



CANADIAN EVANGELICALS AND MISSIONS PROMOTION IN THE LOCAL CHURCH

CEMES Series, Part 4

Rick Hiemstra

Faith Today Publications, 2017
Toronto, Ontario

ISBN 978-0-9813248-9-0 (Electronic/PDF)

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Hiemstra, Rick
Canadian Evangelicals and Missions Promotion in the Local Church
Canadian Evangelical Missions Engagement Study Series, Part 4
ISBN 978-0-9813248-9-0 (Electronic/PDF)
1. Missions – Missions Engagement – Evangelicalism – Canada – Statistics.

Printed in Canada by

The Canadian Missions Research Forum
and
The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada

Toronto, Ontario

Executive Summary

Fourth in the series, *Canadian Evangelicals and Missions Promotion in the Local Church* examines how local churches connect and communicate with missions and missionaries. It looks at who promotes missions within local churches, as well as when, where and how missions content is communicated and relationships developed.

This report is based on ground-breaking, comprehensive, national research on how Canadian Evangelicals engage with “mission” or “missions,” as part of the Canadian Evangelical Missions Engagement Study series.¹ With over 3,400 Canadians polled and qualitative interviews with 56 Evangelicals, this series of reports provides a snapshot of how and why Canadian Evangelicals engage with missions, and forms a baseline for future study.

Promotion

- Pastors (59%) and lay people (51%) said it is usually a pastor who is the most prominent missions mobilizer in the local church. About half (47%) of pastors and 30% of lay people identified the senior or lead pastor in that role. Less frequent service attenders were more likely to identify a pastor as the main mobilizer.
- Time in worship services or “platform time” is scarce and guarded, and this means that intentionally or unintentionally church leadership signals what is important to the congregation by what is included. The worship service acts as a filtering mechanism.
- The cancellation of Sunday evening services has increased competition for Sunday morning worship service time and means missionaries have significantly fewer opportunities to connect with congregations.
- More than half (58%) of pastors say their church promotes missions from the pulpit at least monthly.
- Two-fifths of lay people (41%) and three-fifths of pastors (30%) indicated they do not pray for long-term career missionaries unless prompted.

Connection

- Most pastors (89%) and lay people (86%) said they personally connected with their local church’s long-term, career missionaries in the last 12 months through one type of communication or another.
- Most pastors connected with missionaries through email (78%) whereas lay people were almost equally likely to say they connected through mailed letters (41%) or email (39%).
- Congregations start relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of a trusted relationship or an in-person contact rather than a technologically mediated connection or advertising.
- Pastors expected to hear from missionaries through social media monthly (45%) compared to just 23% of lay people. The majority of pastors (60%) and lay people (57%) expect missionaries to stay in touch by social media at least quarterly if they are able.

¹ “Mission” and “missions” are presented in quotes here because, as we learned in this study and will report on in a subsequent paper, there is no broad consensus on what these terms mean.

- Informants indicated formal written communications should include goals set, goals met, and stories of transformed lives in a length of two pages.

Education

- Three-quarters (74%) of pastors agreed their local churches actively foster conversations about the biblical basis for their missions engagement
- About one-quarter of pastors (24%) and lay people (29%) said their local church either held or helped organize a mission conference in the last 12 months
- Pastors were more likely to agree (55%) that their local church's missions program included an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada than lay people (40%)
- One-third (34%) of lay people said they did not know if their church had a children's program with an ongoing missions component compared to just 6% of pastors.

Evangelicals know that missions are supposed to be important for them, but they don't have the "energy to be connected to all these things," as one interview informant said. Attention in contemporary society is fragmented. As a consequence, many Evangelicals tend to use heuristics, or short-cuts, to allow them to evaluate and connect with missions and missionaries without having to go to the work of engaging deeply with particular missions. These heuristics often take the form of trusted recommendations. The relationships themselves validate the mission and allow Evangelicals to support missions and missionaries with confidence.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Acknowledgements	7
Introduction	8
Promotion	10
Most Prominent Mission Advocate or Mobilizer	10
Table 1. “The most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in our local church is:” lay and pastors, percent	12
Missions Promotion from the Pulpit	12
Table 2. “Our local church promotes missions from the pulpit:” pastors, percent	14
Prayer and Prompting	15
Table 3. “Unless I’m prompted, I don’t pray for long-term, career missionaries,” lay and pastors, percent	17
Connection	18
How Evangelicals Personally Connect with Missionaries.....	18
Table 4. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” lay and pastors ^a , percent.....	18
Communication Expectations of Long-Term, Career Missionaries	18
Formal Written Communications	18
Social Media	20
In-Person Communications	22
Table 5. “If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with [me (lay)/our local church (pastors)] through social media:” lay and pastors ^a , percent	24
How Evangelicals Start Relationships with Missionaries	24
Table 6. “[I (lay)/Our local church (pastors)] start[s] relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” lay and pastors, percent	26
Education	27
Conversations About the Biblical Basis for Missions	27
Table 7. “Our local church actively fosters conversations about the biblical basis of our missions engagement,” lay and pastors, percent.....	28
Missions Conferences.....	28
Table 8. “In the last 12 months, our local church held or helped organize a mission conference,” lay and pastors, percent	29
Children’s Programs and Missions	30
Table 9. “Our local church’s children’s program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada,” lay and pastors, percent	31
Conclusions	32
Bibliography	33
Appendix A. Detailed Tables	34
Table A1. “The most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in our local church is:” lay and pastors, percent	34

Table A1 continued. “The most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in our local church is:” lay and pastors, percent	35
Table A2. “Our local church promotes missions from the pulpit [Frequency],” pastors, percent	36
Table A2 continued. “Our local church promotes missions from the pulpit [Frequency],” pastors, percent	37
Table A3. “Unless I’m prompted, I don’t pray for long-term, career missionaries,” lay and pastors, percent	38
Table A3 continued. “Unless I’m prompted, I don’t pray for long-term, career missionaries,” lay and pastors, percent	39
Table A4. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” pastors ^c , percent.....	40
Table A4 continued. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” pastors ^c , percent	41
Table A5. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” lay ^c , percent.....	42
Table A5 continued. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” lay ^c , percent.....	43
Table A6. “If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with our local church through social media [Frequency],” pastors ^h , percent.....	44
Table A6 continued. “If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with our local church through social media [Frequency],” pastors ^h , percent.....	45
Table A7. If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with me through social media [Frequency],” lay ^c , percent	46
Table A7 continued. “If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with me through social media [Frequency],” lay ^c , percent	47
Table A8. “Our local church starts relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” pastors, percent.....	48
Table A8 continued. “Our local church starts relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” pastors, percent	49
Table A9. “I start relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” lay, percent	50
Table A9 continued. “I start relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” lay, percent.....	51
Table A10. “Our local church actively fosters conversations about the biblical basis of our missions engagement,” pastors, percent	52
Table A10 continued. “Our local church actively fosters conversations about the biblical basis of our missions engagement,” pastors, percent.....	53
Table A11. “In the last 12 months, our local church held or helped organize a mission conference,” lay and pastors, percent.....	54
Table A11 continued. “In the last 12 months, our local church held or helped organize a mission conference,” lay and pastors, percent.....	55
Table A12. “Our local church’s children’s program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada,” lay and pastors, percent	56
Table A12 continued. “Our local church’s children’s program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada,” lay and pastors, percent	57

Acknowledgements

The Canadian Evangelical Missions Engagement Study is the work of many people and supporters. First, I'd like to thank the Canadian Missions Research Forum (CMRF, www.theEFC.ca/CMRF) for having the vision for this research, for commissioning it, and forming the partnership that sustains it. The CMRF grew out of the prayer fellowship of several global mission agencies based in the Greater Toronto Area and continues to grow with participation from denominations and other participants.

Thank you to the denominational leaders, Christian higher education leaders, mission agency leaders, pastors and lay people who participated in one-on-one qualitative interviews. Your insights were invaluable in providing windows on the mission engagement in your contexts.

Thank you to Matthew Gibbins, Chair of The EFC Global Mission Round Table and my mentor, who spent countless hours instructing me in the nuance and complexity of the contemporary missionary enterprise and the communities that carry out this important work. Thank you also to Charlie Cook of the Jaffray Centre for Global Initiatives for his advice and counsel on this project, and to Michael Jaffarian for his comments on an early draft of the pastor and lay questionnaires.

Thank you to Lorianne Dueck, my research assistant, who transcribed more than 50 hours of interviews on the mission engagement of Canadian Evangelicals and did so ably in both French and English. Thank you to my colleague Pierre Bergeron who conducted the French interviews, provided feedback on the survey questionnaires and insight into the Quebec context.

Thank you to Andrew Grenville and his team at MARU/Matchbox who worked with us to get the lay survey into the field and to find a representative sample of Evangelicals for this study. I appreciate being able to work with a pollster who "gets Evangelicals."

Thank you to François Godbout, of Traductions Intersect Translations, who translated the survey questionnaires and other documents into French for this project.

Finally, thank you to The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada for making primary research on the church in Canada a ministry priority.

Introduction

This report, fourth in a series of ground-breaking national research on the mission engagement of evangelical Canadians, examines how local churches connect and communicate with missions and missionaries. It looks at who promotes missions within local churches, as well as when, where and how missions content is communicated and relationships developed. Specific areas include who promotes missions within local churches, the role of the worship service in communicating mission priorities, how their relationships get started and what efforts churches make to educate their people about missions.

Attention is the currency of our age. Churches are involved in a great many “good” things, either directly or tangentially, and they have myriad ways to draw attention to these different ministries or events. The weekly worship service is still churches’ primary vehicle to communicate mission priorities.

Religious service attendance has been in steady decline in Canada since the end of the Second World War. In 1946, two-thirds (67%) of Canadians said they were in a place of worship in the last week while only 11% said they attended at least weekly in 2015.² In a 2005 General Social Survey, Statistics Canada found that, on average, Canadians spent just 20 minutes per week in a place of worship (just slightly less time than they spent in a grocery store).³

Evangelicals are distinctive for their frequent worship service attendance.⁴ A 2015 Angus Reid Forum/EFC poll found that almost half (49%) of Evangelicals attended at least weekly and 64% attended at least once a month. According to sociologists Sam Reimer and Michael Wilkinson, weekly religious worship service attendance is the “watershed distinction” for measures of “institutional commitment, like volunteerism and giving money,” and to this we would add missions engagement.⁵

As important as worship service attendance is, the fragmentation of attention now threatens religious engagement as much or more than declining attendance. The fragmentation of attention in contemporary life leaves little capacity for deep and sustained engagement with any one ministry or mission.

Evangelicals generally believe that missions is important but few have the resources of time and energy to engage with missions very deeply. This report describes the ways Evangelicals find to affirm and evaluate missions and missionaries in the absence of the capacity to engage deeply.

The CEMES was commissioned in the fall of 2014. This multi-phase research project is based on a literature review, qualitative interviews and national polling of 1,419 pastors and 2,059 evangelical lay affiliates.⁶ In-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with 20 Canadian key informants connected

² Bibby, “Religion in the Twenty-First Century: The Canadian Case,” 3. Angus Reid Forum/EFC poll, October 2015, N=2,004.

³ “Overview of the Time Use of Canadians: 2005,” 39.

⁴ Sam Reimer and Michael Wilkinson, *A Culture of Faith: Evangelical Congregations in Canada*, 16–17; Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 10–12.

⁵ Sam Reimer and Michael Wilkinson, *A Culture of Faith: Evangelical Congregations in Canada*, 9.

⁶ Only evangelical affiliates who reported attending religious services at least once in the preceding 12 months were included in the sample.

to global mission initiatives, 17 evangelical pastors and 19 evangelical lay people affiliated with an evangelical congregation. It is important that readers recognize that the national pastor and lay survey data come from two different samples.

The complete study methodology including the survey questionnaires can be downloaded at www.theEFC.ca/CMRF.

Promotion

Most Prominent Mission Advocate or Mobilizer

In our qualitative interviews, we asked informants to identify the most prominent missions advocates or mobilizers in the congregation. In the first round of interviews with key informants (people who had a direct stake in mission agencies, missions training, or denominational mission programs) often told us that senior pastors were the most important missions mobilizers. In the second round of interviews with pastors and lay people, we followed up this observation by asking informants what person or group was the most important missions mobilizer or advocate in their local church.

This lay informant said the pastor was the main promoter of missions in her congregation. In fact, she says that if the pastor was not interested in missions, the church would have nothing to do with missions at all:

C'est le pasteur. Oui, absolument. Donc on dit toujours que c'est le leadership qui définit. Maintenant le pasteur peut nommer quelqu'un qui est en charge de missions, mais c'est le pasteur et le groupe des anciens. Si le pasteur a rien a voir et veut même pas intéresse par la missions, je crois pas que l'église va avoir un atteinte missionnaire.

