but then trained in theology and became a Baptist minister. After working in the church for a number of years, I was asked to become principal of the Christian Leadership College in Fiji for four years, which I did, returning to NZ to be a minister and to do more degree work — this time in social anthropology — and I was for a couple of years an assistant lecturer at Auckland University in the Anthropology department.

Following that I was asked to lead tranzsend, the Baptist Church’s missionary and humanitarian arm for overseas work. I did this for 11 years, working with staff in several Pacific, Asian and African countries. From there I went to work with World Vision Australia, doing a lot of evaluation work in Africa, Eastern Europe and Asia.

Finally, I have returned to NZ to study, as outlined in the Information Sheet, which is my reason for wanting to interview you today.

I have been married to Lois for 40 years, and we have 6 children, 3 of whom are adopted, and 11 grandchildren.
Appendix iii: Participant consent form

Consent Form
For use when interviews are involved.

Project title: The business of peace-building: Redeeming the entrepreneurial spirit for reconciliation
Project Supervisor: Professor Edwina Pio
Researcher: Robert Kilpatrick

I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 15-06-2014 and 26-05-2014.
I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.
I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed.
I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way.
If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.
I agree to take part in this research.
I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research (please tick one):
Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s signature: ........................................................................................................................................
Participant’s name: ........................................................................................................................................
Participant’s contact details (if appropriate):
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
Date:

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 26 May 2014, AUTEC Reference number 14/125
Note: The participant should retain a copy of this form.
Appendix iv: Semi-structured interview questions

Semi-structured Interview Questions

The kind of open-ended question must elicit, as much as possible, the categories that the interviewee generates. The questions, in the order asked, will therefore be:

a) What do you think is the purpose of human existence? Why do humans exist?

b) What do you think are the most important things about being a human in a family and in a community? You can use the sentence ‘Human beings are….’ to start.

c) What do you think are the main things that cause conflict in your community? Can you list them for me and perhaps the story behind some of them?

d) What sort of people are the ones that cause conflict in your community? What characteristics do they exhibit? What do you think most influences their character development?

e) What are all the words that you associate with a peaceful community? Perhaps you can finish this sentence for me several times: ‘A peaceful community…..’

f) Tell me the story of how you became involved in the work you do. What do you think are the main influencing people, ideas and events that have led you to this point?

g) Do you think you have any particular characteristics that suit you for this peace-building work you do? What are they? You could use the sentence ‘A peace-builder is….’ to describe the ideal peace-builder.

h) You have been identified as a peace-builder in your community. Why do you think that people see you in that role?
i) Some people say that religion is a cause of conflict, but others say that
religion can be a force for good, for reconciliation and for peace-building.
Can you describe how you think your faith has shaped your view of the
world, your place in the world, the purpose of life and your involvement in
what you do? Do you think your faith has shaped your character? Has it
affected the roles you’ve taken in life?

j) Does your community practise any rituals of reconciliation? How does that
work?

k) Does your community have informal (no justice system) ways of trying to
settle disputes? Can you describe how they are initiated and resolved? Do you
think they work? Why/why not?

l) What are the favourite community stories or songs about heroes and
heroines? Are they your favourite stories? Who are your cultural heroes?
Why?

m) Talk to me about your views on:
   a. Climate change and the ecology
   b. The rich and poor of the world and their responsibilities to each other,
      particularly in relation to indigenous communities and colonial
      empires
   c. Military spending
   d. HIV/AIDS
   e. How people in your community ‘other’ people who are different to
      them
   f. Corporations and natural resource

n) What are the most important things that should be done to help restore or
maintain peace and prosperity in this community?

o) Do you think communities can influence entrepreneurs like yourself into the
kind of work you now do? If so, how?

p) What questions should I ask you if I wanted to find out what really makes
you do the things you do but I haven’t asked?
Appendix v

The full European Values Study material can be found at


To access the questionnaire itself go to ‘Master Questionnaire’ on that website, which will provide a file called ZA4800_q

To access all the details of the methodology go to ‘Method Report’ on that website, which will provide a file called ZA4800_mr

A sample of the actual survey is reproduced below.
Figure 32: The EVS front page
The business of peace-building

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EUROPEAN VALUE SURVEY (2008)  
28/01/2008

Hello, I am from the [NAME OF ORGANIZATION]. We are carrying out the [NATION] part of a Europe-wide study on what people value in life. This study will interview samples representing the European people. Your name has been selected at random as part of a representative sample of the [NATION] public. I'd like to ask your views on a number of different subjects. Your help will contribute to a better understanding of what people all over Europe believe and want out of life.

