

**Non-Western Students in Majority World Asian Settings:
Understanding and Overcoming Barriers
Inherent in Cross-Cultural Teaching and Learning**

by Vee J. D-Davidson

Introduction

Theological education, as any spiritual quest, would like to be supracultural, but differing worldview beliefs and resulting cultural practices can easily limit a favourable outcome for theological training of non-western students in Majority World theological education settings. Engagement with concepts that are new to the student can be hindered when the concepts are presented in ways with which some Majority World settings are comfortable but which are unfamiliar to others. Self-awareness on the part of both teacher and student can make a crucial difference in the teaching and learning process. Similarly, the uniting potential of Pentecostalism's Spirit-awareness can be the starting point from which to facilitate courage to engage with new and creative ways of learning.

This chapter presents a variety of cultural orientations that can impinge on successful teaching and learning in multiple-culture¹ situations. It also offers transferable principles to facilitate awareness, understanding, and overcoming of such barriers.

Perceptions Related to Time

The schedule of any educational institution will invariably have classes arranged around some kind of time-table structure. Depending on their cultural background, new students will read the timetable. Some will intentionally arrive at the appointed start times while others arrive

¹I differentiate the terms 'multicultural' and 'multiple-culture' since the former can indicate the presence of people from multiple, but non mutually-respecting, cultures in contrast to the latter's nature of a setting with people from multiple cultures engaging with each other and showing mutual respect for each other's differing cultural perspectives. This also reflects the intercultural community to which our theological seminaries aspire.

at the classes in a manner coherent with their cultural norms. This may vary wildly from culture to culture, to the dismay of other students and even the teachers.²

Hall³ introduced the terms polychronic and monochronic time. Monochronism, a single-focus approach to time, views time as a linear progression of increments. Our monochronist students make definite plans so as to measure out how they intend to use those increments of time. They experience discomfort if interruptions prevent them from using time in the way they had planned. In contrast, polychronism takes a multiple perspective approach to time and our polychronist students are more concerned with time as the means by which multiple aspects of life, engagement with the world, and involvement in relationships all play out together.

What to the monochronist is an interruption and potential waste of time becomes for the polychronist just another aspect of life with no negative associations. For polychronists, time is not a series of linear increments to be guarded for best use but rather a collection of limitless opportunities to play one's part in the world regardless of how and when the way opens up.

The act of planning is different within these perceptions of time. Polychronic people plan on a macrolevel in line with seasonal needs such as planting and harvesting, with great flexibility in planning for other events. By contrast, monochronic people plan at microlevel and will intentionally include the minutiae of events on specific dates, at specific times, with far less flexibility.⁴ Our polychronic students may appear to be unreliable or even lazy to monochronists but they are living life according to the worldview with which they grew up.

Acknowledging that some cultures place more emphasis on careful expenditure of time whilst others emphasise quality of events, Lingenfelter and Mayers advise that neither approach is more godly. We need to acknowledge that God's approach to time is quite different from any of ours; no culture fully understands God's approach in terms of priorities or emphasis.⁵

²The material in this section is largely taken from Vee J.D.-Davidson, *Empowering Transformation: Transferable Principles for Intercultural Planting of Spiritually-Healthy Churches* (Oxford: Regnum International, 2018), 34-36. ISBN 9781912343713. Used by permission as are all further excerpts.

³Edward T. Hall. *The Silent Language* (New York: Doubleday, 1973), 153.

⁴A. S. Moreau, E. H. Campbell, and S. Greener, *Effective Intercultural Communication: A Christian Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014), 148-49.

⁵Sherwood G. Lingenfelter and Marvin K. Mayers, *Ministering Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Personal Relationships 2nd ed.* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003) 49-50.

Therefore, I would like to suggest that with God, the outworking of time and unfolding of activities harmonise perfectly. It is our responsibility as Pentecostal teachers and students to adapt appropriately and walk sensitively in step with the leading/leadership of his Holy Spirit.

We should also note that the extremes of the time versus event-orientation poles are best seen as the ends of a spectrum. Teachers and students of different cultures sit at different points on the spectrum. For instance, whereas both Filipino and Indonesian cultures are more event than time-oriented, they will differ in degree of orientation in relation to each other. Similarly, with Japanese culture being more time-oriented than Hong Kong culture, Japanese students are frustrated by their Hong Kong classmates that show even mildly less attention to punctuality. A class professor coming from a relatively higher level of time-orientation can also be frustrated by non-time-oriented tardy students. To resolve potential conflict and distress we can encourage new students (and, indeed, visiting faculty) to be aware of their own cultural preferences but to also engage with school timetabling in a way that will best facilitate God's purposes through the school community culture in relation to classes, chapel ministry and other school events.

