CHAPTER 4

THEORETICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

The purpose of this project is to raise the cross-cultural competence of select Cityview Baptist Church members who are leading cross-culturally. The theoretical presuppositions undergirding this project address the idea that learning involves change on four levels—the head, the heart, the hands, and the home. The project is designed to facilitate change. I am aiming specifically for change that will increase the fruitfulness and faithfulness of developing cross-cultural leaders. Intercultural training material indicates that there are several responsibilities for trainers, teachers, or mentors. Michael Paige and Judith Martin have identified five responsibilities:

1. To help learners understand the dynamics of cultural intervention and change agentry.

2. To promote learner awareness of culture-bound and unconscious patterns of belief and behavior.

3. To promote changes in the existing patterns of learner behavior if they will be maladaptive in the new culture.

4. To provide opportunities for learners to gain skills in identifying and helping others change their maladaptive behaviors.

5. To provide opportunities for leaders to become responsible for their own choices and to help others become responsible for theirs.[98]

---

[98] R. Michael Paige and Judith N. Martin, "Ethics in Intercultural Training," *Handbook of Intercultural Training, 2nd Edition*, Dan Landis and Rabi S. Bhagat, editors (London: Sage Publications, 1996), 39.

The three presuppositions that form my theoretical approach seek to take these responsibilities and posit a unified strategy for the development of emerging cross-cultural leaders in the urban multicultural context of Cityview Baptist Church.

The first theoretical presupposition develops the assumption that a teacher can aid the developing leader's growth through the acquisition and processing of knowledge. The teacher seeks to address the question, "What does the cross-cultural leader need to know?" The second presupposition deals with the leader's need for a growth context. The trainer must address the issue of "What does a cross-cultural leader need to do?" I believe the multicultural leadership context of each participant provides a place for experience outside of a classroom setting that both raises the urgency for new skills and allows them to cultivate new skills. Small groups and ministry teams are settings of intentionality that provide "safe" environments for risk and therefore growth. Finally, the third presupposition is that a mentor will aid the developing cross-cultural leader by facilitating personal reflection for the integration of knowledge and experience into wisdom. Mentoring is part of the strategy for addressing the questions of heart and home—"What does the cross-cultural leader need to be?" and "Who does the cross-cultural leader know?"[99]

Teaching leaders about culture assists them in leading cross-culturally.

Teachers have the opportunity to accelerate a leader's learning process. For the leader who is already immersed in a cross-cultural setting and role, a teacher can help the leader gain an edge for effectiveness. I believe a teacher has a three-pronged task: first,

---

[99] These learning need questions are more thoroughly explored in Appendix C, The Learning Needs of an Emerging Cross-Cultural Leader.

to transfer a body of knowledge; second, to equip the students with clues for processing and gathering of information; and third, to engage the students in the application of that body of knowledge into their lives. I have been influenced by the teaching philosophy of Bruce Wilkinson. Wilkinson believes that "teachers are responsible to cause students to learn."[100] Because teachers ultimately control the subject, the style, and themselves as the speaker, they are responsible. Therefore, a teacher's success is judged by the success of the teacher's students. In Wilkinson's philosophy of teaching, the impact of teachers on students is mitigated "more by their character and commitment than by their communication."[101] The bottom line for Wilkinson is that teachers "exist to serve their students."[102]

As a teacher of adults, I must consider the learning style of the adults I will be teaching.[103] From an andragogical perspective, I am assuming that the learners are primarily self-motivated; if they are aware of the need, they will want to learn. I am also assuming that adult learners prefer a participatory learning atmosphere in which they are safe to engage both information and people; thus, it is important to remove ambiguity regarding expectations of the participants so that the possibility of embarrassment is reduced. Finally, I am assuming that adult learners want to make immediate connections

---

[100] Bruce Wilkinson, *The 7 Laws of the Learner: How to Teach Almost Anything To Practically Anyone, textbook edition* (Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Press, 1992), 29. Wilkinson draws his philosophy from the Hebrew word "to learn;" from the same root in the *piel* form we get the word "to teach" which literally is "to cause to learn."

[101] Ibid., 38.

[102] Ibid., 39.

[103] Russell D. Robinson, "Andragogy vs. Pedagogy, ", *Training Know-How for Cross-Cultural and Diversity Trainers,* L. Robert Kohls and Herbert L. Brussow, editors (Duncanville, Texas: Adult Learning Systems, Inc., 1995), 63. "Andragogy" is "the art and science of helping adults learn" while "pedagogy" is the art and science of teaching children.

between information and day-to-day life; they want to put knowledge and skills to work.[104]

If I am to "cause learning," I need to know not only how adults learn but, also, how they prefer to learn. In a multicultural context this becomes quite complex because of different learning expectations regarding a deductive approach or an inductive approach. The deductive approach is information centered and moves from the specific to the general; it tends to be teacher and lecture driven. The inductive approach is process centered and moves from general to specific; the facilitator draws out information from the students and helps them process its implications. "Besides the United States, inductive is *in* only in England, Canada, Australia, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. In other words, it seems to be a markedly Anglo-Saxon characteristic. All the rest of the world prefers the deductive approach! That's about 180 countries to 8!"[105] Robert Kohls suggests that part of the challenge for an adult multicultural teaching context is that Bloom's Taxonomy which informs the inductive approach is not shared by the deductive approach and the rest of the world.[106] He says that most students around the world never go beyond "comprehension," while most North American grade six students are developing "application" and "analysis" skills. He writes, "Adult foreigners are not dumb. They have simply never had the experience of applying factual data in the

[104] Clive C. Veri and T.A. Vonder Haar, "Characteristics of Adult Learners," *Training Know-How for Cross-Cultural and Diversity Trainers*, L. Robert Kohls and Herbert L. Brussow, editors (Duncanville, Texas: Adult Learning Systems, Inc., 1995), 65.

[105] L. Robert Kohls, "Carrying American-Designed Training Overseas," *Training Know-How for Cross-Cultural and Diversity Trainers*, L. Robert Kohls and Herbert L. Brussow, editors (Duncanville, Texas" Adult Learning Systems, Inc., 1995), 52.