WE START WITH SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT LIFE IN GENERAL, LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES AND WORK.

SHOW CARD 1

Q1 Please say, for each of the following, how important it is in your life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v1</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>quite important</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>not at all important</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v2</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v3</td>
<td>Friends and acquaintances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v4</td>
<td>Leisure time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v5</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v6</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 When you get together with your friends, would you say you discuss political matters frequently, occasionally or never?
1 – frequently
2 – occasionally
3 – never
8 – don’t know (spontaneous)
9 – no answer (spontaneous)

SHOW CARD 3

Q3 Taking all things together, would you say you are:
1 – very happy
2 – quite happy
3 – not very happy
4 – not at all happy
8 – don’t know (spontaneous)
9 – no answer (spontaneous)

SHOW CARD 4

Q4 All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days? Would you say it is
1 – very good
2 – good
3 – fair
4 – poor
5 – very poor
8 – don’t know (spontaneous)
9 – no answer (spontaneous)
The business of peace-building

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EUROPEAN VALUE SURVEY (2008) 28/01/2008

Show card 5

Q5 Please look carefully at the following list of voluntary organisations and activities and say —
   a) which, if any, do you belong to?
   b) which, if any, are you currently doing unpaid voluntary work for?

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: CODE ALL MENTIONED UNDER (a)

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: CODE ALL MENTIONED UNDER (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>mentioned</th>
<th>not mentioned</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare services for elderly, handicapped or deprived people</td>
<td>v11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious or church organisations</td>
<td>v11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, arts, music or cultural activities</td>
<td>v12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>v13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties or groups</td>
<td>v14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community action on issues like poverty, employment, housing, racial equality</td>
<td>v15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third world development or human rights</td>
<td>v16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, the environment, ecology, animal rights</td>
<td>v17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional associations</td>
<td>v18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth work (e.g. scouts, guides, youth clubs etc.)</td>
<td>v19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports or recreation</td>
<td>v20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's groups</td>
<td>v21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace movement</td>
<td>v22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary organisations concerned with health</td>
<td>v23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>v24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (spontaneous)</td>
<td>v25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHOW CARD 6 – CODE AN ANSWER FOR EACH

Q6 On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v46</th>
<th>A People with a criminal record</th>
<th>v47</th>
<th>B People of a different race</th>
<th>v48</th>
<th>C Left wing extremists</th>
<th>v49</th>
<th>D Heavy drinkers</th>
<th>v50</th>
<th>E Right wing extremists</th>
<th>v51</th>
<th>F People with large families</th>
<th>v52</th>
<th>G Emotionally unstable people</th>
<th>v53</th>
<th>H Muslims</th>
<th>v54</th>
<th>I Immigrants/foreign workers</th>
<th>v55</th>
<th>J People who have AIDS</th>
<th>v56</th>
<th>K Drag addicts</th>
<th>v57</th>
<th>L Homosexuals</th>
<th>v58</th>
<th>M Jews</th>
<th>v59</th>
<th>N Gypsies</th>
<th>v60</th>
<th>O Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 33: Typical questionnaire pages from the EVS

## Appendix vi

### The proportionality of the provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>NUTS-1 Code Answered in Q136</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>AM — Armenia</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310000001</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310000003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YEREVAN</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIRAK</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LORI</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAVUSH</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARAGATSOTN</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOTAYK</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEGHARAKUNIK</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARMIVAR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARARAT</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAYATS DZOR</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SYUNIK</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2680000001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20: The proportionality of provinces data with 2008 EVS data*