This lay informant, age 75, from a small Baptist Church identified the pastor as the main mobilizer because the pastor receives all of the information.

Well, of course, everything goes to the pastor, so the pastor would be the main person.

This is an important observation: Everything goes to the pastor. The pastor, then, because of his administrative position acts as a gatekeeper or a filter for information about missions, or other matters, flowing to the congregation.

Pastoral influence, however, is more than administrative. This pastor from a charismatic tradition said that setting a vision and direction for missions is the joint responsibility of the missions committee and himself:

That's the job of the missions committee, but it's also probably my job. **All of it is my job unless somebody else is delegated to do it.** But, really, it's the job of the missions committee and we have been really, really fortunate that we have had some long term members on our missions committee. [Emphasis added]

In this pastor's mind "all of it is my job unless somebody else is delegated to do it." Implicit in this response is the notion that the pastor is responsible for the work of the church and he may delegate some of this work to others in his congregation.

This missions pastor said that he is the gatekeeper that protects the senior pastor from being overloaded with information:

Yeah [I'm the gatekeeper], when it comes to missions or local outreach, yeah. And that's what he has set up, that's what he wants because he can't have all those conversations. And I think that's smart on his part because you can't have one person being the voice for everything all the time, you need to put the right people in place who he trusts will best represent God first, our church and then him as a lead pastor. ... - one guy can't have all that knowledge in his head at once or it will explode!

As in the previous interview excerpt, the senior pastor is seen as the responsible person. Missions responsibility is delegated to the missions pastor in order to extend the reach or capacity of the senior pastor. Delegation relieves the senior pastor from being the "voice for everything all the time."

Although the senior pastor may delegate authority or responsibility to others, this missions pastor says there are times when the congregation will not respect the missions pastor's position; they need to hear from the "head honcho":

If I get up in a service and say, "Hey we're doing this new missions program or we're going on a missions trip, or we're going here and there," as a staff person, people will listen but they won't really. I have found that they're just kind of like "Hey, he's just one of the guys." **When your lead pastor gets up and says the exact same thing, people tend to listen more because he's the head honcho, right? He's the guy in charge.** [Emphasis added]

This key informant from the first round of interviews makes the same point: The senior pastor is the indispensable voice in leading a congregation to engage with missions.

I think that, without question, from our perspective here, the senior pastor is the most important person in the process. **If we're going to have strong giving support in the church it's because the senior pastor has taken the responsibility to lead his congregation in their missions giving.** He doesn't download it to a secondary person, he may have secondary people to help him, he may have people who are very committed to the task alongside him, but how he deals with it determines whether the church is a half-million-dollar-a-year or sixty-thousand-dollar-a-year church [in support]. [Emphasis added]

Given that so many informants described a central role for the senior pastor in missions mobilization, we asked survey respondents to identify the most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in their local congregation. Table 1 below lists the options presented to respondents sorted from the most commonly chosen answer by pastors to the least common. Nearly half of pastors (47%) and 3 in 10 (30%) lay people identified the senior or lead pastor as the most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer (see tables 1 and A1). A quarter of pastors (25%) and 2 in 10 (19%) lay people pointed to a missions committee member as the most prominent person. If all the pastor options are aggregated, pastors said that a pastor in some position fulfilled the role of the most prominent mobilizer in 59% of the cases, compared to 51% of lay people. One in five lay people (21%) responded that they didn't know who was the most prominent mission advocate.

Table 1. “The most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in our local church is:” lay and pastors, percent

Influencer	Lay	Pastors
Senior / Lead Pastor	30	47
Missions Committee Member	19	25
Other	8	12
Missions Pastor	10	7
Don't Know	21	5
Associate Pastor	5	4
Youth or Young Adult Pastor	6	1

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Not knowing who was the most prominent missions advocate correlated with religious services attendance and Bible reading frequency. Only 16% of weekly attenders did not know who was the most prominent missions advocate compared to 44% of those who attended once or a few times a year. Similarly, only 15% of lay daily Bible readers said they did not know compared to 62% of those who never read the Bible.

Among those who identified a missions mobilizer, less frequent attenders were more likely than frequent attenders to see one of the pastors as the most prominent missions advocate. After disregarding “don’t know” responses, three-quarters (77%) of those who attend just once or a few times a year said one of their local church’s pastors was the most prominent advocate compared to just 59% of weekly attenders. Platform presence likely acts as an anchor for responses to this question for less frequent attenders because the people on the platform are likely more familiar to them than other members of the congregation.

Older Evangelicals are more likely to see the senior pastor as the most prominent missions advocate. Just over half of Silent Generation pastors (53%) said that the senior pastor was the most prominent mission mobilizer compared to one third (36%) of Gen-Y pastors (see table A1). Among lay respondents, there was a much smaller gap in generational perceptions of the senior pastors’ role as a mission mobilizer. About a third (35%) of Silent Generation lay people said the senior pastor was the most prominent mobilizer compared to just 29% of Gen-Y lay people.

Missions Promotion from the Pulpit

Many informants talked about “platform time” or the importance of the pulpit. In our busy world, the weekly worship service is often the only hour when the church is gathered and church leadership has the congregation’s attention. In addition to carrying out its sacred calling of worship, from an organizational consideration, the worship service is a precious communications medium. Time in the service or “platform time” is guarded, and this means that intentionally or unintentionally church leadership signals what is important to the congregation by what is included. The worship service is a filtering mechanism.

One key informant, speaking about the pressure pastors feel to be seen in the worship service, explained why it is difficult for pastors to include missionaries in the Sunday morning worship service:

We're down primarily to a Sunday morning service.... The pastor can't allocate very many of those Sunday mornings to promoting missions because then **he's very quickly criticized that he is not fulfilling the job that he was hired to do.** [Emphasis added]

Another key informant said:

There is a much more stringent control and observation by church boards and church leadership, the lay leadership. How many times is the pastor in the pulpit? We're paying him a salary. All these kinds of things, and so his allotment of time to promote mission within his ministry in the church primarily has disappeared.

An informant talking about the difficulty missionaries experience getting platform time said:

Maybe it changed [the amount of platform time that missionaries could get in a service] because pastors started to make sure that their services were only an hour or an hour and fifteen minutes. **So you only have five minutes. ... You're lucky if you get five minutes to speak.** [Emphasis added]

This pastor informant seemed to confirm the amount of platform time given to missions:

And every month we have a five-minute mission moment in our worship, once a month to update our congregations about what is happening to our missionaries overseas and pray for them in the service.

Yet another pastor said missions get 10 minutes of their service once a month to "make sure that it is a high priority." Ten minutes in a worship service is understood to indicate that something has high priority.

We have consistently made time in our church for missions promotion, so one Sunday a month we feature information from one of our missions partners, we have seven or eight different mission partners that our church is involved with. And so, we always give time, about a ten-minute slot in one service a month to feature missions and it's been important for us to do that and to continue to make sure that that is a high priority.

This senior pastor, who describes missions as the reason his church exists, takes time to personally read email correspondence from missionaries to the congregation during the morning worship service while a photo of the missionaries is displayed on the screen behind the pastor:

If the letter was extensive and long it would be edited but those letters are also made available both on our website and as well there are certain people get electronic or paper copies if they're not electronically oriented.

Taking the time to read correspondence in the service communicates the pastor thinks this is important. He has options to deliver the information in other ways, but he is clearly signaling that this

correspondence is important by including it in the worship service and delivering it personally in his role as senior pastor.

Pulpit or platform time may be considered a scarce resource because there is less of it now than in the past. In the first round of interviews, several informants talked about how Sunday evening services provided missionaries with a forum to make presentations to congregations and how very few churches still have Sunday evening services.

Another key informant speaking about the scarcity of platform time talked about how it was only his strong personal connection with pastors that opens access to pulpits today:

[The pastors who give me a whole service] are all people who know me, former classmates, or they are people who in the old days invited me just because they would've invited me.

Most interview informants indicated that pastors were quite guarded about providing missionaries access to their pulpits or platforms.

Many of our informants identified the importance of the pulpit or platform in promoting missions. They talked about the relative scarcity of opportunities for missionaries to connect with congregations. Some talked about how the cancellation of Sunday evening services limited opportunities for missionaries to make presentations to congregations. Some informants also noted that this indirectly changed the nature of Sunday morning services as the former Sunday evening content now needed to be squeezed into Sunday morning services.

Research is needed into the impact of discontinuing Sunday evening or midweek services on the life and ministry of local churches generally and on missions specifically. This research project did not attempt to measure the prevalence of Sunday evening services in our surveys because we did not believe there were enough churches with these services to allow us to do meaningful comparisons between churches with and without them.

We did, however, ask pastors to indicate how often their local churches promote missions from the pulpit. This very general question does not try to identify who is doing the promotion. Although this question is subjective and does not define missions or missions promotion, it does provide a measure of how frequently pastors think their churches are promoting missions from the pulpit.

One-quarter (25%) of pastors say their church promotes missions at least a few times a month and more than half (58%) say they do it at least monthly (see tables 2 and A2).

Table 2. "Our local church promotes missions from the pulpit:" pastors, percent

Frequency	Pastors
Weekly	9
A few times a month	16
Monthly	33
Quarterly	18
A few times a year	22
Not at all	1

Column may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Older pastors tended to report more frequent missions promotion from the pulpit. Six in seven (84%) Silent Generation pastors said their congregations promote mission from the pulpit at least monthly compared to just three-fifths (59%) of Gen-X and half (50%) of Gen-Y pastors.

Several key informants suggested that concerns about the quality of missionary presentations made pastors reluctant to open their pulpits to them. When we asked lay people directly about the effectiveness of missionaries as speakers, they tended to be guardedly positive saying that they are “pretty good” or “pretty informative.” Here is a sample:

[Missionary presentations are] okay, I think there might be videos but definitely pictures that we can see of people and their areas that they’re working in. **And speaking, for me, I think they’re effective.** I’m thinking our older congregants, our older members would have a little trouble because of the accent of some of the missionaries that come and talk, so that might be hard for them to understand all of what they’re saying. But overall, they’re received well and understood and appreciated and they’re effective in delivering a message of what’s going on in their world.

Well I think [a missionary speaker’s effectiveness as a communicator] depends on the person, because there are different kinds of people in the church and depending on how people respond to missions **but I think generally it is pretty good.**

I think they’re pretty informative, I think they’re pretty interesting to a lot of people because a lot of people in Canada probably haven’t experienced those cultures and it’s interesting to know about those people and what they’re doing and the people in Canada can pray for their ministry whether it’s overseas or whether it’s inside of Canada.

Most of them are really pretty interesting especially if they’re drawing on their own experiences, they’re pretty cool that way. Some people aren’t the best public speakers but certainly their experiences are really cool and they definitely draw you in based on that.

Informants tended to evaluate missionary presentations in terms of how “interesting” or “informative” they were.

Further research is needed to understand how churches promote missions during worship services including what they do during announcements, sermons and other worship segments.

Prayer and Prompting

When we talked with interview informants about missions and prayer, they frequently said they tend not to pray for missions, and if they do, it is because they’ve been prompted.

A lay informant, age 58, said she doesn’t pray for missionaries unless her pastor asks her to pray:

You know, I have to be honest, it’s pretty much non-existent unless they [missionaries] tell our pastor to ask people to pray. And, typically, I won’t last beyond a time or two, and then it’s removed from [my mind] - I’m just being honest here.

Another lay informant, age 75, prays for missionaries when they ask for prayer:

What they ask us to pray for [prompts me to pray]. They might have in their letter, pray for certain people at this station so on and so on.

This lay informant, age 63, prays for missionaries at least weekly and when there is a “special need or request”:

Well I guess, probably at least once a week, but if there’s a special need or request for somebody's sick and they’re in a far-off country and they don’t have all the accesses to hospitals to stuff like we have so you pray for them.

Informants were more likely to report unprompted prayer for family members or close friends on short-term mission trips. This lay informant, age 25, said she prays for friends who are on short-term missions “almost daily”:

Probably I would pray for them while they’re there, almost daily, when it’s on my mind. Beyond that, when they come back it probably wouldn’t be at the forefront of my mind unless there is something in particular; information that they had brought back that they would ask me to continue to pray for then I would, but I think maybe it’s different if you had gone.