[106] Ibid. Kohls cites Bloomberg's Taxonomy of educational objectives. The 6 levels of learning from the bottom-up are: Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation.

multiple ways we Americans do every day of our lives. And you can't take people who are comfortable only with the first level and barely conversant with the second level, and suddenly throw them into the fifth or sixth level and expect them to survive in it."[107] In response to this challenge, Kohls, has designed a progression model that engages the students in multiple learning methods designed to move them up the Bloom's Taxonomy to the stages of synthesis and evaluation.[108]

1. Lectures
2. Lectures followed by Question and Answer Sessions
3. Whole-Group Discussions
4. Small Group Discussions (with groups of four) and Reporting Back to the Full Session
5. Discussion Based on Agree-Disagree Statements
   (with small groups assigned the task of coming to consensus)
6. Case Studies (emphasizing multiple acceptable solutions
   rather than one "right" one)
7. Single-Solution (programmed) Case Studies
8. Role Plays (starting with non-threatening scenarios
   and moving to increasingly more threatening ones)

My burden as the teacher and trainer of this multicultural group is to help them learn. I will have to balance inductive and deductive teaching methods. It is my intention to adjust the learning methods used throughout the course to assist my multicultural participants in the application of different learner skills.[109]

---

[107] Ibid., 53.

[108] Ibid.

[109] James E. Plueddemann expresses a recognition of this learning style challenge in the training of missionaries according to the culture of origin. He evaluates their learning needs according to whether or not the trainee is from a "low context" culture—like the United States or a "high context" culture—like Africa. "Low context students will prefer the kind of teaching that integrates ideas with ideas. They will prefer teachers who don't force their ideas on students or demand meaningless rote memory. They will not be impressed by the teacher's formal credentials or experience if the teacher is not able to challenge them to think…. High context students respect the formal credentials of the teacher and will be interested in receiving formal credit for the course… They will be willing to work together and will never forget the friendships made while in training. They are respectful of the teacher and cooperative with each other. They are interested in the practical and personal benefits the course will have for them." James E.

Underneath all of what I am doing as a teacher in this context is the assumption that it does make a difference. I have had to ask, "Does teaching make a difference in cross-cultural competence?" The emerging material in the education, business, and missionary training sectors seems to suggest that it does make a difference. When the training moves people through processes aimed at changing their attitudes, knowledge and skills, people can become less ethnocentric, more bi-cultural or culturally adept, and more appreciative of other-culture people and their cultural strengths.[110] In the past forty years, intercultural training as a field of study and training moved from a purely cognitive approach—focusing on culture specific studies, to a process approach—focusing on teaching people how to learn. In the last fifteen years, it has taken middle ground, making use of both approaches.[111]

Attribution training is one example of the mix between the two approaches. In attribution training members of one culture are trained to make interpretations of behaviour as the members of another culture commonly would.[112] Through the use of "intercultural sensitizers," participants are exposed to scenarios and critical situations illustrating interactions with the other-culture group. In a two-culture discussion afterwards, the facilitator aims at drawing out each group's observations of the events and situations described so that specific cultural expectations can be discovered. A

Plueddemann, "Culture, Learning and Missionary Training," *Internationalising Missionary Training: A Global Perspective*, edited by William David Taylor (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1991), 227-228.

[110] Ibid., 53-54.

[111] Ibid., 57.

[112] Rosita D. Albert and Harry C. Triandis, "Intercultural Education for Multicultural Societies: Critical Issues," *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, edited by Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter, fifth edition (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982), 381.

development of the "intercultural sensitizer" has been the "culture-general assimilator."

It has evolved out of the growing recognition that many people are regularly engaging in

cross-cultural encounters. Again, stories and scenarios are used, but they are used to

prepare people for the *kinds of experiences* they may have in encountering any culture

different from their own. The development of cross-cultural competence has been shown

to be quite successful with this approach. [113]

The empirical research I have reviewed suggests that training does help people

develop cross-cultural competence. [114] However, the training itself is not an excellent

predictor of cross-cultural competence. The movement of people out of ethnocentric

patterns of thinking and action takes time, and for some, it is so distressing that they

retreat back into their familiar cultural world. A benefit of my context is that the value of

multiculturalism, shared in differing degrees by all the participants, contributes to more

cross-cultural ease. [115] These participants by virtue of their affiliation with a multicultural

---

[113] Kenneth Cushner and Dan Landis, "The Intercultural Sensitizer," *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, 2nd Edition, edited by Dan Landis and Rabi S. Bhagat (London: Sage Publications, 1996), 188.

[114] Rabi S. Bhagat and Kristin O. Prien, "Cross-Cultural Training in Organizational Contexts" *Handbook of Intercultural Training, 2nd Edition*, edited by Dan Landis and Rabi S. Bhagat (London: Sage Publications, 1996), 216-230. One example of the research surveys available: Bhagat and Prien explore research evaluating the success of several different cross-cultural training models and the variables influencing "success."

[115] Fathi S. Yousef, "Human Resource Management: Aspects of Intercultural Relations in U.S. Organizations," *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, edited by Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter, fifth edition (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982), 180-181. Yousef believes that an effective training program does not have to major on the many cultures of the world, but may need to simply help the participant understand their own culture and its place in the world. As evidence of this Yousef sites four helpful assumptions of successful managers in a multicultural setting from a four year study of 1000 managers: "**Heterogeneity**—The Image of Cultural Pluralism. We are not all the same; there are many culturally different groups in society. **Similarity and Differences**—They are not just like me. Many people are culturally different from me. Most people have both cultural similarities and differences compared to me. **Equifinality**—Our way is not the only way. There are many culturally distinct ways of reaching the same goal or of living one's life. **Cultural Contingency**—Our way is one possible way. There are many other different and equally good ways to reach the same goal. The best way is contingent on the culture of the people involved. Yousef gathers these observations from Adler, N.

church are what Nina Boyd Krebs would call "edgewalkers:" people who have to some extent learned to expand their tolerance for internal paradox, and therefore have expanded their ability to relate to people different than themselves.[116] Having drawn this conclusion about my participants, it is important to note however, that all of the people these leaders are working with in their ministry contexts do not have as much ease in cross-cultural encounters; their "followers" are further back from the edge.

Culturally diverse ministry teams and small groups provide leaders a safe place for growth in cross cultural leadership.

My second theoretical presupposition highlights the need for adult learners to have a context in which they may apply what they are learning. If there is no application and subsequent reinforcement of knowledge and skills, it is thought that the sought after behaviour will not become habitual and any lasting change is, therefore, minimal.[117] In fact, we may question whether learning has really occurred. James' wisdom applies; "Be a doer of the word, not a hearer only" (James 2:22). Small groups and ministry teams provide a safe context for cross-cultural leadership development for several reasons.

The first is that within the group some shared values and a shared purpose have already been established. There is already a degree of alignment with the Cityview

---

"Domestic Multiculturalism: Cross-Cultural Management in the Public Sector." *Handbook of Organizational Management*, edited by W. Eddy (New York: Marcel Deker, Inc., 1983), 486.