We should be aware, as Pentecostals aiming to witness to the love and life-changing potential of Jesus, that Jesus was event-oriented in his personal life and ministry. This comes from the Jewish culture he was incarnated into. Yet his mission was also time-oriented, as appropriate for the fulfillment of God's plans. He did as, what, and when the Father told him.

For dealing with the difficulties resulting from orientation-preference difference,⁶ an appropriate means of motivation at a sufficient level for non-time-oriented students will help them to meet time demands. These students can be reminded of and motivated by their desire to succeed in studies without 'stealing' classmates' time, so that they follow time demands, such as refraining from tardiness on arrival for class as well as submitting course assignments on time. It can be helpful to have non-time-oriented students bear in mind that God (or even their school community) could have other equally important events for them to be involved in that day as well as their current engagement.

Time-oriented students can be motivated to participate in events by considering who they can meet and what God bring about at the event. Encourage them to talk and think more deeply about the benefits of attending the event (and while attending) to stay present, keeping their minds away from other ways they might use the time!

⁶This section cites D-Davidson, 64. Earlier parts of the following section cite D-Davidson, 49-50.

Communication: High-Context and Low-Context Cultural Interactions

Our students have now arrived at class. Class is underway but we must be aware how members of different cultures receive, understand, engage with, and respond to what is presented. Their reception of what the professor presents will vary from culture to culture and individual to individual. Appropriate presentation of information with students' cultural expectations in mind can make the important difference between confusion and understanding. Moreau et al. describe how

a low-context communication is one in which the meaning of what is being communicated lies in the explicit words used in the communication process . . . [so that] in low-context cultures, direct, verbal skills are valued, for the ability to give detailed, exacting information. By contrast, in high-context cultures, indirect, non-verbal skills are valued. . . . [NB] Even within a single culture, some people will be higher-context communicators than the average person in that culture and some will be lower-context communicators.⁷

Essentially, at stake are shared assumptions about how communications are understood in any particular culture. Unlike low-context communication cultures, high- or higher-context cultures will assume a common understanding beyond actual words used. They will expect a more comprehensive understanding of the range of facets related to behaviour. For instance, affirmative responses and resulting behaviour from students in our seminary who are low-context communicators from a low-level context culture will reflect that. Among students who are high-context communicators from a high-context culture, there is far less guarantee that their resulting behaviour will also reflect a previously-given affirmative response. In this case, we need to pay attention not so much to the actual meaning of the words that they used in the response but what the words they used might be expected to indicate in the wider picture of their cultural behaviours and beliefs.

Professors coming from high-context communication cultures in Asia may give assignment instructions that seem vague and imprecise to students from lower-context communication settings (such as Europe or North America). However, professors from low-context communication backgrounds may be frustrated when high-context communication

⁷Moreau et al., 129-31.

students do not appear to pay attention to the carefully listed details of course requirements.

We need to recognize that in relation to each other on a low-context communication to high-context communication spectrum, differences in degree of orientation also cause misunderstanding in communication, regardless of culture. Meyer⁸ suggests that the greatest potential for misunderstanding is not through communications between low- and high-context communicators but between high-context communicators who come from different high-context communication cultures. She suggests that each culture will have their own specific cultural clues and behavioural practices associated with ways of interacting beyond spoken words. The two parties will likely depend on their own culture-specific understanding of unspoken behavioural clues and misunderstand communications by the other party. Meyer further suggests that in multiple-culture settings, a low-context approach to communication and advising all members of the setting that this is the case, is the best way to reduce misunderstandings.⁹ As teachers who engage with students or faculty from multiple different cultural backgrounds, we must be aware of both our own cultural preferences in communication as well as those of our students and colleagues.

Teaching Method: Principles First or Application First?

In addition to paying attention to context in communication, teachers also need to be aware of their presentation. Teaching and learning preferences for the presentation of material differ from culture to culture. In some cultures, students are accustomed to being given principles, followed by the application of the principles. Other cultures focus on application before dealing with underlying principles. Storytelling cultures will first tell a story containing principles to be taught and then bring out important principles from the story. This contrasts with teaching styles that present principles, followed by illustrations or means of applying the principles.