This lay informant, age 58, prayed several times a day for his daughter when she was on a short-term missions trip:

It's my own mind that prompts me to pray and it can be anywhere from once in a week to multiple days. When my daughter was in [a Caribbean country] [laughs], I was praying four, five, six times a day that she would be safe and that she would realize the goals that they had gone down there with.

Prayer for missionaries was generally linked to prayer for specific needs, and these were usually raised in a request from a pastor or through a prayer letter. Very few of the respondents talked about planned or regular prayer for missions that was not a response to external prompting.

Commissioning or sending services were sometimes described as occasions to pray for missions. This lay informant, age 58, talks about praying for short-term missionaries:

Before [short-term teams] go [on a short-term missions trip], they all go up to the front, but beyond that I don’t know there’s a whole lot [of prayer].

This lay informant said the act of giving money to a missions organization raises his awareness of the mission organization and prompts him to pray:

Yeah it [missions awareness] probably has improved that by giving money, because I get reports from the field either, not so much email, but actually physical mail and those things remind me of what’s happening and it encourages me to remember to pray! [Laughs]

Asked when he thinks (not prays) about missions, another lay informant said something similar:

The communication that we get from where we donate, we get something in the mail that comes pretty regularly and that's probably when I remember!

Given that prompting was usually cited as the occasion for prayer for missions, we asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: "Unless I'm prompted, I don't pray for long-term, career (LTC) missionaries." Our interview informants would often talk about their fervent (and time limited) prayer for loved ones on short-term missions. We framed this question in terms of prayer for LTC missionaries, to try to remove the family or close-friend prayer incentive. Although several informants were candid about their lack of persistence in prayer for missionaries, Evangelicals will likely to be reticent to say they are less than steadfast in prayer so we expect the reported disagreement to be overstated.⁷

Very few pastors or lay people strongly agreed they needed prompting for prayer for missionaries. Two-fifths of lay people (41%) and three-fifths of pastors (30%), however, agreed that they do not pray for long-term career missionaries unless prompted (see tables 3 and A3).

Table 3. "Unless I'm prompted, I don't pray for long-term, career missionaries," lay and pastors, percent

Agreement	Lay	Pastors
Strongly Agree	9	3
Moderately Agree	32	27
Moderately Disagree	29	34
Strongly Disagree	26	36
Don't Know	5	1

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Older respondents were less likely to report needing prompting for prayer than younger ones. Only about one-third of lay people (36%) and one-fifth (21%) of pastors from the Silent Generation reported needing prompting compared to nearly half of lay people (46%) and two-fifths of pastors (39%) from Gen-Y.

More frequent service attenders and more frequent lay Bible readers were less likely to agree they needed prompting. Just over one-third (35%) of lay respondents who attend religious services at least weekly agree they need prayer prompting compared to over half (52%) of those who attend a few times a month or less frequently. One-third (31%) of those who read the Bible at least a few times a week agreed they needed prompting compared to more than half (53%) of those who read seldom or never.

⁷ The tendency to give answers that you think researchers want to hear or answers that place you in the most favorable light is called desirability bias.

Connection

How Evangelicals Personally Connect with Missionaries

A large majority of pastors (89%) and lay people (86%) said they personally connected with their local church’s long-term, career missionaries in the last 12 months through one type of communication or another (see tables 4, A4 and A5). Pastors were most likely to say they connected through email (78%) whereas lay people were almost equally likely to say they connected through mailed letters (41%) or email (39%).

Table 4. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” lay and pastors^a, percent

Connection	Lay	Pastors
Email	39	78
Facebook / Social Media	30	46
Letters / Mail	41	38
Telephone	5	27
Skype / Video Link	8	25
Visits to Mission Field	4	14
<i>Missionary Furlough Visits^b</i>	10	-
<i>Church Announcements^b</i>	4	-
Other ^c	2	-
Any Connection	86	89

^a Only those respondents who said their congregations supported at least one LTC missionary in the last 12 months (Pastors, N = 885; Lay, N = 1,131). ^b Italicized connections were write-in responses. ^c “Other” responses are write-in responses not recoded to other categories.

Communication Expectations of Long-Term, Career Missionaries

People talked about two kinds of communications with missionaries. First, they talked about formal communications such as support letters and other official reports about missions. Second, they talked about social media communication.

Formal Written Communications

Many informants talked about the challenge of managing the volume of communications from missionaries and mission agencies. This denominational informant, after talking about the need to provide missionary supporters with communications, said:

The challenge on the other side is just information overload and then you go numb.

This mission agency informant said mission literature is not read “because there’s so much of it”:

The average evangelical Christian that supports the mission usually supports five or six, or at least gets literature from as many. **So, they don’t read it because there’s so much of it.**
[Emphasis added]

He went on to say that agencies have lost the attention of their donors precisely because they have become so good at producing high quality communications:

Part of it is because we've gotten so good at it and so professional at it. The brochures we put out, the magazines that we put out, Facebook and everything - **it has become information overload for anyone.** [Emphasis added]

A denominational informant commenting on the difficulty in getting attention for missions communications said:

It takes energy to be connected to all these things. ... If you compare to how we lived in the early 60s to now, and the kind of media you had, and what that connected you with, it was basically your local church and those people away in another country that you would give money to. ... Now we have a church that's concerned about its own church, its families, the needy within its membership, it's concerned about its neighbourhood, then it is us to be concerned about its country, ... So, the circles of concern are increasing and some of these people ... they tell me they are just stretched to the limit because there so many issues at all these different levels. [Emphasis added]

The "energy to be connected to all these things" has not expanded to keep up with "all these things." Now "all these things" fragment attention.

Many of the key informants saw a paradox in the demand for information and the common complaint that there was too much information to absorb. Given this paradox we asked the pastor and lay informants what kind of communications they wanted from missionaries.

Most said written communications or reports are only expected infrequently. Most commonly, informants said they expected written communications anywhere from monthly, to twice a year, to annually. This informant's comments were typical:

I think twice a year is good, (this sounds really bad) but I think if you get too many letters you tend to stop reading them because sometimes they don't have new information and then they all start to sound the same! I'm just saying that because of certain mailing lists I've signed up for when I go to MissionFest and then I keep getting mail from people and it all seems the same and then I stop reading them!

In fact, communications that arrive too frequently can signal that missionaries and agencies are wasting resources on postage, as this lay informant says:

I think one of the biggest things for me is the frequency of mailing. I worked for Canada Post and I know how much that stuff costs never mind the printing and the paper and all that, and if they have to keep making frequent appeals, which is what a lot of that is, I feel like they're wasting my money making more appeals. So yeah.

When describing an ideal mission report, most informants said they want to see two elements: Stories of lives changed, and evidence that missionaries have a plan that they are carrying out.

This pastor from a Baptist tradition gave an example of an agency that communicates well:

You know [a well-known mission agency]? They communicated well, a lot of stories, it's details, but they are also good at saying this is how we are spending our money, here's administrative, here's kind of field, and here's our growth and they always give these stats of [measures specific to their mission], they've got numbers and that's pretty inspiring.

Another informant said:

Probably like, just a section that maybe summarizes what they've been doing or what they've done since they've last communicated. So main points, and then maybe a section with goals or projects in mind. Whether those are short-term or long-time goals so as to have an idea of what they're working towards. And then again, action points, because I feel like if you want to be connected with the work that they're doing, they need to give you something to do with it. Whether that's praying or giving money towards it or donations or materials or something.

Another lay informant pointed to a missions communication that she thinks is well done:

Well I guess I'm going to go back to [a well-known missions leader] because every time I get a letter it tells what's been done, what the needs is, they talk about how much things cost, they have it all listed how much more money they need, what they hope to do, like it's just very detailed. And at the same time, they're telling the story where it's not boring, they're telling it actually how it's affected people and what's going on and what they've gained... There's just a lot of stuff packed into a letter and yet it's newsy, it's not just numbers and facts.

Given key informants' concerns about the volume of information we asked pastor and lay informants how long a mission report should be. Remarkably, almost all informants said the ideal length for a written report is about 2 pages and it should be "as basic as possible."

Informants told us the elements they want in a more formal written communication are goals set, goals met, and stories of transformed lives, and they want this in two pages.

Social Media

Some informants talked about connecting with missionaries through social media. Social media connections happened both on a personal level and in worship services as missionaries were Facebooked or Skyped into a worship service.

A pastor from a Baptist tradition talked about "Skyping into a service" because of the relationship:

We've got Skype, we've got Facetime, we've got all that kind of stuff so that it's more an on the ground, Skyping into a service or an evening or something like that, sure you've got time-zones and stuff, but you could make that happen. Because **I think it's the relationship that's key.**
[Emphasis added]

Social media is personal and immediate unlike "form letters." This pastor informant voiced cynicism about "form letter[s]," which he saw as a way to manage donors. He even expressed suspicion about whether missionaries were writing their own letters. A Skype call, however, confirms a missionary is

connected to the mission and that the information is coming from the missionary. The richer, more personal, more immediate medium of Skype or other social media authenticates other communications.

You can get an email sent from Mr. and Mrs. Missionary, but **you could get really cynical and skeptical and say did they even write this, is this just a form letter that they just punch a bunch of names in and just send it off, which sometimes they do!** Whereas a Skype call, they're actually taking time to sit down and engage with whoever they're talking with, whether that be a congregation, a lead team, or an individual, whatever it happens to be. So, there's that piece that gets brought to it. Is it still kind of sterile because you're not there, you can't smell them, touch them, that kind of thing, sure. But I think it's miles closer than just an email that comes into your inbox, even a hand-written letter. We all know the difference between an email and a hand-written letter. A thank you card is a lot better than a thank you email. You can't beat a hand written one. [Emphasis added]

This pastor from a Restorationist tradition reflected on the various technologies that his church uses to promote missions and concludes that “short little videos” and “Skype” in the service makes missions “extremely personal” and “much more alive”:

I don't think we've researched this, we haven't, so you're only getting my sense. With the letter, the photograph of the person is put on the screen and they're actually seeing the words as they're being read, so that just helps with the communication and the visual of who the person is. **There's value in each of them, the letter, that's personal it's coming from them, but seeing their face, presenting a short little video clip that has been made for us in extremely personal, and Skype is then that much more alive.** ... So if you have a missionary that's been out for 50 years, I would say $\frac{3}{4}$ of the people, more, 75 or 80% of the congregation wouldn't even know who this person was. [Emphasis added]

There is, however, an important paradox about social media this pastor highlighted:

Oh, I couldn't put my finger on it, I think it's changed, I think it's kind of in the last ten-fifteen years. People are, we joke that **people are more connected but less connected because of social media**, we are very connected to everybody but we don't actually have conversations with people anymore. And that is sad. ... I may be judgmental on that, I don't know, but I just see it as we are very connected but we are not because we're not really building the relationships with the people we used to have. [Emphasis added]

“People are more connected [through technologies like Facebook and Skype] and less connected” meaning that they don't “really build relationships.” **Social media tends to confirm a relationship but not build it.** Ironically, even though social media interactions are described as conversation, this informant says they are “not actual conversations.” Face-to-face relationships or shared experiences are needed to build relationships.

This pastor described frequent communications as communicating. For him, longer and less frequent communications are not communicating:

We're fortunate in today's electronic world that we don't have to wait three months for a letter to come by ship, and so I want to see newsletters and I want to see blogs, I want to see updates. Facebook, **I can go send a message to one of our missions partners and I can hear back from him later today. But I want communication. When it's so easy to communicate, I want communication.** I want them to tell us what we can pray for, I want them to tell us what they are doing, I want them to tell us what's happening, how they are being effective. And I think in today's world, when electronics is so available, **if we don't hear from people I think then we have to seriously look at that and whether that partnership needs to happen. I want more than for us to be sending money.** [Emphasis added]

This pastor clearly outlined his expectations: If he sends a message today, he wants a response today. If communication is easy, communication is expected. Partnership means frequent, regular communication.

This lay informant talked about how pictures his daughter brought home from a short-term missions trip confirmed "how bad it is down there" and confirmed the validity of the missions trip she took to address the mission field's problems:

No I don't know how they decided on this one, that's something that the youth group has been doing and now that she's in the youth group - we always knew that they went somewhere but we didn't have as close a tie, now she brings home pictures and stuff like that so we can actually see how bad it is down there. Before that we knew about it but it didn't really affect us - we didn't realize it was that bad.

The informant "knew about it, but it didn't really affect [him]." Knowledge or information doesn't necessarily penetrate. Often, as in this case, close ties with the missionary are likely to motivate attention to communications and learning about the work and the field.

In-Person Communications

In-person communications help Evangelicals verify or authenticate the information they have received in written communications. Informants described written communications as having qualities of un-reality and sometimes questioned their authenticity or providence. In many cases, a real-life conversation allows people to quickly verify written communications and have confidence in them.