### The t tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD of MD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 6: How important is religion in your life</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>2.406</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 8: How happy are you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 11: Do you volunteer for a religious organisation</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>-1.637</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 15: Do you volunteer for local community action</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>25.066</td>
<td>-2.414</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 17: Do you volunteer for local environmental</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>0.0740</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 23: Do you volunteer for local health organisations</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 104: Are there clear guidelines about good and evil</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>21.362</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 109: How often do you go to religious services</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 114: Are you a religious person</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>5.403</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 119: Do you believe in God</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 120: Do you believe in life after death</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>17.467</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 124: Do you believe in reincarnation</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>20.907</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 125: Do you believe in a personal God</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>-1.638</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 126: How well do you connect with the divine</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>37.855</td>
<td>6.244</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 127: How spiritual are you</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>9.590</td>
<td>4.961</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 128: Is there one true religion</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>-1.552</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 129: What is the place of God in your life</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 130: Do you get comfort and strength from religion</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 131: Do you meditate or pray</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 132: Do you pray outside religious services</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 186: How interested are you in politics</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>4.838</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 187: In political action would you sign a petition</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 188: In political action would you join a boycott</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 189: In political action would you attend a legal demonstration</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 190: In political action would you join an unofficial strike</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 191: In political action would you occupy buildings or factories</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>8.688</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 205: How much confidence do you have in the church</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 206: How much confidence do you have in the army</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-1.695</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 233: Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 234: Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have the chance</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>10.896</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 235: Is it ever justified to go joyriding</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>5.471</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 236: Is it ever justified to take hashish</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>12.407</td>
<td>-1.731</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 237: Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>6.890</td>
<td>-2.010</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 238: Is it ever justified to have an affair</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>9.856</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 239: Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>4.623</td>
<td>-1.378</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 268: I think Immigrants take jobs away from locals</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>5.153</td>
<td>-0.974</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 269: I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>14.088</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 270: I think immigrants make crime worse</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 271: I think immigrants put strain on the country’s welfare system</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-0.558</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>8.443</td>
<td>-1.172</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 272: The future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>5.704</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 273: I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: t test of the Alaverdi ADP minus District Lori

Source: R. Kilpatrick

---

Appendices 270
### Table 22: t test of the Gavar ADP minus the District of Gegharakunik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD of MD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 6: How important is religion in your life</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 8: How happy are you</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>-0.925</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 11: Do you volunteer for a religious organisation</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>3.918</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 15: Do you volunteer for local community action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 17: Do you volunteer for local environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 23: Do you volunteer for local health organisations</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>-0.744</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 104: Are there clear guidelines about good and evil</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 109: How often do you go to religious services</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.586</td>
<td>0.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 114: Are you a religious person</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 119: Do you believe in God</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>17.943</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 120: Do you believe in life after death</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>20.234</td>
<td>4.072</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 124: Do you believe in reincarnation</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 125: Do you believe in a personal God</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>6.394</td>
<td>5.932</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 126: How well do you connect with the divine</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 127: How spiritual are you</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>-1.536</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 128: Is there one true religion</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 129: What is the place of God in your life</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 130: Do you get comfort and strength from religion</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>10.093</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 131: Do you meditate or pray</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>60.230</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 132: Do you pray outside religious services</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>4.649</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 136: How interested are you in politics</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 187: In political action would you sign a petition</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>6.013</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 188: In political action would you join a boycott</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>7.057</td>
<td>-1.312</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 189: In political action would you attend a legal demonstration</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>5.641</td>
<td>-3.884</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 190: In political action would you join an unofficial strike</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 191: In political action would you occupy buildings or factories</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>10.912</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 205: How much confidence do you have in the event</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 206: How much confidence do you have in the event</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 233: Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 234: Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have the chance</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>12.418</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 235: Is it ever justified to go joyriding</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>-0.688</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 236: Is it ever justified to take hashish</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 237: Is it ever justified to lie for your own</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 238: Is it ever justified to have an affair</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 239: Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 268: I think Immigrants take jobs away from locals</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>-1.651</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 269: I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>-2.899</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 270: I think immigrants make crime worse</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-0.877</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>15.019</td>
<td>-2.747</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 271: I think immigrants put strain on the country’s welfare system</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>-1.027</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>5.862</td>
<td>-3.146</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 272: The future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-0.453</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>-1.405</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 273: I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22: t test of the Gavar ADP minus the District of Gegharakunik**