[116] Nina Boyd Krebs, *Edgewalkers: Defusing Cultural Boundaries on the New Global Frontier* (Far Hills, New Jersey: New Horizon Press, 1999), xii.

[117] Russell D. Robinson, "Some Principles of Adult Learning," *Training Know-How for Cross-Cultural and Diversity Trainers*, L. Robert Kohls and Herbert L. Brussow, editors (Duncanville, Texas: Adult Learning Systems, Inc., 1995), 61. "Learning that is applied immediately is retained longer and is more subject to immediate use than that which is not. Therefore, techniques must be employed that encourage the immediate application of any material in a practical way."

values that inform the ministry at Cityview.[118] As well, each group will know their specific purpose or task—their reason for being. My project design asks participants to lead their small group or ministry team to plan and implement a new ministry project together. My interest in the ministry context is not just the task but also the quality of the participants' relationships.

The second reason small groups and ministry teams are a safe place for the growing cross-cultural leader, is that she or he will have a context of trust from which to gain courage to lead. I intend to make the participation of these leaders in the course public knowledge within the church and within their ministry contexts. In this way, everyone may share in the learning process and trust will be reinforced in congregational life. Nurturing that culture of trust will enable these leaders to inquire and explore cultural differences without risking the relationship if they offend someone.[119]

The third reason that the small groups and ministry teams are a safe place for growing as a cross-cultural leader is that some participants will learn best while "on the job" and in the context of a group. They prefer to learn on the go.[120] They are relational learners. The ministry context is approached intentionally not just as the place of

---

[118] See Cityview Baptist Church Values and Mission in Appendix B.

[119] Pat MacMillian, *The Performance Factor: Unlocking the Secrets of Teamwork* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2001), 141. MacMillian uses the common metaphor of the bank account "to describe the dynamic nature of trust in a relationship. Assume you are a new member of a team. Because trust is really lent to another, picture yourself as a bank, a bank in which the other team members can decide to make deposits (that is lend you their trust) and withdrawals. As a new team member, you need to convince every other team member to make trust deposits in you to build up a positive balance. Over time, no matter how reliable and competent you are, you will make mistakes and the team members will make withdrawals. If, however you have established and maintain a sufficient balance, some withdrawals can be made without endangering the relationship needed for effective teaming."

[120] James E. Plueddemann, "Culture, Learning and Missionary Training," 227-228.

application but the place of learning. In the Western learning context this component is sometimes neglected. For example, the African learning style requires that teachers spend less time giving lectures and more time in dialogue with their students on ministry excursions. Teaching is mobile and situational; learning is defined for the teacher and the students by their immediate context.[121] I am not going to accompany my participants into their ministry context. However, the teaching sessions will provide some supervised cross-cultural experiences, and the mentoring sessions will provide guided exploration of their leadership.

Regular monitoring and conversation with a mentor assists emerging cross-cultural leaders in their growth.

My final theoretical presupposition is the third aspect of my strategy for developing cross-cultural leaders and raising their cross-cultural competence. The emerging cross-cultural leader needs to be taught, to have a context for putting information and skills into practice, and to have a mentoring relationship. Robert Clinton provides a detailed definition of mentoring. He writes, "Mentoring is a relational process, in which someone who knows something, the mentor, transfers that something (the power resources such as wisdom, advice, information, emotional support, protection, linking to resources, career guidance, status) to someone else, the mentoree, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development."[122]

---

[121] David Harley, *Preparing to Serve: Training for Cross-Cultural Mission* (Pasadena, California: World Evangelical Fellowship, 1995), 98-99.

[122] Robert Clinton and Richard Clinton, *The Mentor Handbook: Detailed Guidelines and Helps for Christian Mentors and Mentorees* (Altadena, California: Barnabas Publishers, 1991), 2-3.

Robert Clinton has identified nine types of mentoring divided into three categories. His first category, which includes three types of active mentoring relationships, provides the most help in understanding the type of mentoring relationship I am pursing with the project participants. The "discipler" is a mentor that enables a person "in the basics of following Christ." The "spiritual guide" is a mentor that provides "accountability for spirituality and spiritual disciplines for growth and maturity." The "coach" is a mentor that provides motivation, skills, and the insight for application of skills necessary to fulfill a task.[123] My intent is to serve as a coach for cross-cultural leadership during the project. However, like any excellent coach I am interested not simply in what they *do,* but also, *who* they are. The primary objective of the coaching relationship in this course will be the application of skills and behaviour congruent with cross-cultural leadership.

Though the purpose of these mentoring relationships is defined, the content of the meetings is not scripted. Content is more scripted in the teaching sessions. In the mentoring session however, the mentoree provides the script. Frederic M. Hudson notes that experienced coaches "don't direct the content of discussion or impose a prearranged agenda;" however, they "do direct the structure and process of the session (focus the conversation, the time constraints, the rules of the tribe) and the process issues

---

[123] Ibid., 2-23. The second category is the occasional mentoring relationship. It includes: the counselor who gives "timely advice, and correct perspectives on viewing self, others, and ministry;" the teacher who provides knowledge and understanding of a particular subject; and the sponsor who provides "career guidance and protections as the leader moves upward in an organization. The third type of mentoring are passive mentor relationships. Clinton includes: the contemporary model—one who models life and ministry and "commands emulation;" the historical model—one whose life provides "dynamic principles for life and ministry;" and the divine contact—one who provides "timely guidance or discernment perceived as divine intervention."

of the session (the flow, sequence of events, what's appropriate when and where)."[124] The coach asks questions and receives questions. During the mentor sessions, I will guide the participants to explore their tasks and their relationships as they relate to cross-cultural ministry.

The quality of the mentoring relationship should change over the fifteen-week period that encompasses the project from pre-assessment to post-assessment. The expectation is that it will deepen and be a mutually beneficial relationship. The challenge of coaching has been encapsulated by this statement: "Coaching requires intimacy."[125] Thus, at the beginning of the mentoring relationship there can be some fear and trepidation. Anderson and Reese declare that it is up to the mentor to create the "hospitable space of trust and intimacy," so that "the life of the mentoree can be heard."[126]

Essential to this development is "the respect of vulnerability and boundaries" and the relationship perspective that sees the mentoring relationship on a continuum. The mentor sets the stage for boundaries of time, personhood, and confidentiality. In the development of the relationship, the mentor must also respect the time required to move into deeper levels of trust. Anderson and Reese believe the mentoring relationship may move through Aelred of Rivaulx's four stages of friendship: selection, probation,

---

[124] Frederic M. Hudson, *The Handbook of Coaching: A Comprehensive Resource Guide for Managers, Executives, Consultants, and Human Resource Professionals* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999), 21.