This BC pastor gets a visit from a mission agency representative every six weeks for coffee:

So, for us, he [the mission agency representative] comes, well he probably comes to the [to the area] maybe once every six weeks or something like that and maybe myself or [the senior pastor], or both of us, will meet him for lunch or coffee, and he just fills us in on what's happening. And again, it's like a reporting back, saying, "This is the difference that's been made and these are some of the stories that are coming out of different countries or regions," and that alone kind of excited us and we can take that excitement back to the church and keep going.

It is interesting to note that the agency referred to in this interview produces communications that are described as outstanding and that these communications are available to the pastor. This agency representative is given regular opportunity to speak this congregation, and he “reiterates” what is published in their materials. It is the presence of this agency representative “reiterating” to the congregation and “filling in” the pastor over coffee that authenticates the written material, and allows the pastor to enthusiastically receive the information and promote the mission to his congregation.

This lay informant, age 73, cannot participate in mission trips herself anymore, but explained why she can give confidently:

Because our pastors actually go [to the mission field] and look at what’s being done and see for themselves along with other groups too, whether or not this is a worthwhile expenditure. So it’s not like I’m cut off sending money to some international charitable organization or something that is faceless and has a name, so to me kind of giving to something that is kind of close to something I can actually assess is very important.

Her pastors visit the mission field. They bring back reports from the mission field, and her pastors provide “something I can actually assess.” Her pastors are people she has assessed and they are the authentication of the work on the field.

Looking for mission authentication in trusted relationships is a way to deal with complexity. A missions pastor who has only been in his position for a few months said:

I’ve probably had fifteen to twenty conversations with different organizations wanting to know if [our congregation] would like to support them. And we can’t do it all! And so, you have to just decide “Who do we know?” That’s where I go to first: **Who do I know and have a relationship with already and how do I see them connecting with our church people the best.** And those are kind of the two things that I look for. [Emphasis added]

This pastor looks to members of his congregation to authenticate or filter communications for mission agencies. Printed media, on its own, is not sufficient. It needs to be corroborated or authenticated by a person. As quality communications have become easy to produce, people are paralyzed by the volume of information and are looking for “real people” and relationships to help them sort what is important.

Given social media’s role in authenticating a real person behind other mission communications, we asked pastors how often they expect their church’s missionaries to stay in contact with the local church by social media if the missionaries were able to do so. We asked lay people a similar question changing references to the local church to personal pronouns. Only one in 20 (5%) of pastors expected missionaries to stay in touch with their local church through social media at least weekly, compared to one in ten (11%) lay people who expected personal social media contact (see tables 5, A6 and A7).

Most commonly pastors said they expected to hear from missionaries through social media monthly (45%) compared to just 23% of lay people. Three-fifths of pastors (60%) and lay people (57%) expect missionaries to stay in touch by social media at least quarterly if they are able.

Table 5. “If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with [me (lay)/our local church (pastors)] through social media:” lay and pastors^a, percent

Frequency	Lay	Pastors
Daily	2	0
A few times a week	2	1
Weekly	7	4
A few times a month	9	10
Monthly	23	45
Quarterly	14	28
A few times a year	21	9
Not at all	22	4

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding. ^a Only those respondents who said their congregations supported at least one LTC missionary in the last 12 months (Pastors, N = 885; Lay, N = 1,131). ^b Italicized connections were write-in responses. ^c “Other” responses are write-in responses not recoded to other categories.

Written communications are expected less frequently than social media communications. These written communications report on the ministry of the mission. They are to be brief, highlighting goals, progress and stories of changed lives. Personal contact and social media, on the other hand, confirm the relationship with the missionary. Confidence in the missionary maintained through social media and other forms of contact allows people to support the mission without having to engage deeply with information and reports about the mission. The relationship becomes a substitute for the reports that they are too busy to process.

How Evangelicals Start Relationships with Missionaries

Most long-term, career missionaries rely on supporters who partner with them in their ministries. How do these partnerships with churches and individuals get started?

Our informants clearly told us that relationships of trust were foundational to mission partnerships. These excerpts from the interviews about lay peoples’ relationships with missionaries illustrate how recommendations from people they trust stand-in for evaluating a mission and its work.

When I asked one pastor what would give her confidence to trust an agency, she provided a list of criteria including a good financial track record, evidence of sound financial management, and a common theological framework. Then she added:

To be honest we’ve never had anyone choose to go with another organization [other than one of our denominational sending structures] so I’ve never had to do this sort of research, I’m just thinking of what we would do. Do you want me to try and spell that out a bit more? [Emphasis added]

Asserting that they have “never had anyone choose to go with another organization” is quite remarkable given that this congregation is 160 years old.

This lay informant said she will always prefer missionaries associated with her denominational sending structure. She will listen to presentations from missionaries with other agencies, but she will always prefer denominational missionaries because they are her brothers and sisters:

Parce que pour moi [her denomination], c'est bon, c'est des frères et sœurs de la communauté d'un sensé, comme j'ai dit, si j'entends le témoignages d'un missionnaire qui fait pas partis de [her denomination], mais si je crois dans l'oeuvre que cette personne le fait, je me n'arrêterai pas à dire est-ce qu'il fait un parti de [her denomination] ou non. Pour moi c'est haut de la l'agence l'a une dénomination. Mais c'est sûr que moi je vais toujours favorise les missionnaires de ma dénomination parce que c'est ça, c'est qu'on est une famille, on s'entraide. Mais je ne me limite pas à ça si j'entends un exemple témoignage d'une autre organisation.

When we asked lay informants if they supported missionaries, the following responses reflected the answers typically given. Each one identifies personal relationships with the missionaries they support:

We pledge or donate money as individuals - most of the time to people we know.

Yes, we do [support] a couple that go to our church and my uncle is a missionary in Mexico and we have a young man we grew up [together] that works in [an African country].

I know a friend of mine, actually last month, he went to South America and he was helping, I believe he was building a church with the locals down there and I have another friend who is currently in Kenya and she's doing work with orphans there.

There's so many agencies, it's just, every time I turn around I hear about a new one. And so, in that perspective, it's difficult. And so, it's kind of like, I don't have to go look for anything. They will find you because there's just so many different things out there. ... And so, **it's very rare that I will grab a hold of something new that is a new organization that is coming out, unless it came right out of our church and we established it or something or a person within our church.** [Emphasis added]

"People we know," "a couple that go to our church," "a friend of mine," a missionary that "come[s] right out of [my] church" or is "established [by my church]," or a "person within [my] church." It would be an exception to the rule if informants did not identify a close personal connection with the missionaries they supported.

This lay informant makes the point that **a relationship can function as an evaluation of the mission.** If she knows the person, she doesn't need to "know... too much about what they are going to do":

I think that **when it's someone that I know, I'm inclined to give them a donation before knowing too much about what they're going to do.** And that might be just a matter of knowing them and knowing that they would be associated with something that I would assume is good and that they would do good work. ... **Whereas if it's someone I don't know I would be inclined to want to know more about their work.** I don't know if that's a good attitude but that's probably my best answer! [Laughs] [Emphasis added]

It is enough to know the person because the relationship validates the work. If the person is not known, a secondary way to validate the mission is by learning about the work or agency.

In some cases people rely on relationships to evaluate missions even when there are copious reports and other documentation about the mission available to them. This excerpt from an interview with a Reformed pastor is illustrative. He said, "There is a general trust [in the denomination's missions sending

agency], there’s no two ways about that.” He went on to add, “We’re quite proud of our denomination and sometimes occasionally suspicious of things that aren’t developed by our denomination.” Interestingly, when I asked him what kind of communications allowed his congregation to have this level of confidence in the denominational sending structure he said:

You're chasing down something that I really wrestle with Rick, and that is how much communication is enough and how are you communicating effectively. As a pastor and as a leader in our congregation we wrestled with that on a regular basis because **it seems that we are always being accused of being secretive and not telling everybody enough. And yet it seems that the information we are publishing is not getting read or getting absorbed and so you think you are telling somebody something effectively and they are not catching what you are throwing at them.** [Emphasis added]

This pastor identifies a paradox: He feels that he provides a lot of information to his congregants, and yet they do not seem to be reading it. He says that the result is that people accuse him, and the denomination, of being secretive. I suspect that “they are not catching what you are throwing at them” because they do not have the resources of time and energy to process it.

Four-fifths (81%) of pastors said their congregations start relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of a trusted relationship or an in-person contact compared to just 16% who say they form relationships based on a technologically mediated connection or advertising (see tables 6, A8 and A9).⁸

Table 6. “[I (lay)/Our local church (pastors)] start[s] relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” lay and pastors, percent

Start Relationships Because of:	Lay	Pastors
<i>Prior relationships</i>	33	69
<i>In-person presentation by missionary</i>	36	50
<i>Trusted recommendations</i>	20	45
<i>Direct contact from mission agency representative</i>	14	28
Promotional material	14	12
<i>Exposure at mission conferences</i>	12	9
Exposure through social media and the Internet	8	6
<i>Denomination</i>	-	2
Advertisements	2	2
Other	6	1
Not applicable	38	-
<i>Trusted or in-person relationships</i>	57	81
Media (Technologically mediated or advertising)	19	16
<i>Trusted or in-person relationships and media</i>	17	14

Denomination was a write-in response. Italicized responses are responses clearly involving trusted relationships or in-person contact. Bolded responses are technologically mediated connections or advertising responses.

⁸ “Trusted or in-person relationships” is an aggregate measure using the italicized response options in table 6. “Media connection or advertising” is an aggregate measure using exposure through social media and the Internet, promotional material, and advertisement responses in table 6.

Almost all pastors who said their congregations form relationships based on technologically mediated or advertising connections also indicated these relationships are also formed because of trusted relationships. Only 2% of pastors and 2% of lay people said they form relationships with missionaries or missions based on technologically mediated or advertising connections in the absence of trusted relationships or in-person contact, suggesting that social media and advertising may help people make decisions, but they are not sufficient in of themselves.

The work missionaries do was seldom the reason that people entered into a supporting relationship with missionaries; people usually already had a relationship with a person they trusted. This does not necessarily mean that the work the missionary does is secondary. It is likely that churches do not have the resources to evaluate the mission, so they use relationships as heuristics, as shortcuts or substitutes, for evaluating the mission. If I trust the person, then I trust that what they are doing in their ministry is good. This is likely why missionary-congregation relationships need to be reset when the senior pastor moves on. If the pastor's endorsement of a missionary or mission was the basis for the missionary-congregation relationship, then a new basis for that relationship is needed.

More research is needed, but it seems likely that the volume of information in people's lives is so high that they cannot process it. Instead, they rely on filtering mechanisms or heuristics like trusted relationships and worship service emphasis to help them make mission decisions. In many cases, this may mean that Evangelicals will have slight direct engagement with missions or missionaries.

Education

In this section, we will look at three measures of missions education in the local church. First, we will look at conversations about the biblical basis for missions. Second, we will look at whether churches hosted or helped organize a mission conference in the past 12 months. Finally, we will look at whether churches have an ongoing mission component as part of their church's children's program.

Conversations About the Biblical Basis for Missions

The 2013 Canadian Bible Engagement Study found conversation about the meaning of the Bible for readers' lives to be a key factor in Bible engagement.⁹ Frequency of conversation about the Bible is correlated with religious service attendance. As religious service attendance also tends to be correlated with mission engagement, we decided to ask pastors if their local churches actively foster conversations about the biblical basis of their missions engagement.

Three quarters (74%) of pastors agreed their local churches actively foster conversations about the biblical basis for their missions engagement (see table 7 below). This level of agreement was fairly consistent no matter how we looked at the data (see table A10). It is likely desirability bias influenced these responses, however, they do communicate how pastors think about their own churches.

⁹ Hiemstra, "Confidence, Conversation and Community: Bible Engagement in Canada, 2013."

Table 7. “Our local church actively fosters conversations about the biblical basis of our missions engagement,” lay and pastors, percent

Agreement	Pastors
Strongly Agree	22
Moderately Agree	52
Moderately Disagree	18
Strongly Disagree	4
Don't Know	3

Column may not add to 100 because of rounding.

More research is needed to understand what these conversations look like, how they are fostered and what their influence is on other measures of mission engagement.

Missions Conferences

Mission conferences have long been a part of evangelical experience. These conferences have historically been built around the furlough visits of missionaries supported by local churches to educate the church about missions, to encourage missionary vocations, and to raise support for missionaries and missions. MissionFests tend to be larger mission conferences hosted by a committee that is usually independent of any one congregation or denomination.