Source: R. Kilpatrick
Table 23: t test of the Talin ADP minus the district of Aragatsotn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD of MD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 6: How important is religion in your life</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.389</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>-3.932</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 8: How happy are you</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-2.058</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 11: Do you volunteer for a religious organisation</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>4.209</td>
<td>-1.004</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 15: Do you volunteer for local community action</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>9.976</td>
<td>-1.513</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 17: Do you volunteer for local environmental</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>8.039</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 23: Do you volunteer for local health organisations</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>-0.965</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 104: Are there clear guidelines about good and evil</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 109: How often do you go to religious services</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>-1.974</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 114: Are you a religious person</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>43.704</td>
<td>-3.422</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 119: Do you believe in God</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 120: Do you believe in life after death</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 124: Do you believe in reincarnation</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 125: Do you believe in a personal God</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>5.841</td>
<td>-2.069</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 126: How well do you connect with the divine</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 127: How spiritual are you</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.0886</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td>-6.818</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 128: Is there one true religion</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-0.644</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>4.899</td>
<td>-6.218</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 129: What is the place of God in your life</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>7.532</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 130: Do you get comfort and strength from religion</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>26.475</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 131: Do you meditate or pray</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>52.362</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 132: Do you pray outside religious services</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>6.924</td>
<td>-2.470</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 186: How interested are you in politics</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 187: In political action would you sign a petition</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 188: In political action would you join a boycott</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-0.426</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 189: In political action would you attend a legal demonstration</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 190: In political action would you join an unofficial strike</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>15.570</td>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 191: In political action would you occupy buildings or factories</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 205: How much confidence do you have in the</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-3.307</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 206: How much confidence do you have in the army</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-1.868</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 233: Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 234: Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have the chance</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>8.571</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 235: Is it ever justified to go joyriding</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>-0.720</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 236: Is it ever justified to take hashish</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>2.731</td>
<td>-0.891</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 237: Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.798</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>36.543</td>
<td>-3.999</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 238: Is it ever justified to have an affair</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>24.375</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 239: Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.462</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>15.261</td>
<td>-2.425</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 268: I think Immigrants take jobs away from locals</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-0.991</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-2.044</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 269: I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-0.319</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.716</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 270: I think immigrants make crime worse</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 271: I think immigrants put strain on the country’s welfare system</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.988</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 272: The future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 273: I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>6.038</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: R. Kilpatrick
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD of MD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 6: How important is religion in your life</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>42.407</td>
<td>-5.724</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 8: How happy are you</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>-3.807</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 11: Do you volunteer for a religious organisation</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>4.209</td>
<td>-1.004</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 15: Do you volunteer for local community action</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>36.092</td>
<td>-2.812</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 17: Do you volunteer for local environmental</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>21.845</td>
<td>-2.247</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 23: Do you volunteer for local health organisations</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>16.320</td>
<td>-1.957</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 104: Are there clear guidelines about good and evil</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>23.287</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 109: How often do you go to religious services</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-0.968</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>20.092</td>
<td>-4.917</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 114: Are you a religious person</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>18.968</td>
<td>-2.092</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 119: Do you believe in God</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 120: Do you believe in life after death</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>-1.145</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 124: Do you believe in reincarnation</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>-0.722</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 125: Do you believe in a personal God</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>46.290</td>
<td>-3.489</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 126: How well do you connect with the divine</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>32.750</td>
<td>-2.031</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 127: How spiritual are you</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 128: Is there one true religion</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>15.932</td>
<td>2.372</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 129: What is the place of God in your life</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>126.581</td>
<td>-4.476</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 130: Do you get comfort and strength from religion</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>47.000</td>
<td>-3.126</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 131: Do you meditate or pray</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-1.069</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>28.176</td>
<td>-4.307</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 132: Do you pray outside religious services</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 186: How interested are you in politics</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>5.361</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 187: In political action would you sign a petition</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 188: In political action would you join a boycott</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 190: In political action would you join an unofficial strike</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 191: In political action would you occupy buildings or factories</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>-0.525</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 205: How much confidence do you have in the church</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-0.249</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>-2.466</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 206: How much confidence do you have in the army</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 233: Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>10.938</td>
<td>-2.098</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 234: Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have the chance</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>-0.579</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>5.488</td>
<td>-1.953</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 235: Is it ever justified to go joyriding</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>6.061</td>
<td>-1.272</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 236: Is it ever justified to take hashish</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>12.393</td>
<td>-1.714</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 237: Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>22.717</td>
<td>-2.635</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 238: Is it ever justified to have an affair</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.320</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>31.425</td>
<td>-2.770</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 239: Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.384</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>23.373</td>
<td>-2.592</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 268: I think Immigrants take jobs away from locals</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>5.285</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 269: I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 270: I think immigrants make crime worse</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>4.594</td>
<td>-1.127</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 271: I think immigrants put strain on the country’s welfare system</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td>-3.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 272: The future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-1.180</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 273: I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>6.035</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: t test of Amasia ADP minus Shirak province