Giving the story or application first follows an inductive approach to learning whilst beginning with principles takes more of a deductive approach. Teachers can best help their students into understanding when they are aware of which approach is more likely to appeal to the students. With a multiple-culture class, it will be all the more important for the teacher to recognise that different students might be more accustomed to

⁸Erin Meyer, *The Culture Map: Breaking Through the Invisible Boundaries of Global Business* (Philadelphia: Perseus Books, 2014), 55.

⁹Ibid.

one approach than the other. They should vary the delivery of material using diverse approaches.

Students who will become pastors and teachers in storytelling¹⁰ settings should also be advised:

Despite much of the Bible being in narrative form, believers will still need to be exposed to scripture beyond the storytelling scriptures, and leaders taught to understand and preach scriptures from all the Bible genres, including New Testament didactic forms (influenced as they are by the Greek empire's philosophical and logic-based linear flow of thought), poetry, wisdom literature, and prophetic texts if they are to minister and reproduce Bible literacy and familiarity in a way that will be sustainable in the long term.¹¹

While becoming familiar with our students and aware of their teaching and learning backgrounds, teachers must take responsibility for clear communication. Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter encourage that “the teacher, who has the authority to define the classroom experience, must take responsibility for creating a context that bridges cultural differences . . . [and] create[s] a learning context that is familiar to students yet stretches them beyond their previous experiences.”¹²

Differing Perceptions Related to Thinking Processes and Engagement with Concepts

Lingenfelter and Mayers describe how dichotomistic thinkers tend to consider issues in black and white terms. They “reduce each option or aspect as right or wrong, or, good or bad.”¹³ In contrast, holist thinkers factor multiple variables into their judgements and are more comfortable with ‘gray’ areas.

Like the monochronic versus polychronic orientations, personality as well as culture factors into the preferred orientation and degree of orientation of individual students.¹⁴ Similarly, adult maturity and development of spiritual maturity can also affect choices. Regarding the

¹⁰See for instance Tom A. Steffen, *Passing the Baton: Church Planting that Empowers 2nd ed.* (La Habra, CA: Center for Organizational and Ministry Development, 1999), 59.

¹¹D-Davidson, 163.

¹²Judith E. Lingenfelter and Sherwood G. Lingenfelter *Teaching Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Learning and Teaching* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 52.

¹³Lingenfelter and Mayers, 53.

¹⁴The material in this section draws from D-Davidson, 36-37.

monochromic/polychronic orientation, advancing age influences perception. Older students may see new priorities substituted for earlier priorities. For instance, the dichotomist's need to 'always be right' may become less important.

Similarly, with spiritual development¹⁵ and increasing Christ-likeness, one can anticipate 'growing up and growing out of unhealthy dichotomistic judgmentalism or the holists' seeming unwillingness to commit themselves. In addition, committing oneself to a position that pleases God but which does not reflect the expected cultural norm can also be evidence of growth in spiritual maturity in the journey of life.¹⁶

Teachers must help our students become aware, not only of their own culture's big-picture cultural preferences and their individual personal preferences, but also those of their classmates. This can increase the level of intercultural competence and mutual love and respect within the seminary setting.

In handling differences,¹⁷ be aware that dichotomists tend to perceive issues in black and white (as already mentioned), and may judge their opposites as lacking principles and being inconsistent. On the other hand, holists tend to see issues in terms of gray with no completely right or wrong response. They may view their opposites as legalistic and callous. Faculty can urge students to beware of judging others on the basis of their own perceptions. In getting to know a person, students can form an opinion with graciousness and mindful love. Equally, "left brain analyticism and right brain creativity were designed to function together."¹⁸ As members of the body of Christ, whether we are teachers communicating with students or facilitators working with learners, we must seek to foster mutual learning for fruitful life and ministry beyond the classroom.

Teachers, consciously or subconsciously, reflect their orientation preference through the way they try to present information and new ideas in class. Younger students infrequently receive what is taught without questioning the content. Adult students, with more information, experience, and broader perceptions of life and possibilities, might also be accustomed to questioning what is presented. These adult students may desire to question what is presented in terms of black/white issues in order to investigate alternative 'gray area' possibilities, or vice versa.