One key informant said local churches do not sufficiently subscribe to MissionFests:

[MissionFests] are not taken advantage of as they should. So neither does the local church have a missions emphasis program nor do they tie into a [MissionFest].

However, another key informant wondered if MissionFests provide an excuse for local churches not to go to the work of highlighting global missions in their congregations, resulting in only the most missions minded individuals making the effort to attend:

I wonder if MissionFests, for all the excitement that they bring, might not have an unintended consequence of allowing churches to outsource an element of missions awareness and churches. So the people who are interested in mission go to missions fests from all the local churches. But then people that don't have that interest don't get exposed in the setting of the local church because the church doesn't have its own missions conference anymore.

A pastor informant from a large congregation that holds their own missions conference talked about moving their church's missions conference off Sunday as they did not have space for it in their plans for Sunday morning worship.

We will probably do some type of missions night here at the church on a weekend, an event, where we would have our team members share there **so it's not on a Sunday morning experience but it's still kind of in a church setting.** [Emphasis added]

One lay informant with young children said tending to the children often prevents him from learning about missions at mission information booths set up at his church:

Often times [missions information booths] are just kind of set up in our kind of gym or kind of community center part of the church where typically after the church services there's kind of a coffee and treats kind of thing. So they're usually set up in there so you can kind of wander by and get some more information if you want promotional stuff or whatever. **With our little ones at home, we often aren't heading that way because we're usually trying to bust home at that point in time**, but anytime we have stopped and pick something up or whatnot it's been, the materials are usually pretty good. [Emphasis added]

Asked what brings missions to mind, this lay informant who is part of a church plant said:

It doesn't really, if I'm being honest. Maybe if we have somebody come to church, if they're talking about their missionary work, if there's MissionFest in January, if I go to MissionFest, but it's not something that was a huge part of growing up. And our church has been, **we've just been working on planting and doing work locally so it's not like this huge forefront thing**. [Emphasis added]

Her church is “doing work locally,” meaning work on establishing their church plant. Missions promotion is available but she must leave her congregation to avail herself of it.

About one-quarter of pastors (24%) and lay people (29%) said their local church either held or helped organize a mission conference in the last 12 months (see tables 8 and A11). Three-quarters of pastors (74%) said their congregations did not hold or help organize a missions conference compared to one-third (33%) of lay people. Another third of lay people indicated they did not know. The percent of lay respondents answering “don’t know,” “Not applicable” and “No” add up to 71%, which is very close to the corresponding 75% for pastors. Therefore, it is likely that those lay people who answered “don’t know” or “not applicable” attend a church that did not host or help organize a mission conference.

Table 8. “In the last 12 months, our local church held or helped organize a mission conference,” lay and pastors, percent

Agreement	Lay	Pastors
Yes	29	24
No	33	74
Don't know	34	1
Not applicable	4	-

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding

Evangelicals from larger congregations were more likely to report their congregations held or helped organize a mission conference. Only one in seven pastors and lay people (14% and 16% respectively) from small congregations (average weekly attendance of 1 to 80) reported holding or helping organize a mission conference compared to 46% and 59% respectively for respondents from congregations of more than 1,000.

Worship service attendance and Bible reading frequency did not make a significant difference in whether or not respondents reported that their congregations had hosted or organized a mission conference.

Children's Programs and Missions

Christian education programs for children are one of the ways that churches disciple their children. In the qualitative interviews, we asked pastors if their churches intentionally included a global mission component in their church's children's program. Only two of the 17 pastor informants said they did.

This pastor, from a Reformed tradition, talked about the mission outreach of their Sunday school. Their mission component includes both local and international emphases evidencing the trend toward seeing missions as both domestic and international.

I should mention to you that our Sunday School program has a two-fold mission outreach. So one, they support locally, the kids are encouraged to bring in candies and dry foods for our local food bank and actually bring in quite a bit. And then they, [name of one of their missionaries] is one of our missionaries, sets up education programs somewhere in Africa and the kids actually come in, and bring their money in, to help support buying her educational supplies. So, it's very targeted to them as well.

She then went on to describe the missions teaching component of their Sunday school:

So, there is a display in the Sunday school area and they have a cupboard where they get to go put their food in. And so, they talk about what the food is for, what kind of people, and actually pray for the people that are going to use that food. And then the money again, they talk about, they have so many, when they reach a certain amount they get to put up their little stickers that have school supplies emblems on them so they can see how much they have supported her. So there is a little bit up a visual. In terms of a curriculum though, it's not embedded in the curriculum, it's more what we add on, we've purchased our curriculum and it's not an active part.

Another pastor, from a charismatic tradition, talked about the role of missions in their children's program:

We try to bring missions down into our kid's ministry as well. And so, our kid's pastor who, works with our kid's ministry, she always has a missions project for them. And so, one year we bought mosquito nets for kids in [an Asian country], ... so they raised money, they would bring money for over three-month period of time, and they would raise X number of dollars and they could buy 20 mosquito nets. So we bring missions right down into our kid's ministry. So, they are used to giving to missions even though it comes off of mom and dad's dresser, or dad's pocket probably, but they are used to giving to missions, they understand what missions is about. Often when we have missions partners come and visit we will get them to do a presentation in our service upstairs but then those who are able to communicate effectively, we ask them to go downstairs during the service and do a 5-10 minute thing and say, "We are so and so from [a South American country], from [an Asian country], from where ever, and this is what we do with kids over there as missionaries." So we really try to connect it to our kids as well.

Given that there was so little discussion in the interviews about the place of missions in children's programs, we asked both lay and pastor survey respondents for their agreement with the statement: "Our local church's children's program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry

outside of Canada.” Knowing that some churches might not have children’s programs or a mission focus at their church, we added a “Not Applicable” response option.

Pastors were more likely to agree (55%) that their local church’s missions program included an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada than lay people (40%) (see tables 9 and A12). This discrepancy can be explained, in part, by the tendency of lay people to be less familiar with their church’s children’s program. One-third (34%) of lay people said they did not know compared to just 6% of pastors. This is a lack of familiarity with an internal church program and not just the mission engagement component of this program.

Less frequent service attenders were less likely to be aware of the content of their churches children’s program. About 59% of those who attended religious services once or twice a year did not know about their local church’s children’s program compared to 28% among those who attended more than once or a few times a year.¹⁰

With Bible reading frequency, we saw a steady decline in mission engagement corresponding with a decline in reading frequency until we reached the threshold between those who read seldom to those who read never. Just over one-quarter (27%) of lay people who read at least a few times a week said they did not know about the content of their church’s children’s program compared to approximately half (47%) of those who read seldom and 83% of those who read never.

Table 9. “Our local church’s children’s program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada,” lay and pastors, percent

Agreement	Lay	Pastors
Strongly Agree	13	18
Moderately Agree	27	37
Moderately Disagree	10	16
Strongly Disagree	8	8
Don’t Know	34	6
Not Applicable	9	15

Columns may not add to 100 because of rounding

There are a few reasons a respondent might have chosen the ‘not applicable’ response to this question. First, their local church may not have a children’s program. Second, their local church may not have a missions program. To test which of these is the most likely explanation, we divided pastor responses into two groups. The first group included those pastors who said their local congregation financially supported at least on LTC missionary, and the second group included those pastors who reported their congregations supported no LTC missionaries. Only 12% of pastors whose churches supported at least one LTC missionary said this children’s program question was not applicable compared to 44% of those who did not support any LTC missionaries.

Whether they supported LTC missionaries or not, it was primarily small churches that answered ‘not applicable’ to this question. Out of a total 72 number of respondents who selected ‘not applicable,’ 51 number or 71% were with churches with an average attendance of 1 to 80. This suggests that a lack of a children’s program with an ongoing missions component is a capacity issue (and likely indicates the

¹⁰ Those who never attended were not included in the sample.

absence of any children's program). In fact, the larger the church, the more likely they were to agree that they had a children's program with an ongoing missions program. Four-fifths (80%) of pastors from churches with average attendance of more than 1,000 agreed they had such a program compared to just 37% of pastors of church with attendance between 1 and 80.

Conclusions

"It takes energy to be connected to all these things." Interview informant, CEMES research project.

In our fragmented contemporary culture, attention is fragmented. Evangelicals know that missions are supposed to be important for them, but they don't have the "energy to be connected to all these things." As a consequence, many Evangelicals tend to use heuristics, or short-cuts, to allow them to evaluate and connect with missions and missionaries. These heuristics take the form of trusted recommendations. The trusted relationships themselves validate missions and allow Evangelicals to support missions and missionaries with confidence.

The volume of information and lack of resources to process it forces people to look for other means of evaluation. Often Evangelicals look to what gets platformed or highlighted from the pulpit to know what is authentic and important. The content of the worship service functions as a filter to reduce complexity.

The senior pastor is very often the person Evangelicals look to for recommendations and direction with respect to missions. He or she is also often the administrative conduit for information about missions to flow to a congregation. Therefore the senior pastor is important for providing spiritual direction and vision but also in his or her oversight and administrative role which acts as a filter.

Those who attend religious services more frequently or read the Bible more frequently are more likely to engage more deeply with missions. This is consistently true in all our data. These religious disciplines are chosen limitations on where a person directs their attention and priorities.

Larger congregations have greater resources which make it easier to provide the "energy for [the congregation] to be connected to all these things."

Evangelicals will need to grapple with the effect of attention fragmentation on their ministry capacity. This fragmentation affects all aspects of ministry, not just missions engagement.

Bibliography

- Bebbington, David W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. 1 edition. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bibby, Reginald. "Religion in the Twenty-First Century: The Canadian Case," 12. Brisbane, Australia, 1986. http://www.reginaldbibby.com/images/ARCH_AusNZ_1986.pdf.
- Hiemstra, Rick. "Confidence, Conversation and Community: Bible Engagement in Canada, 2013." The Canadian Bible Forum and The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, 2014. <http://www.bibleengagementstudy.ca/>.
- "Overview of the Time Use of Canadians: 2005." Statistics Canada, July 2006. <http://publications.gc.ca/Collection/Statcan/12F0080X/12F0080XIE2006001.pdf>.
- Sam Reimer, and Michael Wilkinson. *A Culture of Faith: Evangelical Congregations in Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015.

Appendix A. Detailed Tables

Table A1. "The most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in our local church is:" lay and pastors, percent

	Lay							Pastors						
	Senior / Lead Pastor	Miss. Com. Member	Other	Missions Pastor	Don't Know	Associate Pastor	Youth or YA Pastor	Senior / Lead Pastor	Miss. Com. Member	Other	Missions Pastor	Don't Know	Associate Pastor	Youth or YA Pastor
All	30	19	8	10	21	5	6	47	25	12	7	5	4	1
Position in Local Church														
Lay Leader	33	26	11	10	7	5	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Lay Leader	30	18	8	10	23	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Generation														
Silent ^f	35	22	7	10	17	6	5	53	21	13	0	5	8	0
Boomers	33	19	8	9	22	4	5	50	22	12	6	5	4	1
Gen-X	28	19	10	13	22	4	5	46	27	11	9	4	4	0
Gen-Y	29	18	8	10	21	7	7	36	32	9	9	8	4	3
Setting														
Urban	28	19	7	11	23	6	5	47	23	11	9	4	5	1
Suburban	30	19	8	11	20	6	6	47	24	11	8	4	4	1
Rural	38	19	11	6	17	2	6	46	29	12	3	5	4	0
Region														
BC	27	21	8	13	22	5	4	45	22	13	10	3	6	1
AB	24	23	7	14	16	9	8	49	21	12	11	2	3	2
SK/MB	29	25	9	9	20	2	6	49	20	16	6	7	2	1
ON	35	17	8	12	17	5	6	48	27	10	4	6	5	0
QC	23	8	12	3	38	14	3	36	26	19	12	2	5	0
ATL	31	18	10	4	32	1	4	46	31	7	6	6	4	0
Tradition^a														
Anabaptist	20	32	6	10	21	6	6	40	27	17	6	6	3	2
Baptist	30	24	7	8	20	4	6	40	32	12	7	5	3	0
Holiness	26	20	8	12	24	4	7	44	28	6	11	3	7	0
Reformed ^g	24	20	9	11	23	3	9	28	31	23	5	10	0	3
Pent./Charis.	44	11	8	12	17	6	3	62	13	9	5	3	6	1
Restorationist ^g	26	16	19	11	18	4	7	38	25	31	3	3	0	0
Pietist/Free ⁱ	13	41	3	9	19	0	16	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Anglican/Lutheran	37	14	8	7	25	7	2	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^g	31	10	11	14	21	7	5	44	23	10	8	10	3	3

Table A1 continued on the next page.