Source: R. Kilpatrick
The Chi Squared tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is religion in your life (Q1F)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>11.1027</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all things together, how happy are you (Q8)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.1288</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a religious organisation ((Q5B)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.6712</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to local community action (Q5F)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.7103</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to an environmental group (Q5H)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.5521</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a voluntary health organisation (Q5N)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.0060</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there clear guidelines about good and evil (Q22)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>21.9497</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services (25)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>13.4173</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a religious person (Q38)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>5.7503</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in God (Q39A)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.5661</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in life after death (Q30B)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.7634</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in reincarnation (Q31)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5.7907</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement closest to beliefs (Q32)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.4694</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own way of connecting with divine (Q33)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>39.5449</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How spiritual are you (Q34)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>31.4669</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one true religion or no religion offers any truths (Q35)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>5.1034</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get strength and comfort from religion (Q37)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.4897</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you take moments for prayer or meditation (Q38)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How interested are you in politics (Q54)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>8.8680</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you sign a petition (Q55A)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.9795</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join a boycott (Q55B)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.2888</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend a lawful demonstration (Q55C)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.1610</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join an unofficial strike (Q55D)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.7013</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you occupy a building or factory (Q63A)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.0114</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the church (Q63A)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.6344</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the armed forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 25: The $\chi^2$ test for Alaverdi ADP inside Lori province*

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
### Table 26: The χ² test for Gavar ADP inside Gegharaku province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is religion in your life (Q1F)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0.5107</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all things together, how happy are you (Q8)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2.1854</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a religious organisation (Q5B)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to local community action (Q5F)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.9610</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to an environmental group (Q5H)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a voluntary health organisation (Q5N)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.5557</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there clear guidelines about good and evil (Q22)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5.4663</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services (Q25)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>9.8436</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a religious person (Q28)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in God (Q30A)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>4.0924</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in life after death (Q30B)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>15.7143</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in reincarnation (Q31)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement closest to beliefs (Q32)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>32.2436</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own way of connecting with divine (Q33)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>9.5810</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How spiritual are you (Q34)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>11.5406</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one true religion or no religion offers any truths (Q35)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>7.4348</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get strength and comfort from religion (Q37)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.3139</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you take moments for prayer or meditation (Q38)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>11.1392</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How interested are you in politics (Q54)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8.8689</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you sign a petition (Q55A)</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.2493</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join a boycott (Q55B)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1.7675</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend a lawful demonstration (Q55C)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>14.6009</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join an unofficial strike (Q55D)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.1656</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you occupy a building or factory (Q63A)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2.6816</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the church (Q63A)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.6675</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the armed forces</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1.2144</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
### The value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Pearson Chi2</th>
<th>pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is religion in your life (Q1F)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14.7275</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all things together, how happy are you (Q8)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.4121</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a religious organisation (Q5B)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.0140</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to local community action (Q5F)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.2853</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to an environmental group (Q5H)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.8925</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a voluntary health organisation (Q5N)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.9368</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there clear guidelines about good and evil (Q22)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.8289</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services (Q25)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10.2436</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a religious person (Q28)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16.1381</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in God (Q30A)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in life after death (Q30B)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.6997</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in reincarnation (Q31)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.1956</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement closest to beliefs (Q32)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6.7478</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own way of connecting with divine (Q33)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>4.2075</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How spiritual are you (Q34)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>38.1006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one true religion or no religion offers any truths (Q35)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>39.1885</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get strength and comfort from religion (Q37)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.0021</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you take moments for prayer or meditation (Q38)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>8.5429</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How interested are you in politics (Q5A)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.4518</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you sign a petition (Q55A)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.1698</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join a boycott (Q55B)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.2414</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend a lawful demonstration (Q55C)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.7726</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join an unofficial strike (Q55D)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>4.6818</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you occupy a building or factory (Q63A)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.2859</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the church (Q63A)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>17.3009</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the armed forces</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>8.9323</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 27**: The $\chi^2$ test for Talin ADP inside Aragatsot province