[125] R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr., "Coaching in The Midst of Diversity," *Coaching For Leadership: How the World's Greatest Coaches Help Leaders Learn*, edited by Jarshall Goldsmith, Laurence Lyons and Alyssa Freas (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,/Pfeiffer, 2000), 356.

[126] Keith R. Anderson and Randy D. Reese, *Spiritual Mentoring: A Guide for Seeking and Giving Direction* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsityPress, 1999), 13.

admission, and harmony.[127] In this project I will have the benefit of some previous

relationship with the participants. However, the genuine enjoyment of this project will be

the development of deeper friendships and partnership in ministry. The mentoring

relationship will allow friendship to serve as a paradigm for cross-cultural leadership.

---

[127] Ibid., 79-85. "Selection" is the assessment of whether one is attracted to qualities within the other, such as love, affection, security and happiness. "Probation" is the testing of loyalty, right intention, discretion, and patience. "Admission" is the reception of the other as a friend through vulnerability and disclosure. "Harmony" is the shared expectation of being together in growth and ministry.

CHAPTER 5

PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project Design

A brief word about the project design is warranted before the discussion of my objectives. I will lead a select group of Cityview Baptist Church members through a ten-week cross-cultural leadership development module. The module will include pre- and post- attitude and behaviour evaluation measures and a two-hour weekly teaching session. As well, I will have five mentor meetings with each participant over the ten-week period. These sessions will be focused on their development as a cross-cultural leader and will assist them in personal reflection about themselves, the course assignments, and their multicultural group or ministry team. The course will include questions for personal reflection, reading assignments in Acts and Duane Elmer's book *Cross-Cultural Conflict*, and intentional cross-cultural experiences.[128]

I will use two inventories for pre- and post- assessment. The pre-assessment inventories will be administered the week the teaching sessions begin. The first inventory is *The Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory* designed by Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers most often used by cross-cultural trainers in business, academic, or government settings. And the second is a behavioural inventory for cross-cultural leadership,

---

[128] Duane Elmer, *Cross-Cultural Conflict: Building Relationships for Effective Ministry* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1993).

developed by me specifically for our context.[129] Both of these inventories will be administered to the participants four weeks after the last teaching session. Notably, there is some difficulty in measuring personal change because of different views between cultures on assessment.[130] However, I will try to take this into consideration in my final evaluation of the project ministry outcomes. In spite of these difficulties, I have continued to rely on Western assessment strategies in both the design of the project and the design of evaluation tools. My goal is to have a minimum of ten leaders participate in the course.

Objectives for Participants

I have three objectives for the participants in my project. Each objective relates to the participants' growth in cross-cultural competence. The course, informed by both theology and theory, is designed to yield outcomes in both the affective and behavioural realms. Objectives one and two are behavioural and the third is affective.

Develop self-awareness in cross-cultural encounters.

My first objective for the participants in this project is that they develop an awareness of their comfort or discomfort in cross-cultural encounters and their cultural predispositions regarding life, faith, and discipleship that inform those encounters. I want them to be able to distinguish between personal preferences and principles of Christ-likeness. Five components of the teaching material will assist them with this objective.

---

[129] See Appendix D, Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory.

[130] Michael H. Hoppe, "Cross-Cultural Issues in Leadership Development," *The Center for Creative Leadership: Handbook of Leadership Development*, edited by Cynthia D. McCauley, Russ S. Moxley, and Ellen Van Velsor (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998), 350-356. Hoppe provides an excellent discussion of the varied cultural approaches and implications to assessment.

The first is a self-exploration tool called the "Multicultural You." It will assist them in the exploration of their cultural informants.[131] The second is a "Culture Continuum Wall;" it will accompany each of the nine components of culture to be taught in the material.[132] Each participant will mark their self-perceptions regarding themselves and the dominant culture. As well, I will provide the participants with an interview tool that they may use with an other-culture believer for the exploration of that person's spiritual journey.[133] Through this experience, they will gain insight into the spiritual journey of an other-culture person and the varied ways God works to grow people in Christ. The fourth tool to aid their self-exploration in this area is the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory.[134] Through discussion of the inventory, I expect that the participants will be able to identify personal growth areas in the affective domain. The fifth tool supporting growth in this area will be the personal reflection training and questions assigned at the end of each class.

To identify progress in this criterion, the participants will be asked to share their responses to the "Multicultural You" and the "culture component wall" with the class during the teaching sessions. I will ask the participants to complete the spiritual journey interview twice and report on it with me in a mentor session. I expect that the participants will be able to discuss with me their scores on the Cross-Cultural

---

[131] See Appendix E, The Multicultural You.

[132] See Appendix F, Nine Components of Culture.

[133] See Appendix G, Spiritual Journey Interview.

[134] The *Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory* by Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers is available from Reid London House. You may contact them at www.reidlondonhouse.com or 800-221-8378. The inventory measures four areas: Emotional Resilience, Flexibility/Openness, Perceptual Acuity, and Personal Autonomy.

Adaptability Inventory and identify their growth areas. During the mentor sessions, I will explore their responses to some of the mentoring questions. In the post-course assessment, I expect that the participants will have increased scores in at least two dimensions of the CCAI.

Gain cross-cultural decision-making experience.

My second objective for the participants in this project is that they gain experience making decisions with other-culture people and maximizing each other's cultural strengths through shared service. I will ask them to lead a multicultural group or ministry team to accomplish a ministry project. They are to meet a need and make a memory. Shared experiences become the fodder for close community. The ten-week course will assist them in exploring these issues, and I will follow their progress in the mentor meeting. I expect that the reading assignments from Acts and *Cross-Cultural Conflict* will support this objective as well. In my final meeting with the participants, I will consider this objective met if they completed a ministry event or began a new ministry project with a multicultural group.

Increase sensitivity to the needs of other-culture people.

My third objective is that these developing cross-cultural leaders heighten their sensitivity to the needs of other-culture people. They will demonstrate this affective change by growth in at least two areas of the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory.[135] The behavioural inventory measures twenty-four behaviours associated with cross-cultural leadership. These behaviours are grouped into three areas: initiative,

---

[135] See Appendix D for the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory.

introspection, and interdependence. Increased sensitivity to the needs of other-culture people will be demonstrated by the participants' increased initiative to cross cultural barriers, increased reflection on their cross-cultural encounters, and increased mutuality in their cross-cultural relationships.

Personal Objectives

Through this project, it is my desire that, like the participants, I will grow as a cross-cultural leader in the urban multicultural church. Through the project, I will get to unite teaching and mentoring with a single process focused on leading a group of leaders to grow. I will get to facilitate adult learning for a multicultural group and regularly pray for their formation in Christ. I will get to respond to their learning needs, serving as a bridge between the material and their lives. I expect that I will develop greater cross-cultural competence for leadership in the church.