Table A1 continued. “The most prominent mission advocate or mobilizer in our local church is:”
lay and pastors, percent

	Lay							Pastors						
	Senior / Lead Pastor	Miss. Com. Member	Other	Missions Pastor	Don't Know	Associate Pastor	Youth or YA Pastor	Senior / Lead Pastor	Miss. Com. Member	Other	Missions Pastor	Don't Know	Associate Pastor	Youth or YA Pastor
All	30	19	8	10	21	5	6	47	25	12	7	5	4	1
Language														
English	31	19	8	10	21	5	6	47	24	12	7	5	4	1
French ^e	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	34	37	12	15	0	2	0
Gender														
Male	35	19	10	9	17	6	4	48	25	11	6	5	5	1
Female	27	19	7	12	24	4	7	38	22	19	11	6	3	1
Bible Reading Frequency														
Daily	34	21	10	10	15	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A few Xs a week	34	24	9	12	12	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once a week	21	24	8	13	15	12	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1X or 2X a month	27	25	6	10	21	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A few Xs a year	23	8	9	14	26	9	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seldom	28	8	5	6	45	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Never	22	6	4	4	62	0	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Religious Service Attendance														
More than 1X a wk.	35	22	13	10	14	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once a week or so	32	22	10	10	16	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-3 times a month	33	22	5	17	17	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once a month or so	31	9	4	7	24	11	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1X or a few Xs a yr.	18	9	3	8	44	7	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Church Size^b														
1 to 80	34	12	15	7	24	2	6	54	19	14	3	7	3	1
81 to 120	33	18	9	7	18	7	8	47	33	11	1	4	3	1
121 to 200	31	27	10	4	15	6	6	41	37	11	1	4	4	1
201 to 300	34	25	7	8	17	5	4	47	24	12	10	0	8	0
301 to 500	30	27	8	16	12	4	3	38	30	6	13	6	5	1
501 to 1,000	27	15	2	23	16	12	5	37	24	8	22	0	8	0
Over 1,000	31	11	4	30	17	7	1	34	7	5	51	0	2	0

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations: Use with caution. ^e Only 41 French pastor observations: Use with caution. ^f Only 38 Silent Generation pastor observations: Use with caution. ^g Only 39 Reformed pastor observations, 32 Restorationist observations, and 39 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations: Use with caution. ^h Only 32 Pietist/Free observations: Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A2. "Our local church promotes missions from the pulpit [Frequency]," pastors, percent

	Pastors					
	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Quarterly	A few times a year	Not at all
All	9	16	33	18	22	1
Generation						
Silent ^f	24	22	38	0	11	5
Boomers	9	15	34	16	25	1
Gen-X	9	18	32	20	20	1
Gen-Y	10	12	28	27	20	2
Setting						
Urban	8	16	35	16	24	1
Suburban	7	20	30	22	19	1
Rural	13	13	34	18	21	2
Region						
BC	8	17	38	13	24	1
AB	14	11	28	22	24	1
SK/MB	9	21	29	16	23	2
ON	9	17	33	19	20	1
QC	11	9	40	11	27	2
ATL	6	17	35	22	19	3
Gender						
Male	10	16	34	18	21	1
Female	7	16	29	17	26	5
Language						
English	10	17	33	18	21	1
French ^e	3	0	33	18	46	0

Table A2 continued on the next page.

Table A2 continued. “Our local church promotes missions from the pulpit [Frequency],” pastors, percent

	Pastors					
	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Quarterly	A few times a year	Not at all
Tradition^a						
Anabaptist	10	20	27	19	24	1
Baptist	10	17	31	20	20	2
Holiness	12	16	33	19	19	1
Reformed ^b	8	13	23	21	33	3
Pent./Charis.	7	15	43	16	18	1
Restorationist ^c	3	12	21	21	42	0
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^d	10	15	28	28	20	0
Church Size^e						
1 to 80	11	12	29	15	29	3
81 to 120	9	17	33	20	21	0
121 to 200	10	15	43	18	13	1
201 to 300	10	17	34	20	20	0
301 to 500	8	29	32	16	15	0
501 to 1,000	2	22	31	29	17	0
Over 1,000	5	15	33	26	21	0

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations. Use with caution. ^e Only 39 French pastor observations. Use with caution. ^f Only 37 Silent Generation pastor observations. Use with caution. ^g Only 39 Reformed pastor observations, 33 Restorationist observations, and 40 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations. Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A3. “Unless I’m prompted, I don’t pray for long-term, career missionaries,” lay and pastors, percent

	Lay					Pastors				
	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know
All	9	32	29	26	5	3	27	34	36	1
Generation										
Silent ^f	7	29	28	32	5	3	18	33	45	3
Boomers	7	26	30	31	6	3	25	26	45	1
Gen-X	12	32	27	23	6	3	27	43	26	1
Gen-Y	8	38	30	20	3	6	33	36	24	1
Setting										
Urban	9	31	28	28	4	3	30	31	35	1
Suburban	9	35	32	20	4	2	26	39	33	0
Rural	8	24	27	34	7	5	23	33	39	1
Region										
BC	7	32	32	24	4	2	26	36	35	2
AB	8	37	26	25	4	5	27	35	33	0
SK/MB	9	26	33	29	3	7	22	37	34	0
ON	8	35	27	26	4	2	26	33	37	1
QC	18	16	33	26	7	2	26	36	36	0
ATL	10	26	30	24	10	4	29	31	36	0
Gender										
Male	8	34	29	24	5	3	26	35	35	1
Female	9	30	29	27	5	7	26	26	38	3
Language										
English	9	32	29	26	5	3	27	34	35	1
French ^e	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	2	24	29	41	2
Tradition^a										
Anabaptist	3	26	40	28	3	4	30	41	24	1
Baptist	7	33	31	24	5	3	25	35	36	1
Holiness	10	30	26	30	3	4	21	33	42	0
Reformed ^g	5	38	26	24	7	5	23	33	38	0
Pent./Charis.	11	23	31	28	6	3	26	29	40	1
Restorationist ^g	11	32	21	28	9	0	40	43	17	0
Pietist/Free ⁱ	27	27	12	30	3	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Anglican/Lutheran	18	25	35	17	5	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^g	10	43	23	21	3	0	38	35	28	0

Table A3 continued on the next page.

Table A3 continued. "Unless I'm prompted, I don't pray for long-term, career missionaries," lay and pastors, percent

	Lay					Pastors				
	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know
Bible Reading Frequency										
Daily	6	25	33	33	3	-	-	-	-	-
A few times a week	4	31	34	29	1	-	-	-	-	-
Once a week	6	35	39	15	4	-	-	-	-	-
Once or twice a month	12	37	24	23	5	-	-	-	-	-
A few times a year	6	50	22	17	5	-	-	-	-	-
Seldom	20	30	21	16	13	-	-	-	-	-
Never	40	27	4	13	17	-	-	-	-	-
Religious Service Attendance										
More than once a week	3	22	34	37	4	-	-	-	-	-
Once a week or so	8	32	31	27	2	-	-	-	-	-
2-3 times a month	10	35	25	26	4	-	-	-	-	-
Once a month or so	15	43	23	15	4	-	-	-	-	-
Once or a few times a yr.	14	34	24	14	13	-	-	-	-	-
Church Size^b										
1 to 80	13	25	27	29	6	3	28	30	38	1
81 to 120	8	32	27	30	3	2	21	44	31	1
121 to 200	7	31	33	27	3	4	28	35	33	1
201 to 300	5	35	36	21	3	5	30	27	36	2
301 to 500	5	38	31	24	2	3	25	37	34	0
501 to 1,000	12	38	25	20	4	2	25	38	36	0
Over 1,000	8	37	29	25	2	2	24	34	37	2

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations. Use with caution. ^e Only 41 French pastor observations. Use with caution. ^f Only 40 Silent Generation pastor observations. Use with caution. ^g Only 39 Reformed pastor observations, 35 Restorationist observations, and 40 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations. Use with caution. ^h Only 33 Pietist/Free observations: Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A4. "In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church's long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply)," pastors^c, percent

	Pastors						Any Connection
	Email	Facebook / Soc. Media	Letters / Mail	Telephone	Skype / Video Link	Visits to Mission Field	
All	78	46	38	27	25	14	89
Position in Local Church							
Senior/Lead Pastor	81	45	39	29	23	12	92
Associate Pastor	66	47	37	24	30	17	81
Missions Pastor	97	52	57	59	70	34	97
Other Pastor/Staff	66	45	33	14	19	14	79
Generation							
Silent ^e	75	24	42	12	12	9	87
Boomers	79	42	40	29	23	13	90
Gen-X	81	51	37	28	29	16	91
Gen-Y	62	48	34	22	30	9	81
Setting							
Urban	77	43	35	27	26	19	89
Suburban	79	48	36	29	31	13	87
Rural	80	47	44	26	19	8	94
Region							
BC	79	51	39	33	24	16	91
AB	80	50	35	30	31	20	88
SK/MB	78	49	43	26	24	12	90
ON	80	42	42	27	22	13	90
QC	81	41	26	19	27	10	94
ATL	66	46	37	22	29	7	86
Gender							
Male	79	44	39	28	26	13	90
Female	67	56	38	19	23	19	83
Tradition^a							
Anabaptist	75	43	38	23	21	16	88
Baptist	79	38	44	24	26	11	90
Holiness	83	49	39	30	36	19	92
Reformed ^f	76	36	28	20	16	4	88
Pent./Charis.	76	56	36	30	24	15	91
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^f	78	41	38	31	24	12	85

Table A4 continued on the next page.

Table A4 continued. “In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church’s long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply),” pastors^c, percent

	Pastors						Any Connection
	Email	Facebook / Soc. Media	Letters / Mail	Telephone	Skype / Video Link	Visits to Mission Field	
All	78	46	38	27	25	14	89
Language							
English	77	47	39	28	26	14	89
French ^d	85	22	20	13	24	7	96
Church Size^b							
1 to 80	72	42	38	24	16	8	89
81 to 120	86	47	46	19	15	5	95
121 to 200	80	48	36	24	31	14	88
201 to 300	76	46	43	30	35	21	90
301 to 500	83	51	33	33	37	22	90
501 to 1,000	83	50	33	38	33	18	85
Over 1,000	81	39	46	51	51	41	87

^a Traditions with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only those pastor respondents who said their congregations supported at least one LTC missionary in the last 12 months (N = 885). ^d Only 36 French pastor observations: Use with caution. ^e Only 38 Silent Generation pastor observations: Use with caution. ^f Only 39 Reformed pastor observations and 39 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations: Use with caution.

Table A5. "In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church's long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply)," lay^c, percent

	Lay									Any Connection	No Connection ^f
	Letters / Mail	Email	Facebook / Soc. Media	Furlough Visits ^f	Skype / Video Link	Telephone	Visits to Mission Field	Church Announcements ^f	Other ^g		
All	41	39	30	10	8	5	4	4	2	86	14
Position in Local Church											
Lay Leader	49	61	28	12	9	4	6	3	1	94	7
Not Lay Leader	39	35	30	10	8	5	3	4	2	85	15
Generation											
Silent ^f	53	45	18	14	6	4	4	5	6	94	6
Boomers	46	41	29	12	7	4	3	5	3	91	9
Gen-X	36	45	32	12	7	8	4	3	1	87	13
Gen-Y	35	29	35	4	12	5	5	2	1	79	22
Setting											
Urban	45	42	34	9	8	7	7	4	2	89	12
Suburban	38	35	26	11	7	3	3	3	2	82	18
Rural	38	44	28	12	8	7	0	4	2	91	9
Region											
BC	46	39	22	10	8	6	4	7	4	90	10
AB	37	42	34	13	6	4	1	2	0	83	18
SK/MB	45	45	34	9	15	8	7	3	1	87	13
ON	40	36	34	11	7	5	5	3	2	89	12
QC ^e	40	45	19	0	1	5	0	0	0	79	21
ATL	40	43	23	9	8	2	0	3	2	80	20
Gender											
Male	44	45	25	10	7	7	5	3	2	85	15
Female	39	35	34	11	9	4	3	4	2	87	13
Tradition^a											
Anabaptist	44	55	36	5	12	11	5	5	2	92	9
Baptist	44	43	28	10	8	3	5	5	2	88	12
Holiness	45	42	28	16	7	6	3	2	1	90	10
Reformed	42	41	26	6	3	0	1	2	1	85	15
Pent./Charis.	30	29	30	12	10	5	5	4	2	82	19
Restorationist ^d	38	43	22	5	7	12	4	0	1	77	23
Anglican/Lutheran ^d	69	29	13	17	0	0	2	5	5	98	2
Non-/Inter-Denom.	33	32	43	9	10	10	2	1	2	83	17

Table A5 continued on the next page.