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
The business of peace-building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The value</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is religion in your life (Q1F)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>30.3261</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all things together, how happy are you (Q8)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>25.8970</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a religious organisation (Q5B)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.1308</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to local community action (Q5F)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7.7055</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to an environmental group (Q5H)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4.9836</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you belong to a voluntary health organisation (Q5N)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.8007</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there clear guidelines about good and evil (Q22)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>19.3662</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services (25)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>37.1219</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a religious person (Q28)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.3647</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in God (Q30A)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.3417</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in life after death (Q30B)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1.3153</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe in reincarnation (Q31)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.5256</td>
<td>0.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement closest to beliefs (Q32)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>11.9268</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own way of connecting with divine (Q33)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>23.5568</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How spiritual are you (Q34)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>5.8589</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one true religion or no religion offers any truths (Q35)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5.1367</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get strength and comfort from religion (Q37)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>18.4800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you take moments for prayer or meditation (Q38)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>9.4379</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How interested are you in politics (Q54)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7.4518</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you sign a petition (Q55A)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.6363</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join a boycott (Q55B)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.1584</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend a lawful demonstration (Q55C)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.2530</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you join an unofficial strike (Q55D)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1.4496</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you occupy a building or factory (Q63A)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.6090</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the church (Q63A)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>7.2217</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the armed forces</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4.1921</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 28: The χ² test for Amasia ADP inside Shirak province*

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
The 2t tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The values of Alaverdi ADP inside Lori province</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pr(T &lt; t)</th>
<th>Pr (T &gt; t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go to religious services (Q109)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-0.2134 0.6927</td>
<td>1.0435</td>
<td>0.8510</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the place of God in your life (Q129)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-0.4423 0.9080</td>
<td>0.6803</td>
<td>0.7514</td>
<td>0.2486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get comfort and strength from religion (Q130)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-0.1434 0.0685</td>
<td>0.6967</td>
<td>0.2455</td>
<td>0.7565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to (Q233)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-0.6576 0.5219</td>
<td>0.2270</td>
<td>0.4103</td>
<td>0.5897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have a chance (Q234)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.3630 2.2271</td>
<td>2.7414</td>
<td>0.9966</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to go joy riding (Q235)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-0.1107 0.4077</td>
<td>1.1302</td>
<td>0.8701</td>
<td>0.1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take hashish (Q236)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-0.3360 0.0219</td>
<td>-1.7308</td>
<td>0.0426</td>
<td>0.9575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage (Q237)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-0.8713 -0.0081</td>
<td>-2.0100</td>
<td>0.0229</td>
<td>0.9771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to have an affair (Q238)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-0.0879 0.6855</td>
<td>1.5196</td>
<td>0.9348</td>
<td>0.0652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work (Q239)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-0.5221 0.0927</td>
<td>-1.3777</td>
<td>0.0850</td>
<td>0.9150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants take jobs away from locals (Q268)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-1.5011 0.5088</td>
<td>-0.9742</td>
<td>0.1656</td>
<td>0.8344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants (Q269)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-1.0955 0.8140</td>
<td>-0.2910</td>
<td>0.3857</td>
<td>0.6143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants make crime worse (Q270)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-1.3619 3.0515</td>
<td>0.7558</td>
<td>0.7746</td>
<td>0.2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants put a strain on the country's welfare system (Q271)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-1.4971 0.3817</td>
<td>-1.1716</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
<td>0.8785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society (Q272)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-0.7244 3.4878</td>
<td>1.2948</td>
<td>0.9014</td>
<td>0.0986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs (Q273)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-0.5082 1.3673</td>
<td>0.9039</td>
<td>0.8164</td>
<td>0.1836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: The 2t test for Alaverdi ADP inside Lori province