Through the mentoring processes, I will get to participate in the spiritual journey of other-culture leaders. It is my personal objective that I will expand my mentoring skills in cross-cultural leadership. This project will require that I further develop my time management and information organization habits for long-term mentoring relationships; that I apply varied mentoring styles according to a leader's need; and that I hone my listening and feedback skills for communication clarification when mentoring cross-culturally.

To evaluate my progress in this objective, I will keep a mentoring log that will record my schedule of meetings and my personal reflection. This log will be shared with my field supervisor. As well, I will evaluate the participants' attendance and completion of assignments as an indication of my effectiveness as a cross-cultural leader. Though

not a sure sign of effectiveness in raising cross-cultural competence, these do serve as indicators of my effectiveness in cooperating with the Spirit of God to motivate volunteers to continue investing in their own personal growth and the ministry of Cityview Baptist Church.

CHAPTER 6

REPORT ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Phase One: Pre-Assessment

The first part of implementing the teaching module for raising cross-cultural competence among the leaders of Cityview Baptist Church required that I personally invite leaders to participate. Although the course was announced at large, most of the leaders who participated did so in response to a personal invitation. I invited about twenty-five leaders of various levels of involvement in Cityview to participate. As I began the process of recruiting participants, I made the decision to open the course up to a few people who did not have an identifiable group, yet were leading in a cross-cultural capacity within the church. As well, after being approached by individuals outside of the Cityview Baptist Church congregation, I made the decision to include some participants who were not Cityview members. Seventeen students committed to take the course and fourteen completed it. A profile of each participant is in Appendix H.

At our first meeting, I administered the two pre-assessment tools: the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory (CCLBI) and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI). Each student tallied his or her scores for the inventories. Their scores are listed in Appendix I and Appendix J.

Three conclusions about the class as a whole from the pre-assessment inventories influenced my teaching and the choices I made week to week. (1) Although the participants generally scored in the upper end of both inventories, many of the

63

participants had identifiable growth areas. From the CCAI I concluded that a number of participants needed growth in perceptual acuity and in personal autonomy. (2) Likewise, scores on the CCLBI were generally high. However, in my own evaluation, I would have ranked most participants lower in both initiative and interdependence, as these two areas were readily observable to me; therefore, I decided to challenge the participants for growth in these two behavioural areas throughout the course. (3) Most of the participants seem to have felt a fair degree of confidence regarding their competence for cross-cultural ministry. However, I believed that they probably lacked a way to talk about what they knew intuitively and experientially so others could gain from their knowledge and experience. Therefore, in the teaching module I planned on giving clues on how the participants might use the information to help other people grow as cross-cultural leaders.

Phase Two: Teaching and Mentoring

I began teaching the material on the first night after the inventories were administered. The introductory material consisted of an explanation of the inventories and their results, an overview of the whole course, and an introduction of the components of culture. Each week I adapted the material according to the progress we made the week before. As I wanted to honour the participants and give ample room for the course, I sought to begin on time and stay within the two-hour framework for each class period. It quickly became apparent though, that I would have to adjust my expectations and plan. I reduced the amount of material to be covered each week to allow for the discussion required for processing new information and informing affective change. I pursued the

serendipitous moments that arose in the classroom discussion related to the video clips, the class material, and the reading assignments. [128]

A typical class session began with prayer and a review of the previous week's material. The "Multicultural You" worksheet was presented by a student near the beginning of each session. This provided the participants an opportunity to inquire about the presenter's cultural influences and perspectives. I found this to be a good "ice-breaker" as it encouraged interaction and warmth. Over the course of nine-weeks the participants brought their own snacks to share with the students. We had fun noting our different cultural preferences that surfaced from the candy bowl for salty, sour, or sweet. I tried to balance the presentation of information, such as the "culture continuum" or cross-cultural communication models, with questions designed to elicit conversation about previous experiences or their hope for future interactions. When presenting biblical material, I often assigned them one or two questions to explore in groups of three or four and then make a presentation to the whole class. I tried to strategically plan the use of videos in a class session to correspond either with the presentation of new information or the unpacking of biblical material. Throughout the course there were plenty of "housekeeping" matters to attend to, such as attendance, weekly assignments, and affirming the mentor meeting schedule. However, I limited the amount of time these required and planed them for the end of the teaching period as they tended to lower the sense of energy among the participants.

---

[128] See Appendix K for an outline of the teaching module, *Agents of Reconciliation: Becoming a cross-cultural leader in a multicultural world*, and the video clips used.

Throughout the course, most of the students maintained consistent attendance; however, some of the participants had to be absent on occasion. I left it up to each participant to get the notes and material from other students if they were absent. However, at the beginning of each class, I provided a brief review of what we covered the previous week. About three weeks before the end of the course, I realized that half of the class was going to be absent on week ten, so I decided to shift some of week ten's material into the remaining weeks, reducing the teaching sessions down to nine. The attendance records are listed in Appendix L. By week six, three of the participants dropped the class; two because of increased demands in their Master-level studies, and a third because of a change in her work schedule.

In my preparation for the teaching, I had expected that I would have to rely on a lecture method in the first half of the class because of the learning style of the participants. However, during the first week it became apparent that I was able to vary the teaching methods with good class response. The profiles of the participants indicate that most of these adult learners would be comfortable with teaching methods further down Kohls list of teaching methods aimed at synthesis and evaluation.[129] All but one of the participants had upper levels of education beyond high school and all but two had lived for over five years in the North American context.[130]

As I contemplated the fact that I had 17 participants in the course, I was confronted with my own schedule and realized that it would be difficult to have five mentor sessions with each participant. Therefore, I planned three waves of mentor

---

[129] For the discussion on Kohls' teaching method continuum see the Theoretical section of this paper.

[130] See Appendix H for the project participant profiles.

meetings. The first wave was scheduled during the second week of the course. Because of the size of the class, I paired several people together to reduce the number of meetings I was having. I managed to meet with all but four people in the first wave. These first mentor meetings were focused on drawing out individual growth objectives for the course and in answering their questions about the course. The second wave of mentor meetings was largely concerned with three issues: (1) Assessing the existence of new learning markers from the class, the reading, or their experiences and personal reflections; (2) Helping them think about their ministry project; and (3) Hearing about their interview with an other-culture person. At the start of this wave it became apparent that three people were not going to complete the course, so of the remaining students I met all but four. The third wave of mentor meetings coincided with the last week of the course and continued into the month of June. In these mentor meetings I explored the participants' ministry projects, continued growth plans, and personal highlights from the course. Nine of the final fourteen students met with me in a third mentor session.