¹⁵See J.W. Fowler, *Becoming Adult, Becoming Christian: Adult Development and Christian Faith* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000), and F. Oser and P. Gmünder, *Religious Judgment: A Developmental Approach* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1991).

¹⁶See S. R. Misar, *Journey to Authenticity: Discovering Your Spiritual Identity through the Seasons of Life* (Cape Coral, FL: Master Press, 2010).

¹⁷This section draws from D-Davidson, 64-65.

¹⁸Lingenfelter and Mayers, 56.

This can be reflected in their cultural perceptions of what is appropriate power distance, a concept to which we turn next.

Power Distance and Role and Status in Relation to Social Power

Social power is present in all levels of society from the family unit upwards. “In every society or communal grouping there are liable to be some members who are richer and are able to take advantage of opportunities that are not available to those who are poorer. The power that access to such advantage brings is also a means of control.”¹⁹

Hofstede introduces this important facet of a society’s rules of social engagement and interaction as ‘power distance’. He defines it as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally.”²⁰ Large, or high, power distance cultures expect members of society to respect the hierarchical structure of society by showing the expected level of respect for those with higher levels of authority. Titles make clear where authority lies and what kind of behaviour is expected towards such title-holders. In high power distance settings, the teaching and learning model will see a preference for lectures since personal interaction between teachers and students is neither expected nor encouraged.²¹ Not surprisingly, the extremes of high power distance cultures include those with a background that acknowledges the strict hierarchy of Confucianism, such as China, Korea, and Japan.

In contrast, low or small power distance cultures, typically western cultures, reflect values that prefer equality and mutual respect regardless of a person’s title and position in society. Teaching and learning models in these cultures welcome interaction and discussion in classes. Students may publicly challenge or disagree with the teacher figure,²² but this should always be with a respectful attitude in line with the associated and inculcated worldview beliefs. The teacher may be holding ultimate authority and power but this may not be so obvious to the observer.

Difficulties can occur in multiple-culture class settings when students and/or teachers are unaware of the different cultural expectations related to power distance. Students from high power distance cultures are likely to be uncomfortable in settings where students from low power distance cultures challenge or appear to

¹⁹D-Davidson, 45-46.

²⁰Geert Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991), 46.

²¹Moreau et al., 166.

²²Ibid., 167.

disagree with the teacher figure. Similarly, students from a lower power distance culture may find a higher power distance class environment both restrictive and frustrating.

Trying to project one's own cultural power distance preference into the classroom setting will be helpful for students with a similar preference. However, it may act as 'noise'²³ to others and drastically reduce effectiveness in teaching. In addition,

Power distance not only differentiates between those with more power and those with less power, and sets the understood rules for interaction, but it also affects the social distance between members of a society and so also dictates the rules of social interaction. In small power distance settings, casual interaction with superiors is considered the norm . . . [whereas] The greater the power distance of a culture, the less likely are members to interact casually in social settings with those who are considered to be at the opposite end of the power spectrum.²⁴

This can have major implications for interaction between our class members from the same high power distance cultural background who are from different levels of society (e.g. one is a high level pastor but another is a church member devoid of status or role). Interacting together in class discussions or at seminary fellowship events may not come easily. Our role as teachers and learning-facilitators in any setting is best served by seeking to heighten dignity amongst ourselves and our students. We recognise, affirm, and model that before God, we are all equal in status and role as his beloved children.

Individualism versus Collectivism

Some students will be accustomed to independence and learning on their own whilst students from other cultures will find greater security through interdependence and working in groups. The difference may be influenced by the degree to which our students have grown up in either individualist or collectivist settings.²⁵

Moreau et al. describe how individualism and collectivism are different vehicles for describing the self. In "individualistic countries,

²³See D-Davidson, 47: "Communication theory describes anything that detracts from successful communication as 'noise'." See also David, J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communications, 2nd Ed.* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1991), 52.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵Preference can also be influenced by the degree to which a student has either an extrovert or introvert personality.

there is an interest in ‘self-image, self-reliance, self-awareness’ . . . while collectivists [are] members of a group and share its goals.”²⁶ However, in today’s global-village age there are likely to be very few societies that follow the far extremes of either collectivism or individualism. Individuals in any setting have familial links and mutual obligations whether geographically near or far. Conversely, even for people living in the most extreme degree of collectivism, there will be occasions when individuals will make decisions for themselves with little or no need to observe collectivist principles.