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
### The values of Gavar ADP in Gegharak province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pr(T &lt; t)</th>
<th>Pr (T &gt; t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go to religious services (Q109)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>-0.4879 0.2638</td>
<td>-0.5865</td>
<td>0.2790</td>
<td>0.7210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the place of God in your life (Q129)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.4688 0.6237</td>
<td>0.2790</td>
<td>0.6098</td>
<td>0.3902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get comfort and strength from religion (Q130)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>-0.0199 0.1561</td>
<td>1.5219</td>
<td>0.09255</td>
<td>0.90745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to (Q233)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>-0.4162 0.3488</td>
<td>-0.01733</td>
<td>0.92605</td>
<td>0.07395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have a chance (Q234)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.0106 1.2562</td>
<td>1.9349</td>
<td>0.05474</td>
<td>0.94526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to go joy riding (Q235)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.3067 0.1477</td>
<td>-0.6881</td>
<td>0.2460</td>
<td>0.7540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take hashish (Q236)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.1399 0.2146</td>
<td>0.4145</td>
<td>0.6606</td>
<td>0.3394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage (Q237)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.4697 0.3422</td>
<td>-0.3089</td>
<td>0.3788</td>
<td>0.6212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to have an affair (Q238)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-0.3156 0.1898</td>
<td>-0.4897</td>
<td>0.3124</td>
<td>0.6876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work (Q239)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.1869 0.4421</td>
<td>0.7981</td>
<td>0.7873</td>
<td>0.2127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants take jobs away from locals (Q268)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>-1.3126 0.1150</td>
<td>-1.6511</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>0.9501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants (Q269)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-1.6436 -0.3142</td>
<td>-2.8987</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.9980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants make crime worse (Q270)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-1.5052 -0.2485</td>
<td>-2.7466</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.9968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants put a strain on the country’s welfare system (Q271)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>-1.6457 -0.4086</td>
<td>-3.2583</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.9994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society (Q272)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-1.0887 0.1819</td>
<td>-1.4046</td>
<td>0.0806</td>
<td>0.9194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs (Q273)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-0.2648 1.1059</td>
<td>1.2076</td>
<td>0.8859</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 30: The t2 test for Gavar ADP inside Gegharaku province*

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The values of Talin ADP in Aragatso province</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pr(T &lt; t)</th>
<th>Pr(T &gt; t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go to religious services (Q109)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.8356 -0.0004</td>
<td>-1.9742</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>0.9751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the place of God in your life (Q129)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.2358 1.4015</td>
<td>2.7703</td>
<td>0.9969</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get comfort and strength from religion (Q130)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.0176 0.2643</td>
<td>2.2543</td>
<td>0.9873</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to (Q233)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-0.5891 0.5891</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>0.5059</td>
<td>0.4941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have a chance (Q234)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-0.3155 1.5200</td>
<td>1.3029</td>
<td>0.9029</td>
<td>0.0971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to go joy riding (Q235)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.3387 0.1575</td>
<td>-0.7198</td>
<td>0.2363</td>
<td>0.7637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take hashish (Q236)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.2459 0.0928</td>
<td>-0.8908</td>
<td>0.1871</td>
<td>0.8129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage (Q237)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-1.1918 -0.4045</td>
<td>-0.4045</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to have an affair (Q238)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.0569 1.3746</td>
<td>2.1425</td>
<td>0.9833</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work (Q239)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.8371 -0.0862</td>
<td>-2.4520</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.9919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants take jobs away from locals (Q268)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-1.9472 -0.0347</td>
<td>-2.0441</td>
<td>0.0212</td>
<td>0.9788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a country's culture is undermined by immigrants (Q269)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-1.1979 0.5597</td>
<td>-0.0761</td>
<td>0.2374</td>
<td>0.7626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants make crime worse (Q270)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-1.0447 0.6525</td>
<td>-0.4559</td>
<td>0.3245</td>
<td>0.6755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants put a strain on the country's welfare system (Q271)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-1.3216 0.4396</td>
<td>-0.9879</td>
<td>0.1622</td>
<td>0.8378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society (Q272)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-0.6566 1.0636</td>
<td>0.4666</td>
<td>0.6794</td>
<td>0.3206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs (Q273)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.8664 3.6769</td>
<td>6.0383</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 31:** the 2t test for Talin ADP inside Aragatso province.