Phase Three: Post-Assessment

In the second week of July, I began collecting the post-assessment material from the participants. Five weeks had passed since the completion of the teaching sessions. The participants were to have completed their interviews of other-culture people and their ministry projects. From a second administration of the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory and the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory, I hoped to discover if behavioural and affective change had occurred.

Before the course was launched, I had planned for the participants to do two spiritual journey interviews of other-culture people. Eight of the participants completed a

spiritual journey interview with an other-culture person in the first half of the course. The interviews seemed to be rewarding to those who did them. However as the course progressed into the second half, the ministry project became their priority outside of the classroom. I am not aware of any participants that completed a second spiritual journey interview.

Ten of the participants completed their ministry projects and gave me either a verbal or a written summary of their experiences. Several of the participants collaborated in the development and implementation of their ministry project; therefore only seven ministry projects were completed. The projects were as diverse as the participants: a cooking class, a party for an international English school, a wedding, the development of a mission conference planning team, a dinner targeting Korean women with non-Korean spouses, the mentoring of a Taiwanese student entering a "foreign" work culture, and the development of a worship team. Three participants who did not complete a ministry project indicated that they made concerted efforts to apply the material in their multicultural work-settings.

The participants completed the two behavioural and attitudinal inventories for a second time: the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory. The scores have been tabled in Appendix M and Appendix N with their respective scores from the pre-assessment. One unfortunate aspect of the post-assessment process was that in the effort to shorten the course, I neglected to administer the "course evaluation" that was part of the module in week ten.

CHAPTER 7

PROJECT ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

Evaluation of the ministry outcomes for participants

<u>Develop self-awareness in cross-cultural encounters.</u>

The project participants gained new insights into themselves and their cross-cultural interactions as evidenced by their ability (1) to identify personal growth areas, (2) to discuss their own cultural formation, and (3) to identify their cultural preferences when interacting with the dominant cultural norms of Vancouver.

The project participants were keenly interested in their scores from the two inventories, especially the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory. In my discussions with them, most of the participants were able to identify something from the CCAI that gave them more self-awareness and insight into their cross-cultural interactions. The participants that got the most from the inventory were able to grasp how their scores reflected something they believed about themselves. For example, two second generation Asian participants noted in their mentor meeting that the intense pressure to please "everyone"—the family in the home and friends in the Canadian society—had brought them to believe that they must do this even though they could not. Their scores in two dimensions, a high emotional resilience and a low personal autonomy reflected that belief. Throughout the course, participants referred back to their scores on the CCAI. In the post-inventory administration of the CCAI, ten students had increased scores in at

least one dimension. Five participants increased in three areas; and three participants increased scores in all four dimensions.

When we used the "Multicultural You" worksheet, participants were surprised at the number and the diversity of cultural informants each person had. The class realized that "just looking at a person," even at themselves, was often informed by the socially normalizing process of stereotyping. As they worked through the process and later shared their story that emerged from the page, I noticed that some participants seemed both delighted and affirmed to realize that their multiple cultural identities were something to be valued. However, later in the course as we began to work through the implications of an ethnocentric view rather than a Christocentric view, I had to help some participants gain perspective on how to accept God's providential design and yet find their identity in Christ.

Perhaps the most helpful tool that aided participants in understanding their comfort or discomfort in cross-cultural situations was the "culture continuum wall." By week three, I had varied responses to this dissection of culture. Most participants were thankful to understand better the source or sources of frustration in their cross-cultural interactions. However, one participant came to a moment of utter despair, blurting out, "What's the use? How can we ever get along? How can we ever get anything done?" I tried to seize the teachable moment to emphasize the importance of gaining understanding and the miracle of being a people gathered under the name of Christ and filled with His Spirit. I realized that I would have to put these cultural components and the people groups represented by either side of the continuum "back together again."

Every participant in the course used this tool to highlight their cultural preferences and the way it affected their cross-cultural interactions.

The other-culture interview was not as helpful for the participants as I had expected. The students who completed the interview gained insights into the varied ways God works for the salvation of people and life change. Some participants made new friendships. However, I am disappointed with the process and the priority the interview took with the course. I believe a greater benefit for the students would have been gained if the second interview had taken place as planned near the end of the course. In this interview they could have assimilated the material and insights gained during the previous eight weeks. However, because of the demands of their lives and the ministry project, I did not press them to complete it and none of the participants did so.

In spite of this, I believe the interview can be an effective tool for raising cross-cultural competence in ministry. Participants benefited from it because they "had a reason" to engage an "other-culture" person in conversation. The interview questions engaged the participants in a level of personal and spiritual exploration to which they may not have be accustomed. Over a long-term leadership development process, the participants could complete several interviews and compare the information gleaned to gain further insights into discipleship processes across cultures.

Gain cross-cultural decision-making experience.

Ten participants completed a ministry project and gained experience in cross-cultural leadership. During the planning and implementation of the project the participants made decisions with other-culture people and tried to maximize cultural strengths for ministry. Their projects addressed many types of needs: expanding

relational circles for people, having fun, gaining a sense of significance, providing a venue for a group of churches to challenge young adults and youth to engage in God's global mission, helping someone succeed at work, and helping people meet Jesus. Several of the projects yielded ministry opportunities and cross-cultural relationships that went beyond the course. Four of the seven projects revolved around a shared meal in order to facilitate cross-cultural exchange.

In their reports, the participants reported a wide variety of emotions in the various stages of planning, implementing, and evaluating the ministry experience. These ranged from fear and frustration to joy and satisfaction. The leaders reported that they faced cross-cultural challenges that included: trying to be understood, decision-making, negotiating people's differing senses of time, understanding views on authority, expectations of children, large and small group dynamics, the "cultural" yes, and differing work expectations.

The leaders who reported the most satisfaction with their project shared some common project processes and outcomes. First, they had successfully assisted diverse people to serve each other and others with strengths and gifts drawn from their cultural backgrounds. Second, they had spent a significant amount of time considering the needs of the group they were seeking to serve and how that particular group would best respond to having that need met. This is in contrast to those that simply plunged into the project without considering how the target group would receive the intended ministry. And third, these leaders were able to articulate what they wanted to accomplish through the project during the mentor meeting. In addition these leaders reported that they believed

Jesus Christ had been honoured, that they found the experience enjoyable, and that significant relational connections had been made for further ministry.