On teaching in multicultural contexts, Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter urge teachers in multicultural contexts to ask their students what common communications would work for them as a group. They affirm that “teachers cannot possibly teach to all the potential differences [in a classroom setting] but they can become more culturally sensitive to the diversity of their students. One of the most important things they can do is explain the context of what they are doing and make their teaching techniques explicit.”²⁷ For instance, teachers can facilitate new ways of teaching and learning by introducing a mixture of group activities and individual assignments.

From my own multiple-culture class experiences, collectivist-background students accustomed to lectures are also unused to experiential learning. When introduced to it, along with more individualist-like learning through small group activity, they quickly find their feet. Learning is especially fast when they are made aware of how the personality facets of introversion and extraversion can affect group dynamics. Similarly, students who have grown up with an individualistic learning mentality can discover for themselves through group activity the reality of more and differing perspectives. This gives them a greater pool of knowledge from which to solve problems. They become able to recognise the truth of the body of students being more than the mere sum of its parts, and gain a deeper appreciation of differences. This also helps them value the mutuality and inclusivity of all members of the Body of Christ.

For our students, discovering approaches to teaching and learning different than the style they grew up with can be liberating for learning. It also serves to enlarge their perceptions of the value and importance of intercultural diversity in learning together.

²⁶Moreau et al., 154-155 with reference to D.W. Klopf, *Intercultural Encounters: The Fundamentals of Intercultural Communication*. 5th ed. (Englewood, CO: Morton, 2001) and G. Fujino, “Towards a Cross-Cultural Identity of Forgiveness,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (2009): 22-28.

²⁷Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter, 57.

Patron-Client Relationships and Social Power

Moreau et al. describe how social power can be considered to be

a type of capital that is used as an exchange mechanism within a society . . . just as people are attracted to money and try to accumulate it, they are also attracted to social power and try to accumulate it. People who have social power and can control distribution of it in some way (granting favors, naming people to positions of social power) . . . are referred to as patrons. Those who come under their power are called clients, resulting in what is called a patron-client system.²⁸

Apart from the patron-client relationship that is inevitable with familial ties, people with lower social power can seek to establish a patron-client relationship with someone of higher social power. As with the building of any functional relationships, the potential client will likely have some kind of underlying agenda; the potential patron will likely also first weigh up the potential value of permitting such a relationship. Any patron-client relationship brings with it mutually understood obligations and responsibilities, which Tino describes as a “friendship with strings.”²⁹

All cultures employ some kind of patron-client relationship mechanism with differing degrees of subtlety. Cultures also have their own understandings of power distance and how roles, such as those of teacher and learner, are expected to be played out.³⁰ Teachers and students will be aware of the patron-client obligations and expectations of their background culture, at least subconsciously. Difficulties and conflicts come when one or other party assumes their own understanding is also the rule outside of the setting of their background culture.

In many cultures, gift-giving can be a means of initiating a subtle obligation or expectation of some kind of response. When students give their teachers gifts, the desire may be subtly more than showing appreciation of the teacher. Rather the student may want to initiate patron-client obligations from the teacher. Moreau et al. note that “this relationship is always negotiable, and either may pull away or seek to revise the relationship,”³¹ but this will always be done in a way that

²⁸Moreau et al., 170-171.

²⁹James Tino, “A Lesson from Jose: Understanding the Patron/Client Relationship,” *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 44, no.3 (2008): 322.

³⁰Much of this section comes from D-Davidson, 48-49.

³¹Moreau et al., 171.

preserves honor. The potential patron's choice to receive or refuse the potential client's relationship-building initiative must communicate in a way that provides a clear meaning for both parties in their cultural context whether through words or actions. Therefore, it is necessary for teachers and students away from their home cultures to be able to understand and correctly interpret such behavioural cues.

Teachers and students in new cultural settings must identify the implications and underlying rationale of the relationships they see played out and those into which they are invited. Some students come from a culture in which the teacher, as patron, is also expected to be a parental figure. There can be mutual frustration when these students do not see their teachers' own culturally-cued actions and behaviours reciprocated with a parent-like care. Equally, for those facing different cultural expectations without awareness of these expectations, there can be frustration due to what might appear to be a naïve lack of adult maturity on the part of the students.