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The values of Amasia ADP in Shirak province</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pr((T &lt; t))</th>
<th>Pr((T &gt; t))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go to religious services (Q109)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-1.355 -0.5797</td>
<td>-4.9171</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the place of God in your life (Q129)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-0.1121 1.2146</td>
<td>2.3720</td>
<td>0.9907</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get comfort and strength from religion (Q130)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-0.2682 -0.1042</td>
<td>-4.4763</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a benefit you are not entitled to (Q233)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-0.6309 -0.0197</td>
<td>-2.0963</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>0.9815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to cheat on taxes if you have a chance (Q234)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>-1.1637 0.0054</td>
<td>-1.9527</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
<td>0.9739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to go joy riding (Q235)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-0.2327 0.0501</td>
<td>-1.2722</td>
<td>0.1023</td>
<td>0.8977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take hashish (Q236)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.1031 0.0071</td>
<td>-1.7144</td>
<td>0.0439</td>
<td>0.9561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to lie for your own advantage (Q237)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-0.7014 -0.1011</td>
<td>-2.6350</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.9955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to have an affair (Q238)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.5476 -0.0923</td>
<td>-2.7698</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>0.9970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ever justified to take a bribe at work (Q239)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-0.6758 -0.0921</td>
<td>-2.5925</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.9949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants take jobs away from locals (Q268)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>-0.5896 0.9295</td>
<td>0.4410</td>
<td>0.6702</td>
<td>0.3298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a country’s culture is undermined by immigrants (Q269)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-0.4973 0.9399</td>
<td>0.6070</td>
<td>0.7277</td>
<td>0.2723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants make crime worse (Q270)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-1.0309 0.2809</td>
<td>-1.1268</td>
<td>0.1305</td>
<td>0.8695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think immigrants put a strain on the country’s welfare system (Q271)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>-1.6480 0.3421</td>
<td>-3.0043</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.9985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the future proportion of immigrants will be a threat to society (Q272)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-1.8598 -0.4993</td>
<td>-3.4182</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.9996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is better for society for immigrants to retain their own customs (Q273)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.4987 2.9526</td>
<td>6.0346</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: The t-test for Amasia ADP inside the Shirak province

Source: R. Kilpatrick, generated by SPSS
References


Bassi, S. (2014). Tick as appropriate: (a) gay, (b) queer, or (c) none of the above: translation and sexual politics in Lawrence Venuti's a hundred strokes of the brush before bed. *Comparative Literature Studies, 51*(2), 298–321.


The business of peace-building

Chesterton, G. K. (1910). *What's wrong with the world*


Goles, T., & Hirschheim, R. (2000). The paradigm is dead, the paradigm is dead...long live the paradigm: The legacy of Burrell and Morgan. *Omega*, 28(3), 249 – 268. doi:10.1016/s0305-0483(99)00042-0


Appendices


Kipling, R. (2014). *Just so stories*


The business of peace-building

Translation & Interpreting Studies Association, 10(2), 223-242. doi:10.1075/tis.10.2.04cha


Appendices 300


Shedlock, M. (2012, 2013). China's shadow banking system collapses exposing numerous Ponzi schemes; Implosion reaches critical mass. Retrieved from http://aut.summon.serialssolutions.com/link/0/eLVCxmWvY2BQSDYwTkk177FMMUo1TbNISj1VLBh1DZ2IJSjJ5uDj8hJjuuUlUZsQAlNqniIDnJtRL0HlqxoJyJy5k3MeI1B0OBsbyqyg8iaDV3kl4F1iKcIMrGnaqEqoVBxWf4kCJxkBk4liyd2itNwgXCEYV68YvJVJr7BEHhag2Na10jPAAAIACwW

The business of peace-building


The business of peace-building