The most difficult component of this project for the participants was not the group decision-making process, but the attempt to maximize cultural strengths in the decisions they made together. Several of the leaders struggled internally with how to effectively do this. It was an issue of whether to be overt or to be quietly shrewd. Most came to the conclusion that they could effectively draw out cultural strengths by engaging their team members in tasks or networking that reflected the members' affinities. The affinities often reflected something of the members' cultural backgrounds. For example, one of the leaders working with a Korean member from her small group did not emphasize that member's "Korean-ness," but rather emphasized the member's circle of relationships, experiences, and knowledge. The question was not, "Do you have any lost Korean friends?" Rather, it was "Who in your circle of relationships has a need we could meet?" Another group maximized their interest in learning how to cook Chinese food by shaping the project around the skills of the people they were hoping to reach—women who were Chinese. Maximizing cultural strengths for ministry was something the leader was aware of trying to do without making it an issue for the members.

As I listened to the course participants reflect on their projects, I appreciate the wisdom found in the affinity approach. Cross-cultural leadership runs the risk of polarizing people with labels when cultural backgrounds are emphasized. This project heightened the attention course participants gave to the question of cultural background. In our church, most of the ministry leadership is not dominated with concern about the cultural background of the members. The goal is for them to be cross-cultural leaders

who act as an agent of God's reconciliation in Christ; therefore, they will need to emphasize identity in Christ without ignoring the cultural components of a person's identity. Inattention to the cultural background of members in the congregation ignores the opportunity for powerful ministry and devalues people. Striking a fine balance between identity in Christ and cultural background is an example of leadership as art rather than formula. As I observed the course participants, I recognized that the dynamic quality of cross-cultural competence is continually tested in the leaders of a multicultural congregation. Spiritual maturity will mean that members are not ruled by their affinities, rather they are governed by love and the call of God in Jesus Christ; under Christ their affinities are redeemed. In the future, I will lead Cityview to adjust its ministry discovery process to help members understand the providential design of God in their cultural formation and the role it may play in their ministry.

<u>Increase sensitivity to the needs of other-culture people.</u>

The course participants reported varied levels of change in this dimension of the project. To some degree all of the participants in my ministry project were active in cross-cultural ministry and relationships. Their scores on the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory indicate that many of them would probably be successful in a more intensive cross-cultural situation, such as moving into a foreign setting for work. It is not a surprise that the group as a whole scored quite high in all three areas measured by the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory. However, most surprising to me in the post-course assessment was that ten of the participants scored lower in one of the three

areas.[139] I had sought positive change in at least two areas; only six participants reported this level of change.

I suspect that the participants were overly positive about themselves the first time the inventory was administered. Perhaps, the problem could have been corrected in the assessment by designing the inventory for 360° feedback.[140] The scores may also reflect a low expectation on the part of the participants regarding their learning needs. Fortunately, the first several weeks of the course seem to have raised their expectations. A significant marker of this change came to light for me, during the fifth week of the course, when a participant said, "Wow, I am learning that I don't know as much as I thought I did."

In spite of this caveat regarding the Cityview Cross-Cultural Leader Behaviour Inventory, the data indicate that six participants had positive change in two areas, and ten participants had significant change in at least one area.[141] In an analysis of the twenty-four specific behaviours measured, seven of the participants changed positively in eight or more behaviours and eleven of the participants had a positive change in at least seven behaviours. In light of the fact that the change is being reported five weeks after the end of the teaching modules, I have concluded that these scores reflect the affective change

---

[139] See the Project Participant Profiles in Appendix H for a listing of each individuals pre- and post- inventory scores.

[140] 360° assessment is a term used to describe assessment of individuals by themselves and their peers over a period of time as it relates to predetermined objectives and values. A helpful discussion of the 360° process and cross-cultural management is provided by Michael H. Hoppe in "Cross-Cultural Issues in Leadership Development," *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development,* 336-377.

[141] The change is being noted as significant if the point total for the area in question changed from poor to fair, or fair to good. See Appendix O for the summary of CCLBI scoring.

sought by the project—increased sensitivity to the needs of other-culture people. Increased sensitivity to the needs of other-culture people as evidenced by increased initiative, introspection, and interdependence can be nurtured through a three-pronged development process involving teaching, mentoring, and on-the-job experience. Post-course developments in the lives of the participants also indicate that the project was effective. For example, one of the participants, a public high school teacher, developed a teaching unit with students that implemented learning projects designed to enable the students to explore their immigrant family experiences. The teacher indicated that this would not have happened without the learning experience during this project.

Evaluation of the personal learning experience.

My personal learning objective was to grow as a cross-cultural leader by further developing my teaching and mentoring skills. Four observations describe my growth during this experience. (1) I learned that my limit for effective mentoring on a coaching level is probably between 4 and 6 people. (2) I learned that I must continue to refine my ability to strategically think through the planning, implementation, and follow-up of ministry processes. (3) I learned that when mentoring culturally distant people, I need to plan more flexible blocks of time. (4) I gained insight to make adjustments to the course for increased effectiveness in the future.

The post-course assessments and the ministry projects completed by the participants affirmed my conviction that a three-pronged strategy of intensive teaching, mentoring, and on-the-job experience is helpful in the development of cross-cultural leaders in the multicultural church. However, I have also become convinced that a team of leaders is necessary for an effective cross-cultural leadership development strategy.

One person can effectively teach modules and related assignments. However, it is unlikely that one person can effectively mentor such a large class.

I struggled to work within the confines of my own life and the lives of seventeen others for the level of mentoring that some required; it was simply a logistical challenge. The time I needed to review and prepare for each mentoring session was often compromised by other demands of ministry and life. I feel that I was only able to effectively mentor six of the participants. These participants reported the most satisfaction in their ministry projects. As a long-term strategy for Cityview, I would do well to take some of the participants in this first class and have them trained in mentoring or coaching. Then in the next run of the course they could serve as a team of mentors for the participants.

As the mentor in this project, I appreciated the opportunity the course provided to focus the purpose of each session. My personal disposition is to focus on the general, big picture in life and ministry. I believe this tendency has sometimes benefited mentoring relationships, but it has also hindered the development of some individuals. When they needed focused direction and accountability in a specific area, I may have failed to recognize it until it became a crisis. In this situation though, both the course participants and myself knew our purpose—to explore cross-cultural leadership and the course assignments as it related to them; therefore, we were able to make more headway in a short amount of time.

As a cross-cultural leader, I experienced the most challenge as a mentor with those participants with whom I shared a greater cultural distance. In these instances, I found myself asking plenty of exploratory questions to try and understand their

perspectives. I came to have a greater appreciation of these people, but felt some frustration, when an hour had passed and we had not made headway on specific assignments. I sensed that these participants left the session feeling positive about the experience. However, my task orientation was stretched by their need to be relational. I learned that I need to create more flexibility in my schedule for the backend of these type of appointments so that there is time to talk about the task after the relationship has been tuned up. Upon further reflection, I realize that these high people oriented individuals will be more likely to discuss the task without resentment if there has been some other relational investment on my part during the week prior to the meeting.