Expectations of teacher, learner, and teacher as learner can be crippled when misunderstanding exists concerning differing cultural patron-client obligations. In settings where the student's achievement (or lack thereof) has wider social implications in relation to maintaining honour of both the student and the student's wider family, missing the cultural expectation clues has the potential to alienate on a long-term basis.

Honor, Guilt, and Shame

Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter advise that in honor-honoring societies, "the student's quest for learning and achievement is directly linked to the honor and expectations of the family. Students from eastern cultures do not share this collective burden."³² Whilst this might be seen as a rather simplistic perspective on students from western cultures, teachers do well to recognise and value the differing beliefs related to honor, guilt, and shame in different cultures.

Advances in the literature concerned with guilt and shame somewhat dichotomistically link guilt with western cultures and shame with Asian cultures.³³ Shame is associated with the concept of losing face, common in Asian cultures. It causes dishonor to the wider family, beyond any discomfort to the individual who has lost face. More recent literature broadens the range and links guilt with western cultures and shame with African, Asian, and South American cultures, i.e. guilt with the Global North and shame with the Global South.

³²Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter, 72.

³³Much of this section borrows from D-Davidson, 42-43.

Arbitrarily labelling individual cultures as either a guilt culture or a shame culture (which often happens in the literature) does not do sufficient justice to differing behaviour rationales. It is probably more helpful to recognise that all cultures have a place for *both* guilt and shame but that each culture may have a greater tendency towards either the guilt or shame end of the spectrum. When in doubt, rather than trying to engage with either guilt or shame when resolving areas of cross-cultural misunderstanding, contention, or conflict, addressing areas where *regret* has arisen might be more helpful.

For students who experience unfulfilled patron-client expectations in anticipated (but not achieved) academic success, teachers can direct their attention to God's desires of faithfulness in study and individual giftings. Even with family honor at stake, regardless of supposedly accrued obligation in terms of a student's hoped-for academic success, a teacher cannot put into the student, or make up for, what God has left out. As teachers we are also on-going learners in God's eternal purposes and can be his vehicles for compassionate empathy.

Conclusion

Widened understanding of cross-cultural barriers to teaching and learning on the part of theological educators can influence an entire student body and deepen students' perceptions. Wider understanding of cross-cultural barriers to teaching and learning helps faculty and students alike to heighten the reality of 'unity in diversity'. In the power of the Spirit, each member is called to live out the wonder of Pentecostalism's intercultural Christ-like commonality. This not only facilitates the means for individual and corporate spiritual growth; it also has the potential to bring a vibrant and living witness to the reality of the uniting love of Christ into the theological institution's community at large.

Bibliography

- D-Davidson, Vee J. *Empowering Transformation: Transferable Principles for Intercultural Planting of Spiritually-Healthy Churches*. Oxford: Regnum, 2018.
- Fowler, J.W. *Becoming Adult, Becoming Christian: Adult Development and Christian Faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Fujino, G. "Towards a Cross-Cultural Identity of Forgiveness." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (2009): 22-28.
- Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language*. New York: Doubleday, 1973.
- Hesselgrave, David J. *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communications, 2nd Ed.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991.
- Hofstede, Geert. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1991.
- Klopf, D.W. *Intercultural Encounters: The Fundamentals of Intercultural Communication. 5th ed.* Englewood, CO: Morton, 2001.
- Lingenfelter, Judith E. and Lingenfelter, Sherwood G. *Teaching Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Learning and Teaching*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Lingenfelter, Sherwood G. and Mayers, Marvin K. *Ministering Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Personal Relationships 2nd ed.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Meyer, Erin. *The Culture Map: Breaking Through the Invisible Boundaries of Global Business*. Philadelphia, PA: Perseus Books, 2014.
- Misar, S. R. *Journey to Authenticity: Discovering Your Spiritual Identity through the Seasons of Life*. Cape Coral, FL: Master Press, 2010.
- Moreau, A.S., Campbell, E. H., and S. Greener. *Effective Intercultural Communication: A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Oser, F. and Gmünder, P., *Religious Judgment: A Developmental Approach*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1991.
- Steffen, Tom. A. *Passing the Baton: Church Planting that Empowers 2nd ed.* La Habra, CA: Center for Organizational and Ministry Development. 1999.
- Tino, James. "A Lesson from Jose: Understanding the Patron/Client Relationship." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 44, no.3 (2008): 322-27.