Table A5 continued. "In the last 12 months, I personally connected with our local church's long-term, career missionaries through (Check all that may apply)," lay^c, percent

	Lay									Any Connection	No Connection ^f
	Letters / Mail	Email	Facebook / Soc. Media	Furlough Visits ^f	Skype / Video Link	Telephone	Visits to Mission Field	Church Announcements ^f	Other ^e		
All	41	39	30	10	8	5	4	4	2	86	14
Language											
English	41	39	30	10	8	5	4	4	2	87	13
French	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Bible Reading Frequency											
Daily	40	48	36	9	11	7	4	3	2	89	11
A few Xs a week	47	41	28	13	10	8	4	4	2	94	6
Once a week	43	41	29	13	3	1	0	4	1	81	19
1X or 2X a month	38	25	23	8	3	1	5	5	1	75	25
A few Xs a year	31	33	29	8	7	0	7	2	1	76	25
Seldom	36	18	21	8	1	1	0	9	7	77	23
Never	24	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	20
Religious Service Attendance											
More than 1X a wk.	46	50	34	10	13	9	7	2	3	93	7
Once a week or so	42	37	30	14	7	4	2	5	2	86	14
2-3 times a month	40	32	26	6	5	6	3	4	4	86	14
Once a month or so	31	29	29	8	6	4	9	1	0	79	22
1X or a few Xs a yr.	29	40	28	0	6	2	3	4	0	77	23
Church Size^b											
1 to 80	36	43	31	11	5	6	4	4	1	90	10
81 to 120	40	37	19	6	10	6	5	4	1	87	13
121 to 200	42	40	32	12	9	6	3	2	1	86	14
201 to 300	45	41	34	13	11	1	4	3	1	87	13
301 to 500	46	35	33	6	6	8	6	4	4	83	17
501 to 1,000	40	43	25	13	4	1	1	1	1	87	13
Over 1,000	40	40	34	14	12	5	2	8	6	84	17

^a Traditions and languages with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only those lay respondents who said their congregations supported at least one LTC missionary in the last 12 months (N = 1,131). ^d Only 35 Restorationist and 33 Anglican/Lutheran lay observations: Use with caution. ^e Only 35 Quebec observations: Use with caution. ^f Italicized connections were write-in responses. ^g "Other" responses are write-in responses not recoded to other categories.

Table A6. "If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with our local church through social media [Frequency]," pastors^h, percent

	Pastors							
	Daily	A few times a week	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Quarterly	A few times a year	Not at all
All	0	1	4	10	45	28	9	4
Generation								
Silent ^f	0	0	3	10	53	23	10	0
Boomers	0	0	5	8	44	29	11	3
Gen-X	0	1	4	12	45	26	8	4
Gen-Y	0	1	3	7	46	32	4	7
Setting								
Urban	0	1	4	10	49	23	9	4
Suburban	0	1	5	9	43	31	6	5
Rural	0	0	3	10	43	30	12	2
Region								
BC	0	0	5	12	46	26	7	5
AB	0	1	6	9	44	28	9	3
SK/MB	0	1	3	11	47	20	11	6
ON	0	1	3	9	45	28	10	4
QC	0	0	6	10	45	24	12	4
ATL	0	0	2	6	42	39	7	4
Gender								
Male	0	0	4	9	45	28	9	4
Female	0	1	2	10	43	29	13	1
Language								
English	0	1	4	10	45	28	9	4
French ^e	0	0	0	0	56	25	17	3

Table A6 continued on the next page.

Table A6 continued. "If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with our local church through social media [Frequency]," pastors^h, percent

	Pastors							
	Daily	A few times a week	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Quarterly	A few times a year	Not at all
Tradition^a	0	1	4	10	45	28	9	4
Anabaptist	0	1	4	12	41	20	15	7
Baptist	0	0	3	8	44	32	7	6
Holiness	0	1	9	9	50	20	8	4
Reformed ^g	0	0	0	0	51	41	8	0
Pent./Charis.	0	0	3	12	46	28	7	3
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^g	0	3	0	12	47	18	18	3
Church Size^b								
1 to 80	0	1	5	9	40	30	12	4
81 to 120	0	0	4	10	45	23	12	6
121 to 200	0	1	4	8	49	28	8	3
201 to 300	0	0	6	8	46	29	5	4
301 to 500	0	1	2	9	51	27	7	3
501 to 1,000	0	0	0	18	44	25	5	7
Over 1,000	0	3	0	9	60	23	0	6

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations. Use with caution. ^e Only 36 French pastor observations. Use with caution. ^f Only 38 Silent Generation pastor observations. Use with caution. ^g Only 37 Reformed pastor observations and 34 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations. Use with caution. ^h Only those pastor respondents who said their congregations supported at least one LTC missionary in the last 12 months (N = 885). Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A7. If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with me through social media [Frequency],” lay^c, percent

	Lay							
	Daily	A few times a week	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Quarterly	A few times a year	Not at all
All	2	2	7	9	23	14	21	22
Position in Local Church								
Lay Leader	4	1	8	11	26	15	17	18
No lay leadership roll	2	2	7	9	22	14	22	23
Generation								
Silent ^f	0	0	3	4	24	17	34	19
Boomers	1	1	4	8	22	16	25	23
Gen-X	2	3	7	9	23	18	18	20
Gen-Y	5	1	12	13	22	8	15	25
Setting								
Urban	3	2	8	8	22	12	24	21
Suburban	2	2	7	11	22	15	19	22
Rural	1	0	4	7	26	18	20	24
Region								
BC	1	4	2	9	27	17	23	18
AB	2	0	9	10	19	13	23	24
SK/MB	5	0	7	3	30	16	18	22
ON	2	1	6	10	24	14	18	24
QC	6	18	18	32	3	0	18	6
ATL	1	0	13	5	17	14	28	21
Gender								
Male	2	2	7	9	19	15	22	25
Female	2	1	7	10	26	14	21	19
Tradition^a								
Anabaptist	3	1	9	16	25	12	17	17
Baptist	4	2	6	10	23	16	19	19
Holiness	0	0	4	6	22	21	24	22
Reformed	0	0	8	7	34	10	19	22
Pent./Charis.	0	2	5	8	21	12	23	28
Restorationist ^d	9	6	6	11	9	20	26	14
Anglican/Lutheran ^d	0	0	9	6	19	9	22	34
Non-/Inter-Denom.	0	4	11	10	22	12	24	18

Table A7 continued on the next page.

Table A7 continued. "If they are able, I expect our missionaries to stay in contact with me through social media [Frequency]," lay^c, percent

	Lay							
	Daily	A few times a week	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Quarterly	A few times a year	Not at all
All	2	2	7	9	23	14	21	22
English^a	2	1	7	9	23	14	21	22
Bible Reading Frequency								
Daily	2	1	4	7	23	16	25	21
A few times a week	0	2	9	11	28	17	19	14
Once a week	0	4	11	8	23	12	22	22
Once or twice a month	6	2	5	16	19	14	13	26
A few times a year	0	0	11	12	13	7	13	42
Seldom	7	0	8	1	16	8	30	30
Never	0	0	0	0	33	17	33	17
Religious Service Attendance								
More than once a wk.	6	1	7	9	22	12	23	20
Once a week or so	0	2	6	9	27	14	21	20
2-3 times a month	1	0	8	6	18	17	20	30
Once a month or so	0	3	14	18	15	14	17	20
Once or a few times a yr.	3	1	8	9	12	17	23	26
Church Size^b								
1 to 80	1	2	2	13	16	17	28	21
81 to 120	1	3	14	12	23	13	21	13
121 to 200	1	1	6	7	20	19	17	30
201 to 300	6	3	6	11	31	11	19	14
301 to 500	3	0	10	6	24	14	20	23
501 to 1,000	0	0	3	5	24	8	22	39
Over 1,000	4	2	8	10	25	15	22	16

^a Traditions and languages with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for lay respondents who said their local congregation supported at least one LTC missionary (N = 1,131). ^d Only 35 Restorationist and 32 Anglican/Lutheran lay observations: Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A8. “Our local church starts relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply),” pastors, percent

	Pastors									
	Prior relationships	In-person presentation by missionary	Trusted recommendations	Direct contact from mission agency reps.	Promotional material	Exposure at mission conferences	Exposure through social media and the internet	Denomination ^f	Advertisements	Other
All	69	50	45	28	12	9	6	2	2	1
Position in Local Church										
Senior/Lead Pastor	71	53	47	29	13	9	6	3	3	1
Associate Pastor	67	45	42	26	11	10	6	3	3	1
Missions Pastor	66	48	47	43	15	14	9	1	2	0
Other Pastor/Staff	63	39	32	20	10	5	2	2	1	1
Generation										
Silent ^d	50	41	35	20	12	5	4	2	2	0
Boomers	67	51	41	28	14	11	7	2	3	1
Gen-X	76	51	49	33	12	7	5	2	3	1
Gen-Y	71	46	49	18	4	9	5	3	1	0
Setting										
Urban	67	46	40	25	13	10	5	4	3	1
Suburban	68	42	46	29	7	5	6	2	2	0
Rural	74	63	50	31	16	11	7	1	1	1
Region										
BC	72	52	47	26	7	8	5	2	1	2
AB	68	46	40	25	11	9	6	2	2	1
SK/MB	71	53	44	29	8	9	6	1	1	0
ON	71	51	48	30	11	10	5	3	2	1
QC	65	61	42	22	29	5	16	2	20	2
ATL	66	44	40	30	19	8	7	4	1	1
Gender										
Male	70	52	46	30	13	9	6	3	3	1
Female	62	37	37	17	10	5	5	1	2	3
Language										
English	70	50	45	28	11	9	5	2	2	1
French ^c	61	60	31	22	43	8	15	3	25	3

Table A8 continued on the next page.

Table A8 continued. "Our local church starts relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply)," pastors, percent

	Pastors									
	Prior relationships	In-person presentation by missionary	Trusted recommendations	Direct contact from mission agency reps.	Promotional material	Exposure at mission conferences	Exposure through social media and the Internet	Denomination ^f	Advertisements	Other
All	69	50	45	28	12	9	6	2	2	1
Tradition^a										
Anabaptist	70	46	42	31	8	11	4	3	1	0
Baptist	69	52	47	36	15	8	8	1	2	2
Holiness	72	52	40	30	9	9	5	4	4	1
Reformed ^e	60	43	60	40	4	0	0	7	3	0
Pentecostal/Charismatic	69	54	44	20	15	11	8	3	3	1
Restorationist ^e	85	36	54	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Non-/Inter-Denominational ^e	71	34	43	17	7	7	0	0	0	0
Church Size^b										
1 to 80	66	49	43	23	16	10	7	3	3	1
81 to 120	76	60	50	39	13	4	5	2	2	1
121 to 200	67	50	41	28	10	6	5	2	2	1
201 to 300	79	49	52	31	14	9	5	5	1	0
301 to 500	76	59	47	34	5	10	6	1	0	0
501 to 1,000	69	42	38	24	8	14	6	1	3	2
Over 1,000	68	35	51	26	4	10	2	2	2	4

^a Traditions and languages with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only 44 French pastor observations: Use with caution. ^d Only 55 Silent Generation pastor observations: Use with caution. ^e Only 45 Reformed, 36 Restorationist and 47 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational pastor observations: Use with caution. ^f Denomination was a write-in response.