The teaching sessions were intense but very enjoyable. In the process of teaching the course, I made some adjustments to the material that will be beneficial for its future use. Several insights informed those decisions. I had over planned what was possible to teach in the allotted time. Therefore, I had to cut out material in order to allow for discussion that would facilitate learning. This decision was aided by three understandings that reduced the necessity of teaching the characteristics of different culture groups in this setting as separate teaching sections. I had planned sections on the major characteristics of Asian, North American, and African cultures. However, these culture groups became topics of discussion during the teaching of the "components of culture."[142] I also realized that categorizing people from certain geographic areas in order to predict worldview and behaviour ignores the tremendous intra-cultural diversity contained in these groups. Furthermore, it seems that a significant understanding of

---

[142] I taught nine "components of culture" as developed by Norma Carr-Ruffino in *Diversity Success Strategies* (Boston: Butterworth Heinemann, 1999), 22-29.

one's own culture is a greater predictor of cross-cultural competence than the possession of knowledge about another cultural group.[143] Therefore, I removed those sections from the course.

During my evaluation of the course, I have realized that another adjustment is warranted. In six of the sessions I intended to use video clips as "culture-general assimilators;" however, I seem to have used them as "intercultural sensitizers." The conversation regarding the clips would have been more effective in the course as "culture-general assimilators." It is better to use the clips to elicit discussion about *the kinds of experiences* leaders may have when they encounter a culture different from their own. For example, in the class discussion regarding a movie clip from the *Joy Luck Club*, the discussion focused on the Asian immigrant experience and on identifying particular aspects of Asian culture.   It would have been more helpful to focus on the kind of experiences one might face as an immigrant or as a guest in an immigrant's home. Although I had cited the research noting the difference between "intercultural sensitizers" and "culture-general assimilators" in my project proposal, I had not had experience facilitating the second kind. One of the participants drew my attention to this issue when he commented that it is "arrogant to believe one has a handle on a culture group because he has seen a video clip." In the future I will use only five movie clips over the course of

---

[143] Patty Lane, *A Beginner's Guide to Crossing Cultures: making friends in multicultural world* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 25-30. Lane discusses the problem of "stereotypes" and tries to remedy this with the application of "archetypal models." She notes that it is essential to know one's own culture in order to take down the often negative stereotypes built up about other cultures in contrast to one's own. However she recognizes that there does need to be a way to talk about the differences. She defines "archetypes" as insider developed observations that "allow a person to have a general idea of cultural norms, customs and values without limiting anyone to be the archetype" (26). For the development of cross-cultural competence through understanding one's own culture see footnote 113 referencing work by Fathi Yousef.

the class, and I will change the leading questions I use in order to facilitate discussion so that the focus is on the *kind* of cross-cultural encounters the participants may have as leaders.

My development as a leader is constantly being pressed by the high expectations I put on other people and myself. This project has been no different. However, I have had some new insights into ministry and who I am. My generalist tendencies mean that I am often down in the middle of a battlefield with knowledge of what constitutes victory, but without a full understanding of what it will take to get there. On the battlefield one appears to make it up as he goes along. To effectively engage other people in the pursuit of victory, I need to communicate clear expectations and clear plans. I will need to stand back and methodically plan what the situation and the envisioned victory require. This project and the planning required helped me advance in a crucial dimension of effective leadership to my ministry.

Recently, I began to more clearly communicate with my pastoral staff and the leadership of Cityview a long-range plan and a sense of timing for its implementation. Beforehand, I failed to realize that I had not fully communicated with them or engaged them in the process. They appreciate the effort I am making. It has brought relief from unwarranted pressure and more dynamic input for the planning process. As well, they are beginning to understand where they fit into the implementation of new structures related to strategy and vision. The staff seems to have new enthusiasm for the required personal and corporate change.

I am not sure that my personality will change significantly in this growth process. I will still tend to function as a field commander. However, I hope to continue learning

how to more effectively lead this team to participate in the Kingdom of God. I still find that my expectations are high but not necessarily effective. Expectations are effective in leadership only if they are cogent and well communicated. This project has afforded me ample opportunity for reflection on the quality of my cross-cultural relationships with my staff and with the church as a whole. In ministry these relationships have sometimes suffered because I am perceived to be in a rush or to be unclear about what I want other people to do.

Through this project, I sharpened my skills to communicate what needs to be done, when it needs to be done, and who needs to do it. I disciplined my thinking to consider the desirable outcomes and the processes that will promote those outcomes. As well, I gained new experiences that will assist me in the future as I help emerging cross-cultural leaders and Cityview Baptist Church discover new ways of being a reconciling force in the name of Jesus.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

It is possible to raise the cross-cultural competence of leaders in the church. Churches that desire to raise the cross-cultural competence of their members would do well to create a three-pronged strategy of teaching, mentoring, and on-the-job experience. It will require extensive contextualization; I do not believe that there will be a one-size-fits-all approach. The development strategy will require an extended time of mentoring, punctuated by periods of intensive teaching. Further research is needed to explore how 360° assessment tools could assist emerging cross-cultural leaders in the church. Churches will want to focus on Christ-like character as the foundation for developing competencies in these leaders. As well, the emerging leaders will need a biblically informed cross-cultural theology as the foundation for their intentionally counter-cultural attitudes and behaviours.

Churches that want to respond to changing communities in a multicultural setting may want to infuse their leadership base with bi- and tri-cultural leaders. These leaders will possess qualities, learned through their daily attempt to live "with a foot in two worlds," that others may emulate. These leaders can create space that is safe for emerging cross-cultural leaders. Bi-cultural leaders simultaneously provide a model for leadership and give emerging leaders room to explore both their identities in Christ and their providentially arranged cultural strengths.

This project has been an attempt to ease the "torturous journey" each generation seems to make from being Jerusalem-centered to being Kingdom-centered. Seeking to raise cross-cultural competence in the church's leaders is a way to cooperate with the grace of God and His Spirit's work in the world. The urban and multicultural realities of the world's cities will only be amplified in the future as people move, marry, and manage wealth. Wherever the grace of the gospel of Jesus Christ is dynamically released in multicultural and multi-ethnic settings, God's people contribute to the creation of a new culture founded in love under the banner of Christ. I hope that this project will contribute to the formation of a generation well-equipped to love people in Jesus' name cross-culturally.