Table A9. "I start relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply)," lay, percent

	Lay									Not applicable
	In-person presentation by missionary	Prior relationships	Trusted recommendations	Direct contact from mission agency reps.	Promotional Material	Exposure at mission conferences	Exposure through social media and the Internet	Other	Advertisements	
All	36	33	20	14	14	12	8	6	2	38
Position in Local Church										
Lay Leader	46	42	22	20	16	14	11	8	5	23
Not Lay Leader	34	32	19	13	14	11	7	6	2	40
Generation										
Silent	41	33	18	20	20	14	6	5	2	35
Boomers	42	33	19	15	15	13	7	4	1	39
Gen-X	34	34	22	14	13	10	8	7	3	35
Gen-Y	29	33	18	13	12	11	9	7	3	40
Setting										
Urban	38	37	23	16	15	16	8	5	4	36
Suburban	34	32	19	13	13	9	7	8	2	37
Rural	37	30	16	14	13	8	9	6	0	40
Region										
BC	40	39	20	13	13	12	9	5	1	35
AB	37	38	19	20	17	13	8	6	5	36
SK/MB	43	45	24	19	16	21	13	5	6	27
ON	35	31	20	14	14	12	6	8	1	35
QC	14	21	17	5	6	1	7	0	4	68
ATL	32	23	16	12	12	6	9	6	1	50
Gender										
Male	35	32	21	15	15	13	8	7	3	38
Female	36	34	18	14	13	11	8	5	2	37
Tradition^a										
Anabaptist	40	49	24	15	12	14	12	7	6	22
Baptist	39	36	19	12	18	13	9	7	2	33
Holiness	40	38	19	16	11	13	4	4	1	35
Reformed	31	31	24	16	22	11	8	13	3	37
Pent./Charis.	34	24	19	13	11	10	8	5	3	45
Restorationist ^c	41	14	23	27	4	13	3	4	6	38
Pietist/Free ^c	24	33	2	11	15	11	5	8	0	62
Anglican/Lutheran ^c	24	27	12	10	13	5	5	3	6	47
Non-/Inter-Denom.	33	32	19	17	11	11	9	4	0	44

Table A9 continued on the next page.

Table A9 continued. "I start relationships with missionaries or mission projects because of: (Check all that may apply)," lay, percent

	Lay									Not applicable
	In-person presentation by missionary	Prior relationships	Trusted recommendations	Direct contact from mission agency reps.	Promotional Material	Exposure at mission conferences	Exposure through social media and the Internet	Other	Advertisements	
All	36	33	20	14	14	12	8	6	2	38
Language										
English	36	34	20	15	14	12	8	6	2	37
French	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Bible Reading Frequency										
Daily	46	42	25	20	18	15	9	6	3	26
A few Xs a week	45	46	24	16	20	17	13	7	1	23
Once a week	35	32	21	12	10	20	3	7	0	37
1X or 2X a month	32	29	16	14	9	10	9	8	1	39
A few Xs a year	23	13	14	9	13	2	5	5	5	58
Seldom	11	13	9	5	2	1	1	6	2	67
Never	4	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	92
Religious Service Attend.										
More than 1X a wk.	45	42	27	19	17	17	9	6	4	25
Once a week or so	42	39	22	18	15	16	8	6	2	32
2-3 times a month	34	32	16	9	15	6	10	6	3	39
Once a month or so	29	22	17	16	14	7	9	8	1	39
1X or a few Xs a yr.	14	16	9	4	6	3	4	5	2	66
Church Size^b										
1 to 80	34	26	18	11	11	7	8	5	2	41
81 to 120	31	25	15	17	14	8	7	5	1	40
121 to 200	40	40	20	15	16	12	5	7	1	35
201 to 300	41	40	19	15	15	15	7	7	5	28
301 to 500	45	37	24	19	20	15	11	5	5	29
501 to 1,000	41	39	29	19	17	17	15	9	0	30
Over 1,000	46	48	31	19	15	28	9	4	6	29

^a Traditions and languages with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only 57 Restorationist, 33 Pietist/Free and 59 Anglican/Lutheran observations: Use with caution.

Table A10. “Our local church actively fosters conversations about the biblical basis of our missions engagement,” pastors, percent

	Pastors				
	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know
All	22	52	18	4	3
Generation					
Silent ^f	25	50	22	0	3
Boomers	24	51	15	5	4
Gen-X	19	56	19	4	2
Gen-Y	21	43	28	4	4
Setting					
Urban	24	53	16	4	3
Suburban	27	50	17	3	4
Rural	16	53	22	6	2
Region					
BC	31	51	12	3	3
AB	22	48	22	5	3
SK/MB	18	52	22	7	2
ON	23	52	17	4	3
QC	17	52	19	6	7
ATL	14	57	23	3	3
Gender					
Male	22	53	18	4	3
Female	24	47	17	5	7
Language					
English	22	52	18	4	3
French ^e	22	51	16	8	3

Table A10 continued on the next page.

Table A10 continued. “Our local church actively fosters conversations about the biblical basis of our missions engagement,” pastors, percent

	Pastors				
	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know
All	22	52	18	4	3
Tradition^a					
Anabaptist	19	52	23	5	1
Baptist	22	51	18	6	2
Holiness	29	43	21	3	4
Reformed ^g	18	39	34	8	0
Pent./Charis.	21	57	15	3	4
Restorationist ^g	18	67	12	0	3
Pietist/Free	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Anglican/Lutheran	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^g	10	72	5	3	10
Church Size^b					
1 to 80	19	51	19	5	6
81 to 120	22	52	21	4	1
121 to 200	18	54	21	6	1
201 to 300	27	50	20	3	0
301 to 500	24	56	14	3	2
501 to 1,000	39	44	11	5	2
Over 1,000	26	62	10	0	3

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations. Use with caution. ^e Only 37 French pastor observations. Use with caution. ^f Only 38 Silent Generation pastor observations. Use with caution. ^g Only 38 Reformed pastor observations, 33 Restorationist observations, and 39 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations. Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A11. "In the last 12 months, our local church held or helped organize a mission conference," lay and pastors, percent

	Lay				Pastors			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Applicable	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Applicable
All	29	33	34	4	24	74	1	-
Position in Local Church								
Lay Leader	36	49	12	4	-	-	-	-
No Lay Leadership Roll	28	31	37	4	-	-	-	-
Generation								
Silent ^f	29	35	29	7	17	81	3	-
Boomers	27	37	31	5	25	73	2	-
Gen-X	33	33	32	2	24	75	1	-
Gen-Y	28	30	39	3	25	74	1	-
Setting								
Urban	32	31	33	4	28	71	1	-
Suburban	28	34	36	2	23	75	2	-
Rural	24	42	28	7	21	78	1	-
Region								
BC	30	33	33	5	30	68	2	-
AB	26	35	36	4	29	70	1	-
SK/MB	38	33	24	5	24	76	0	-
ON	33	33	32	2	22	77	1	-
QC	21	37	40	3	28	70	2	-
ATL	18	33	42	7	16	82	1	-
Gender								
Male	33	33	31	3	25	74	1	-
Female	26	33	36	5	21	77	2	-
Language								
English	29	33	34	4	24	75	1	-
French ^e	^a	^a	^a	^a	39	61	0	-
Tradition^a								
Anabaptist	35	39	24	2	31	68	1	-
Baptist	31	34	32	3	24	75	1	-
Holiness	30	22	44	3	32	66	2	-
Reformed ^g	21	44	33	2	21	79	0	-
Pent./Charis.	29	33	34	3	20	78	2	-
Restorationist ^g	45	27	21	7	18	82	0	-
Pietist/Free ⁱ	41	19	41	0	^a	^a	^a	-
Anglican/Lutheran	24	34	38	3	^a	^a	^a	-
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^g	20	39	35	6	24	71	5	-

Table A11 continued on the next page.

Table A11 continued. "In the last 12 months, our local church held or helped organize a mission conference," lay and pastors, percent

	Lay				Pastors			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Applicable	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Applicable
All	29	33	34	4	24	74	1	-
Bible Reading Frequency								
Daily	32	39	23	5	-	-	-	-
A few times a week	33	38	26	3	-	-	-	-
Once a week	37	38	23	2	-	-	-	-
Once or twice a month	25	29	44	1	-	-	-	-
A few times a year	24	21	48	7	-	-	-	-
Seldom	24	22	51	3	-	-	-	-
Never	0	20	76	4	-	-	-	-
Religious Service Attendance								
More than once a wk.	34	42	17	6	-	-	-	-
Once a week or so	30	39	27	4	-	-	-	-
2-3 times a month	28	32	38	2	-	-	-	-
Once a month or so	37	18	44	2	-	-	-	-
Once or a few times a yr.	18	16	62	4	-	-	-	-
Church Size^b								
1 to 80	16	50	27	7	14	85	1	-
81 to 120	28	35	32	5	15	83	1	-
121 to 200	26	36	36	2	34	64	1	-
201 to 300	43	27	28	2	26	73	1	-
301 to 500	34	31	33	2	37	61	2	-
501 to 1,000	35	28	37	1	49	51	0	-
Over 1,000	59	19	20	1	46	51	2	-

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations: Use with caution. ^e Only 41 French pastor observations: Use with caution. ^f Only 37 Silent Generation pastor observations: Use with caution. ^g Only 39 Reformed pastor observations, 33 Restorationist observations, and 41 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations: Use with caution. ^h Only 32 Pietist/Free observations: Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table A12. "Our local church's children's program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada," lay and pastors, percent

	Lay						Pastors					
	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know	Not Applicable	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
All	13	27	10	8	34	9	18	37	16	8	6	15
Position in Local Church												
Lay Leader	22	33	12	9	15	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
No lay leadership roll	11	26	10	8	37	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Generation												
Silent ^f	14	27	8	4	33	15	16	38	14	3	8	22
Boomers	15	25	9	6	35	11	17	36	16	6	6	19
Gen-X	13	30	9	6	34	8	21	38	18	10	5	9
Gen-Y	9	25	13	13	33	7	10	35	11	16	12	16
Setting												
Urban	14	27	9	7	33	10	17	34	17	7	7	18
Suburban	12	27	11	9	33	9	19	41	16	9	6	9
Rural	11	27	12	8	32	10	18	37	14	9	6	17
Region												
BC	12	30	9	8	30	10	15	37	15	8	6	18
AB	8	28	12	11	31	10	20	44	12	5	7	12
SK/MB	14	31	11	3	32	8	15	39	13	9	10	14
ON	15	27	8	7	35	8	18	36	18	8	6	13
QC	9	10	14	3	45	18	21	35	16	5	4	19
ATL	10	21	13	10	36	10	22	29	15	12	3	19
Gender												
Male	13	29	12	8	29	10	18	38	17	8	6	14
Female	13	25	9	8	38	9	18	28	9	11	9	25
Language												
English	13	27	10	8	34	9	18	37	16	9	6	15
French ^e	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	20	32	22	2	0	24
Tradition^a												
Anabaptist	11	37	12	6	27	6	14	39	17	9	10	13
Baptist	12	25	14	8	34	7	17	36	19	10	6	11
Holiness	12	35	10	5	34	4	25	41	11	6	5	12
Reformed ^g	14	25	7	11	32	10	3	41	24	8	16	8
Pent./Charis.	20	23	9	5	35	9	20	36	14	6	5	18
Restorationist ^g	16	28	5	4	39	9	13	28	16	16	3	25
Pietist/Free ⁱ	16	44	3	0	22	16	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Anglican/Lutheran	10	14	10	12	39	15	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a	^a
Non-/Inter-Denom. ^g	8	20	6	13	36	17	13	39	5	8	5	29

Table A12 continued on the next page.

Table A12 continued. "Our local church's children's program includes an ongoing mission component focused on ministry outside of Canada," lay and pastors, percent

	Lay						Pastors					
	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know	Not Applicable	Str. Agree	Mod. Agree	Mod. Disagree	Str. Disagree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
All	13	27	10	8	34	9	18	37	16	8	6	15
Bible Reading Frequency												
Daily	20	26	8	6	28	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
A few times a week	13	37	11	8	25	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once a week	12	29	7	12	31	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once or twice a month	10	22	14	10	39	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
A few times a year	6	26	10	9	41	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seldom	4	17	12	7	47	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
Never	4	0	6	2	83	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Religious Service Attendance												
More than once a wk.	24	24	7	12	20	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once a week or so	13	29	11	8	33	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-3 times a month	9	37	14	8	24	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once a month or so	9	30	8	7	32	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once or a few Xs a yr.	4	13	11	4	59	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Church Size^b												
1 to 80	10	21	8	14	30	17	12	25	17	10	5	33
81 to 120	7	28	14	8	33	10	21	37	16	11	8	6
121 to 200	16	23	13	8	33	6	21	45	18	8	6	2
201 to 300	20	27	12	7	30	5	21	48	18	5	6	3
301 to 500	11	35	14	4	30	7	29	44	13	6	9	0
501 to 1,000	18	38	2	5	28	9	20	52	7	8	11	2
Over 1,000	20	36	7	6	27	4	24	56	12	0	5	2

^a Traditions, languages and trip lengths with fewer than 30 observations not shown. ^b Average weekly worship service attendance over the last 12 months. ^c Only for those who went on a short-term mission trip in the last 10 years. ^d Only 33 lay observations: Use with caution. ^e Only 41 French pastor observations: Use with caution. ^f Only 37 Silent Generation pastor observations: Use with caution. ^g Only 37 Reformed pastor observations, 32 Restorationist observations, and 38 Non-Denominational/Inter-Denominational observations: Use with caution. ^h Only 32 Pietist/Free observations: Use with caution. Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.